



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2020

No. 108

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, thank You for Your great and precious promises. You have promised to keep a record of our pain. You have promised that no weapon formed against us will prosper. You have promised to supply our needs and to surround us with the shield of Your blessings. You have promised to keep us from stumbling or slipping.

Lord, You have promised that nothing can separate us from Your love. You have promised to do for us more than we can ask or imagine. Great and precious are Your promises.

Give our lawmakers confidence in Your promises as they face these tumultuous times. Sustain them with Your unfailing love and keep them on the right path.

We pray in Your matchless 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 (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING REDUCTION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. The miracles of scientific innovation have cleared ill-

nesses that a generation ago delivered a death sentence to many Americans. Dr. Jonas Salk's polio vaccine in 1953 eradicated the fatal effects of the virus that killed thousands of children in the first half of the 20th century.

I have every confidence that our scientific community will unlock a vaccine to stop the coronavirus pandemic. Testing, developing, and reviewing vaccines take time, but all of that is well underway.

However, there is no time to lose for Congress to pass my bipartisan Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act. We have the responsibility to ensure that pharmaceutical treatments, therapies, and vaccines are affordable for all Americans facing this pandemic or any of the future ones.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Over the last several weeks, major challenges have dominated the headlines on a daily basis. Following the sacrifices Americans have made to fight the coronavirus, our Nation is gradually beginning to reopen. Our economy has started adding back jobs. But as some States are seeing their numbers increase, the fallout for American workers remains historic, and schools, universities, and employers are still looking for smart and safe ways to step back toward normal.

The Senate is working to ensure that our efforts to treat, contain, and re-

cover from the pandemic can succeed. We have confirmed a Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery. Committees are overseeing the CARES Act, and Senator CORNYN is crafting measures to make sure a second epidemic of frivolous lawsuits does not block schools and colleges from reopening or employers from rehiring workers.

At the same time, the killings of Black Americans like George Floyd and Breonna Taylor have accelerated important conversations. With the leadership of Senator SCOTT of South Carolina, the Senate is preparing to add to the conversations surrounding law enforcement with our own serious proposal—policies that would take smart steps without attacking the vast majority of police officers who bravely do their jobs the right way.

Of course there is also a long list of legislative priorities which the Senate was going to tackle before these new issues materialized. This week, Chairman INHOFE and the Armed Services Committee have been marking up the 60th consecutive National Defense Authorization Act, which I hope the full Senate will be voting on later this month.

Here on the floor, we have also been considering a landmark bill to protect and preserve our Nation's public lands for future generations.

In my home State of Kentucky, we know all about the important role that public lands play in preserving our physical heritage, providing access for outdoor recreation, and sustaining jobs and prosperity in the process. Across the Commonwealth, outdoor recreation supports 120,000 jobs and drives nearly \$13 billion in consumer spending. From natural wonders like Red River Gorge and Mammoth Cave National Park to historic sites like Mill Springs Battlefield and Camp Nelson, Kentuckians have grown up enjoying our public lands, and we intend to protect them for future generations.

Let me give just one example. As I mentioned yesterday, when I came to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2901

the Senate, Kentucky was the only State without its own national wildlife refuge. We had plenty of history and heritage. We just needed a little help to preserve it.

With the support of hunters, boaters, and outdoorsmen in the Jackson Purchase region, I led the establishment of the Clarks River National Wildlife Refuge. It was a huge step to protect local species and our treasured Kentucky pastimes. This refuge has continued to grow over the years. Thanks to the Land and Water Conservation Fund and many willing sellers, it now makes thousands of acres available for appreciation, recreation, and tourism.

Like many public lands, these wildlife areas make great neighbors. In a single year, more than 50 million visitors come to America's wildlife refuges nationwide and spend billions in nearby communities.

Decades later, another Kentucky community was looking to safeguard its own natural treasure. The Green River, which flows through Kentucky and meets the Ohio River near Henderson County, is one of the most biodiverse waterways on the entire continent. I was proud to take the lead once again, and alongside strong local supporters and a broad coalition of groups, we sent a bill to President Trump, and he signed it into law. We welcomed the Interior Secretary to Western Kentucky last year to cut the ribbon on the Green River National Wildlife Refuge.

But Kentuckians know that ribbon cuttings are just the beginning. Our State has newly designated public lands that need attention to get off the ground. We have well-established public lands that have opportunities to grow and improve, and we have places like the Daniel Boone National Forest, established more than 80 years ago, that need our careful attention and upkeep.

This legislation before the Senate will help all of them. It will help us repair levees at the Clarks River National Wildlife Refuge. It will also help our two wildlife refuges continue to grow. It will help Mill Springs Battlefield and Camp Nelson continue to teach the history of emancipation and the Civil War to new generations. It will help us make infrastructure upgrades at Mammoth Cave National Park for the safety of 2 million annual visitors. It will help enhance the Land Between the Lakes and its \$600 million economic impact. It will fund transportation and structural maintenance in the Daniel Boone National Forest, which supports more than 900 jobs. It will help us rehabilitate the Cumberland Gap and give future Americans the opportunity to literally follow in the footsteps of our early explorers.

Kentucky is proud of our public lands. We are proud of the role our natural inheritance plays in our vibrant present and our promising future. Of course, we are only just one State. Every one of my Senate colleagues has

parks, forests, refuges, and historic sites they are equally proud of that are equally central in their communities. That is why we voted to advance this legislation earlier this week by an overwhelming bipartisan margin.

President Teddy Roosevelt once said this about our Nation's national treasures: "We have fallen heirs to the most glorious heritage people ever received, and each one must do his part if we wish to show that the Nation is worthy of its good fortune."

I want to thank Senator DAINES and Senator GARDNER for their leadership in making sure that we keep up our end of the bargain with the generations of Americans who came before us and those yet to come. I am also grateful for Senator ALEXANDER, Senator PORTMAN, and our Democratic colleagues, Senators MANCHIN and WARNER, for helping to assemble this bipartisan bill. I will be proud to speak for Kentucky and to vote for it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the killings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery catapulted the issues of racial justice, police violence, and systemic racism to the forefront of this Nation's conscience. These issues are not new. Some are even older than the Nation itself. The anger felt by hundreds of thousands of protestors is about that historical and pervasive injustice. It is rooted in our decades-long failure to reform police departments and the yawning gap between our ideal of equal justice under law and the reality of equal justice for only some.

America is an experiment. The Founding Fathers said that. We know it deep in our bones. An experiment means you can change, and some of the best observers of the difference—I think de Tocqueville was one of these—of America and the difference between us and other countries—we are willing to change.

I am touched and moved—I was with the demonstrators on Saturday in New York, in Brooklyn—by how many people were there—great diversity—and how many were young and idealistic and doing things for just the right reasons—not selfish reasons but for the betterment of the country, to make us a more perfect union.

We must seize this moment. We cannot let it pass. This isn't about simply

renewing a national dialogue, although dialogue is always important. It is about action. It is about making real and meaningful progress. And the way to do that is with comprehensive police reform legislation in Congress.

House and Senate Democrats have already drafted legislation that would ban the use of choke holds and other tactics that have taken the lives of Black Americans like George Floyd and Eric Garner; that would also ban the use of no-knock warrants in drug cases, which is one of the reasons for the death of Breonna Taylor; that would limit the transfer of military equipment to police departments; and, crucially, that would make it easier to hold police accountable for misconduct, as well as institute several reforms to prevent that misconduct in the first place.

The moment does not call for cherry-picking one or two things to do; it calls for bold, broad change—whole-scale reform, not piecemeal reform. I know the inclination of some of my Senate colleagues would be to cherry-pick a few small improvements and say the job is done. It will not be. We need to start—start—with the Justice in Policing Act, a strong, comprehensive bill that people, particularly Senators BOOKER and HARRIS, the CBC, spent a lot of time with experts who have studied this issue for many, many months and years.

For too long, when major issues wash over the country, the waves of change and progress crash against the rocks of a disinterested Republican Senate majority.

When Americans watched in horror as another spate of mass shootings rocked the Nation, they rose up and demanded change. President Trump and Senate Republicans initially tried to make the right noises. Leader MCCONNELL promised that a debate on expanding background checks would be "front and center" in the Senate after shootings in Dayton and El Paso, but, predictably, that debate never came to pass.

That seems to be the M.O. of our Republican friends. When there is a national crisis, major issues, people in the streets worried and concerned and wanting change, we hear words, and then the strategy is delay and, at the end, do nothing. We cannot go through these same motions again.

This is about the original sin of America that we must try to deal with head-on. There are Americans in the streets, shouting at the top of their lungs for change, young people, idealistic people—the best of America. The Senate must pursue comprehensive reform, not the lowest common denominator and certainly not more empty rhetorical resolutions.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Of course, there is another crisis in the country crying out for action and leadership.

The COVID-19 pandemic didn't go away while the Nation rightfully turned its eyes to issues of racial justice.

Yesterday, the United States eclipsed 2 million cases of coronavirus. Another 1.5 million Americans filed for unemployment this week. Federal Reserve officials—sober, nonpolitical—are predicting that, best case, we will end the year around 10 percent unemployment—a staggering figure. One out of every 10.

The disease is spiking in a number of States around the country. Arizona officials have warned that its hospitals could be filled by next month. Texas has gone 3 straight days with record numbers of hospitalizations. North Carolina, New Mexico, California, Oregon, and several other States are experiencing a resurgence or peak levels of COVID-19.

As the President continues to fixate on the stock market and Senate Republicans are prematurely ready to declare victory, we need to wrest the focus back to these crucial issues. So today I am requesting that Dr. Fauci and Dr. Birx and other members of the administration's Coronavirus Task Force conduct a briefing for Democratic Senators on the recent spikes and do it next week. We need to understand why these spikes are happening and how to adapt our national response.

The President—always interested in himself, not in the good of the country—was too quick to sideline the Coronavirus Task Force, too eager to pretend that everything was back to normal and better than ever. The country needs Dr. Fauci on billboards, but the President wants to put him on a milk carton.

The Vice President yesterday was photographed with campaign staffers in a tight space, no social distancing, without anyone wearing a mask. The very least the administration could do is lead by example and often cannot even manage that much.

At the same time, we cannot forget that the issues of racial justice and COVID-19 are intricately related. The COVID-19 pandemic disproportionately kills Black Americans. Communities of color have less access to quality healthcare, greater food insecurity, greater percentages of poverty, and a disproportionate number of our front-line essential workers—41.2 percent—are African American and Latino. The majority of African Americans are renters and dedicate more than 50 percent of their income to rent.

The truth is, an emergency bill on COVID-19 is a racial justice issue too. Hazard pay for essential workers is a racial justice issue too. Healthcare is a racial justice issue too. Rent assistance and forbearance from eviction is a racial justice issue too. These are all items that must be discussed in another COVID relief bill, and it is past time to get to work.

African Americans, Latinos, and other minorities are taking the eco-

nomie hit from the coronavirus on the chin, but Senate Republicans, led by Leader MCCONNELL, are reportedly unwilling to consider another emergency relief bill until late July. How many more workers will lose their jobs between now and late July? How many renters will be kicked out of their homes between now and late July? How many State and local government workers will lose their jobs, as State and local governments meet their budget deadlines on July 1 and don't have the dollars to deal with them? How many of them will lose their jobs? Waiting until late July is callous, it is cold, and it is wrong for our economy.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Republican majority seems to have a whole lot of time to push rightwing judges. That is what they want to do next week. And both of the judges that they nominate—to show the hypocrisy of those who talk about wanting to help and compare it to their actions, both of those judges have an antipathy to our healthcare law. In the middle of a public healthcare crisis, the Republican majority thinks they can get away with stuff like this, but they can't. Americans are catching on. One of the nominees, Cory Wilson, has an alarming record on voting rights in the middle of a national reckoning on racial injustice, and you are all going to vote for him? This guy has opposed voting rights, and you are going to vote for him. They oppose healthcare. You are going to vote for them. And then they are going to give nice speeches on how they want equality. The two have to add up together.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. The Republican majority also seems to have time to chase all of President Trump's wild conspiracy theories about how he was wronged by law enforcement—the poor, beleaguered President Trump. My goodness. That is what is happening in Judiciary today. Republican Majority Leader MCCONNELL can devote time to that, but they can't commit to time on the floor about how Black Americans are being wronged by law enforcement.

In order to bring a small appearance of fairness to this ridiculous Judiciary Committee vote today, Democrats will be requesting subpoenas for Trump campaign associates like Michael Cohen, Rick Gates, George Papadopoulos, and Michael Flynn, among others. These men have at one time or another pled guilty to offenses related to Putin's interference in the election. Let's hear what they have to say, or should this be just a one-sided kangaroo court to please President Trump?

If the Republican conspiracy caucus wants to waste the Senate's time dredging up old conspiracy theories about the previous election, let's at

least get the straight story. Let's at least hear witnesses who might have something different to say. This is not a dictatorship. This is not how courts or hearings are supposed to work, I would say to the Republican chairman, and it is beneath his dignity and the dignity of the body to conduct such sham, kangaroo court hearings.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRASSO). Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019— Resumed

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

McConnell (for Gardner) amendment No. 1617, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell amendment No. 1626 (to amendment No. 1617), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1627 (to amendment No. 1626), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 1628 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1617), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1629 (to amendment No. 1628), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 1630, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1631 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1630), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 1632 (to amendment No. 1631), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

(The remarks of Mr. THUNE pertaining to the introduction of S. 3938 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

PROTESTS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it has been 17 days since Minneapolis police murdered George Floyd; 90 days since police in Louisville, KY, killed Breonna Taylor, who would have turned 27 just days ago; and 109 days since Ahmaud Arbery was killed by

armed White residents in South Georgia.

These are just some of the most recent examples of the senseless, repeated killings of Black people in our communities, including by police, that have led to the massive outpouring of anger and grief we have seen on display in streets across the country. We know that these protests are not only about unjust tragedies. They are also about Tony McDade, Sandra Bland, Mike Brown, Atatiana Jefferson, Walter Scott, Philando Castile, Aiyana Stanley-Jones, and Tamir Rice, as well as Manny Ellis, Charleena Lyles, and Che Taylor, from my home State of Washington. There are countless Black people and people of color whose vast majority of names we don't know whose lives have been unfairly taken.

Even more important, these protests are driven by people, including many young people, who are justifiably sick and tired of the systemic racism behind those killings that is deeply woven throughout the fabric of our democracy and our history and rightly believe we are not moving forward nearly fast enough.

I know this is true in my home State of Washington, where according to data compiled by the Mapping Police Violence database, between 2013 and 2019, Black people were more than three times more likely to be killed by police. It is beyond clear that the disproportionate impact of police violence on Black communities—as well as other communities of color—is not some accident, and it speaks to a rot that is deep in the design of our Nation. I come to the floor today because our Nation has to change, because the people are demanding it, and I believe each of us, especially those of us privileged enough to serve in the U.S. Senate, is responsible for being a part of the solution.

It has been more than 2 weeks since George Floyd's murder, and we are still seeing protests across the country in towns big and small, in urban and rural areas. More importantly, they don't seem to be stopping. More and more people are getting engaged and learning and listening and signaling. We have a real opportunity to make change in our country. I believe strongly this is a problem we can start to solve today, and we have policies to do it.

One major step we can take is by passing the legislation offered this week by Senators HARRIS and BOOKER. I thank them for their moral leadership on so many challenges but especially this week with the introduction of the Justice in Policing Act. Their legislation would, among other things, reform qualified immunity that is an antiquated judicial doctrine that has kept so many officers from being held accountable for violating Americans' constitutional rights. It would ban the use of choke holds and carotid holds and make Federal funds available only for State and local departments com-

mitted to codifying an end to these shameful tactics in law. It would reform the use-of-force standards to make officers clear a higher bar before using deadly force and require deadly force to be used only as a last resort.

It would ban the use of no-knock warrants in Federal drug cases and provide strong incentives to State and local governments to do the same. It would strengthen transparency of policing through data, like creating a national police misconduct registry to prevent misconduct from being swept under the rug and requiring the Federal Government to finally begin national tracking of incidences of use of force.

It would limit the transfer of military-grade equipment to State and local law enforcement, as well as steps to restore and build on many of the policing reform efforts initiated during the Obama administration. None of these policies should be controversial for any of us here in the Senate, Democrat or Republican. We have all seen the same egregious violence and the same abuses of power from police in the communities we represent—communities whose safety should be our priority. It is undeniable that change is not only necessary but long overdue, and there is absolutely no reason this body shouldn't be able to take up these straightforward vital steps and pass them immediately.

Now, I don't think Senators HARRIS or BOOKER or any of us cosponsoring the bill think this is a panacea or a solution to all of the longstanding problems the last few weeks have laid bare, but this is action that we can start taking now to begin ensuring justice and accountability in our laws and in our law enforcement and, hopefully, help put us on a path to begin to heal our Nation's deep wounds.

While we need to pass legislation to address police brutality, we can't stop there. The Justice in Policing Act is the first of many steps we need to take in Congress to help reset our Nation's moral compass. It isn't lost on me—the massive uprising of peaceful protests against police brutality we have seen in recent days—that it is happening while many of our States are still working overtime to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and to keep people safe as we reopen communities.

Over the last couple of weeks, I have been in contact with Black leaders and activists on the ground back home, and I have heard over and over again about the connection between the racism at the heart of the policing of Black communities and the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on them and their families, and, more importantly, how traumatizing multilayered challenges like these can be for Black people in our lives who deal with these injustices day in and day out.

For instance, one Black civil rights leader in southwest Washington told me how their community has had a

hard time getting vulnerable members of the Black community tested. She is fighting for more resources and support, and she is organizing car rallies to enable people to make their voices heard against police brutality while still maintaining social distancing. Another Black leader in Seattle shared with me how absolutely critical it is that Black and other underserved communities have access to COVID-19 testing and healthcare during this ongoing pandemic, that these were both important, and that it isn't an either/or proposition.

That people are rushing to the streets to make their voices heard in the middle of a global health emergency underscores how serious this moment in our country is and highlights the depths of the injustices baked into our systems at every level. This means that during this unprecedented public health emergency, we must prioritize equity in our response, including ensuring that we are collecting the necessary demographic data to target our efforts toward those most in need and using this data to aggressively address disparities; making sure critical supplies like testing kits and PPEs are getting to our hardest hit communities, which is not happening consistently and is contributing to Black and Brown communities suffering disproportionately from the health and economic impacts of this virus; not to mention planning now for equitable distribution of a safe and effective vaccine.

More broadly, the protests are a passionate call for meaningful change in our systems and institutions to combat the status quo of racism and anti-Blackness that stains our democracy. In order to make the right policy and resource decisions to help us change America for the better and move toward a more just and peaceful future, it is critical that we all try to stand in the shoes of those demanding change and hear what they are saying from the perspective of their life experience, not solely of our own, because like I have heard recently in my conversations with Black Washingtonians, it is not that these are new ideas or proposals, but that as a Nation we haven't paid nearly enough attention to the profound grievances Black people have been raising for a long time.

What I hear is people crying out for this country to live up to its values, saying it is time for all of us, especially elected officials, to listen and act by reinvesting in supporting our communities, rather than allowing law enforcement to be an unaccountable, militarized nonanswer to perfectly understandable calls for better healthcare, better schools, and real safety.

It means not only addressing the racism and police violence in our national COVID-19 response but also in how we address maternal mortality, which disproportionately impacts Black women and families; and access to healthcare

more broadly for Black communities; and how we work to solve the climate crisis, which is a long-time demand of Black and Brown communities that have suffered some of the worst impacts of growing pollution; in how we work to close the gender pay gap that has Black and Latina women hardest; and in how we ensure equity of resources and opportunity and quality in our schools and our colleges and our universities; and much, much more.

Now, none of this will happen overnight, but it is important that we start the work now to dismantle systemic racism if we ever want to make justice and equality realities instead of distant ideas.

There is also another big piece. I would be remiss if I didn't mention it. I want to talk about something that I and so many people across this country—especially White people, who don't live every day feeling the impacts personally—are grappling with right now, which is the part of this work that isn't about our systems or our institutions. It is about looking inward.

Far too often the fear of finding out that you have been wrong or completely misunderstood closes us off from honest self-reflection and growth.

We can't let it. Let's be clear: Change in our own hearts and our own minds and in our communities is as fundamental and essential to truly overcoming racism in our country as reforming policies and systems.

Instead of letting fear of getting it wrong lead to inaction or complacency, I urge you to let it motivate you to listen and to learn because we all have more to do. I am personally committed to doing more. We all need to play a role in this work, especially our Nation's leaders, which is why it is so frustrating that next week, instead of addressing the profoundly urgent issues we are hearing about from literally all corners of this country, the Senate will be working toward confirming a personal friend of the majority leader's to a lifetime judicial nomination—and very little else. I refuse to accept this, and we all should.

I also haven't mentioned the President of the United States yet. Before I do, I want to make one thing really clear: He is not the cause of all this injustice; he is the symptom. And we, all of us, are the only cure. Instead of rising to try to unify the country, the President has shown more interest in fanning the flames of divisiveness and making dangerous, unconstitutional threats to intimidate into silence and suppress these vital protests.

To see this President at the helm of our country in this moment is tragic and frightening. But try as he might, the President cannot simply dismiss the legitimate anger on display in Seattle or Tacoma or Spokane or across the country at the pervasive and crushing impact of racism on Black people and other people of color.

For generations, we have seen in our newspapers and on our televisions and

from our cell phones the dire and unfair and too often fatal impacts of systemic racism on Black lives. Our focus must be on the painstaking work to actually address the deep, systemic racism in our country, which continues to create these moments of understandable despair.

I am going to keep listening to the people who are at the forefront of these movements, including leaning on the work that has already been done to help reimagine our Nation's approach to public safety, working to redirect taxpayer dollars towards community resources that invest in the health, safety, and security of Black people and others who have been historically overlooked, and acting, not just talking, to keep our momentum and efforts on this front progressing forward.

I am so glad I have been able to connect with leaders in Washington State on these issues. As an elected leader, I know I have to keep stepping up and amp up these necessary voices. Even though our country is at a crossroads—perhaps the most perilous one we have faced in recent memory—we have an opportunity for real progress right now. I feel it in the demands for change coming from the streets and on social media. I feel it in the energy, the resilience, and the courage of civil rights leaders on the ground in Washington State. And I feel it in the Justice in Policing Act.

In closing, I hope every single Senator in this Chamber will join Senators HARRIS, BOOKER, and myself in cosponsoring this critical legislation and getting it signed and on the books as quickly as possible. I challenge each of my colleagues and all of us to commit ourselves to a fairer, more compassionate vision for our future.

Some will say that nothing will change or can change, that we are stuck to live out this historical loop of racial intolerance in perpetuity. But, as Seattle-based writer Ijeoma Oluo reminds us, "you don't have to pretend to be free of racism to be an anti-racist . . . [a]nti-racism is the commitment to fight racism wherever you find it, including in yourself. And it's the only way forward."

As a country, let's commit to fight racism in our laws and systems. As individuals, let's commit to fight racism in ourselves and in our communities. This is the work before all of us.

As a voice for my State and as someone committed to forming a more perfect union for everyone, I intend to work for justice every day until it arrives.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida).

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, yesterday, our Senate Education Committee held a hearing on going back to school safely—a subject on the minds of tens of millions of American families—since today two-thirds of married parents both work outside the home, and they have children. The children are ready to go back to school, and the parents are even more ready for them to go back to school.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks this morning my opening statement from that hearing.

The commissioner of education from Tennessee—and I know that the Presiding Officer, while he is a proud Senator from Florida, also knows a little bit about Tennessee, having lived there—was one of our witnesses there. She said: We want children to do things. We want them to be safe, but we want them to thrive.

That is the sense I got from all of the witnesses yesterday, which includes the Denver school superintendent; a national representative of education, Dr. Benjamin; and it included the commissioner of education for the State of Nebraska, who is also the head of the Chief State School Officers.

Anyone who looks at the children in America today knows they need to go back to school. They have been out for 5 to 6 months now. This is a time when we are especially concerned in our country, and our attention is focused on racial injustice, on problems that minority families and minority children have. The single best thing we could do to help minority children and minority families is to help them go back to school safely in August and September.

Any teacher can tell you and most parents can tell you that emotional, intellectual, and physical damage to children has been caused by being out of school since March, and that will continue to be the case until they reopen in August. Articles have talked about 50 percent learning deficits. We have that every summer when children are away from school. Teachers in the fall know they have to catch back up.

It has also shown us the limits, as well as the benefits, of remote learning. My daughter has three young sons, two of them in school. She said they have had it about up to here with remote learning, even though they are in a very good public school system. There are limits as to what you can learn remotely. Teachers aren't trained to teach remotely. In many parts of our country, broadband isn't sufficient to allow students to learn remotely. Teachers haven't made lesson plans to teach remotely, so they have to change the whole way they go about teaching.

So much of the children being home affects homeschooling. Homeschooling is a good thing for parents who are able to do that, but homeschooling is hard. It takes a lot of time. If you are in a family, as two-thirds of married families are, where you are both working

outside the home, how are you going to do the homeschooling appropriately so that your child doesn't get far behind?

For the benefit of the children, for the benefit of the parents, and especially for the benefit of low-income children—many of whom get one or two meals a day at school—we need to go back to school as a country. When we do—when 100,000 public schools and 36,000 private schools, 55 million children go back to school and 20 million students go back to the college—that will be the surest step toward regaining the rhythm of American life that we can have. That would show we are actually going back toward normal.

It will be another year before we get to normal. I think we all understand that. We are going at warp speed to find a new vaccine. We are building manufacturing plants for vaccines before we even know that they work. We have never done that before. In fact, there has probably never been a time in our history where we had more scientific brainpower in this world devoted toward a specific target than we do right now at trying to increase the number of fast, rapid, accurate diagnostic tests, the number of treatments to reduce the effects of COVID-19, and a vaccine for COVID-19. We probably have never had so many scientists in the world working on a single project like that. We will probably have good results, but it will take a while.

All of the plans that are being made—and we heard about them yesterday—will take a whole year. In the next semester, we will have more tests, we will have more treatments, we will have more contact tracers, and there should be, hopefully, the beginning of vaccines, but our plan should be for a year.

How do you make sure the schools are safe? The formula is pretty simple, although it is not as simple in its application. The things that we know work are, No. 1, staying apart some distance; No. 2, washing your hands; and No. 3, wearing a mask.

In colleges, that will be easy because colleges have more space. In fact, they are big wasters of space. They usually don't teach in the morning or in the evening or on Saturday or in the summer, and colleges can spread out and create smaller classes. There are more lectures. You can do lectures more easily.

You can have a culture of mask-wearing—as President Mitch Daniels of Purdue University testified the week before—at colleges. I think colleges will have an easier time than schools.

In addition to that, we know that, unfortunately, COVID-19 affects older people. In Tennessee, for example, 5 percent of the cases of COVID-19 are in nursing homes, and nearly 40 percent of the deaths are in nursing homes. The same is true in other States. COVID-19 affects younger people a lot less. Dr. Fauci has warned us not to be cavalier about that, but the truth is, younger people seem not to be as affected by COVID-19.

We have a population that is not as affected. We have a population that is in a smaller, controlled setting. You can shut a school if someone gets infected and keep other schools open. We do that with the flu. We have children, who are more subject to being told what to do. So we have a setting where we should be able to create communities—there are 100,000 public schools, as I said—little communities that are among the safest in our country. On the other hand, little children may have a difficult time wearing masks. They aren't the best at hygiene. Children go home every day; they may come back and forth bringing germs with them.

We have those basics that I talked about—plus, testing. What we know about testing is that we have the capacity to do about 10 million tests a month this month, according to Admiral Giroir, the Assistant Secretary of Health. He says we will have a 40 to 50 million test capacity by the time we go back to school in August, September. That is four to five times as many as we have today.

What is going on now is that in Florida and in Tennessee—every State is making its plan for the tests that it needs and sending it to the admiral. They are working on it together. If the State has needs the State can't deal with, the Federal Government helps with that. In our second month of that kind of relationship, that seems to be working pretty well.

I know that in Tennessee, which is 11th among all the States in terms of testing per capita, the Governor's motto is, if in doubt, get a test. You can go to the local public health department and get one in 5 minutes. It takes 2, 3 days to get the result, but there are no delays. Anybody who wants it can get it. That has created an environment where everybody feels more comfortable. If they are worried about COVID-19, if they don't want to go home and see their older relatives or their spouse, if they wonder if they are sick, they can go get a test.

So tests should be available for the schools.

We will have to be careful and recognize that the way schools open will vary by community. There are many counties in Nebraska, the commissioner of Nebraska said yesterday, where there is not a single case of COVID-19. So on his dial of green to red in terms of school opening, they would be very green and wouldn't have to do much in response to the COVID-19 in terms of changing the way they operate. On the other hand, in Omaha, NE, it might be different. In Nashville, it might be different. In New York City or Phoenix, it might be different.

The Denver school superintendent talked about perhaps having children come for 2 or 3 days a week on alternate days in order to have smaller classes and about having extra time for disabled children or children from homes where they have less support,

more vulnerable children needing more help in our schools.

My hope would be that we can find ways for children to come back to as normal a school day as possible. It will take some flexibility. Some of those that will need to be flexible are the States, the Federal Government, and the unions with their rules and regulations. Colleges have a lot of flexibility in rearranging class schedules, class sizes, and class times. Schools have a lot less because they have State rules and union rules that restrict what they can do. They need some flexibility so they can reschedule.

Then there is the question of money. Just as we say we want children to be safe, we want them to learn, there are two arguments on behalf of more money from the Federal Government. One would be Federal spending to help them learn. Generally, that is the responsibility of State and local governments. They spend about 90 percent of that.

In our first COVID-19 bill, the Federal Government was generous with schools, recognizing that we shut down the economy, and then that shut down the schools, and that caused a lot of expensive problems. The Federal Government supplied \$23 billion, and Tennessee got about \$260 million for just K-12 schools. There was another slug of money for colleges, and then there was \$150 billion for States. As the Presiding Officer knows, a big part of the State budget—30 to 40 percent—goes to education. So my thinking is that a part of that \$150 billion—\$23 billion we have already allocated for K-12 and the \$25 billion that we allocated to testing, which could include contact tracers, some of which could be a part of schools—should help pay for keeping schools safe enough to reopen.

If there is more money, we need to be open to that, I think, here in the Federal Government, but not before we see whether it is really needed.

The Tennessee commissioner—and I put a lot of stock in her thinking. Because Tennessee is a conservative State, it doesn't spend a lot of money, has no debt, a big rainy day fund, low taxes—a lot like Florida. She estimates that it will cost about \$1.5 million per school district, with the average school district being about \$3,500, in her words, to provide the things the school districts need to reopen safely. Those are things like more sanitizing equipment, barriers that separate children in the lunchroom or maybe even in class, extra money for busing because when you create a lot of new classes, a lot of new schedules, you may have to change the bus schedules, and that will cost more than most things. So it is about \$1.5 million.

I will be very interested to see how much of the money we have already appropriated or how much of the money that we have appropriated that is very inflexible and might be made more flexible for Governors to use just for opening schools safely and whether we need to add any more.

I think it is in our interest to make sure that principals and school boards know that they will have sufficient funds to open 100,000 public schools safely, because school administrators, with all respect, sometimes are a little bit conservative and reluctant to take risks. If there is the excuse that “We don’t have enough money to open safely,” they may just say “Let’s keep up with remote learning.” I think we are about up to here with remote learning in most places in the country. It is especially not good for the youngest children and for children who are from disadvantaged families or low-income families. I think it is important to get the country going. It is good for the children and it is good for the parents to make sure that schools have sufficient funds to reopen safely.

It was a very good hearing yesterday. I thank the witnesses for their participation. It was all remote, even for all of the Senators.

We will have another hearing next week on telehealth. We have had to cram 10 years of experience into 3 months to learn about telehealth, telework, and telelearning. While this has been a very painful way to learn a lesson, we should take advantage of these lessons because, as we will find out in our hearing next week on telehealth, we have gone from almost none of it to seeing that 40 or 50 percent of the physician-patient visits are done remotely. If that were to turn out to be, over the long term, 15 or 20 percent, that would produce a massive opportunity for change in the way we deliver medical services in the country.

The one other thing I would mention is that I heard about liability yesterday. Colleges and the schools I have talked to want to be included in whatever the Federal Government does to make sure that teachers and administrators and schools and universities are appropriately protected from lawsuits as a result of the COVID-19 epidemic.

As long as they meet a standard of care that is reasonable, they should not have to worry about being liable if a child who is 8 years old forgets to wear a mask, coughs on another child, and that child goes home and makes Grandma sick and Grandma sues the school.

Teachers are always worried about liability. The teachers’ unions often use liability insurance as one of the major incentives to join the unions. Many States, like my State, provide tort liability for teachers.

I think we need to make sure that here in the Senate, as we consider any additional legislation that has to do with COVID-19, we include colleges and we include schools. We received a letter from all of the colleges from the American Council on Education specifically asking us to do that. Otherwise, we might discourage schools and colleges from opening. If we discourage schools from opening, that leaves children sometimes home alone, sometimes home without being educated,

some of them being left with remote learning that doesn’t help and developing a learning gap that will leave them at a disadvantage for the rest of their lives.

As we look at all of the issues we have to deal with, I hope we include appropriate steps to put limits on liability, at least as a result of the COVID-19 experience.

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

[June 10, 2020]

COVID-19: GOING BACK TO SCHOOL SAFELY

A May 28 story in the Memphis Commercial Appeal about schools planning for the 2020-2021 school year included a bittersweet image—a young girl reaching her hand out to touch a teacher, who is standing in line to welcome students to the first day of school in 2019. As the Commercial Appeal reporter writes: “The first day of school in August 2019 would flunk 2020’s course on social distancing.”

Today’s hearing is about how we reopen schools safely this fall—that means teachers welcoming students back without hugs or high fives.

The opening of schools in 2020 is not going to look like 2019.

But today’s witnesses will talk about their work to help 56 million students from kindergarten to 12th grade go back to the 100,000 public schools and 34,000 private schools in the fall as safely as possible.

In doing so, they will help our country take its surest step toward normalcy.

Witnesses:

Dr. Penny Schwinn, Commissioner of Education, Tennessee Department of Education, Nashville, TN

Dr. Matthew Blomstedt, Commissioner of Education, Nebraska Department of Education, Lincoln, NE

Ms. Susana Cordova, Superintendent, Denver Public Schools, Denver, CO

John B. King, Jr., President and CEO, The Education Trust, Washington, DC

The question for governors, school districts, teachers and parents is not whether schools should reopen—but how.

Any teacher can explain the risk of emotional, intellectual and social damage if a child misses a school year.

Schools need to assess how this year’s disruption has affected our children and get student learning back on track.

At our hearing last week on the reopening of colleges, we heard about a variety of strategies that colleges are using to help keep classrooms and campuses safe, including keeping class sizes small so students can stay 6 feet apart, creating campus-wide policies for wearing masks, and rigorous hygiene improvements.

As with colleges, k-12 schools’ plans will vary for each community and will also depend on the prevalence of the virus in the fall.

The goals for schools working to reopen are fundamentally the same as the colleges we heard from last week: social distancing, aggressive hygiene practices, face masks where appropriate, and then a system of testing and contact tracing.

In order to accomplish those goals, it’s clear that school boards, superintendents and principals need to be focused on:

Creating an environment where students and teachers can socially distance

Making modifications to the school year calendar and daily schedule

Preparing to integrate more distance learning

Restructuring classrooms and extra-curricular activities

Providing meal services in a safe way

Making sure the school has gloves, masks, and other protective equipment

Protecting students and adults in the school buildings who are at a higher risk.

To accomplish this, schools will also need to create a strategy for testing and tracing students who may have been exposed. You want your school’s testing needs to be in your state plan.

The availability of widespread testing will allow schools to identify teachers and students who have the virus or have been exposed to it and trace their contacts.

Widespread testing not only helps contain the disease; it builds confidence that the school is safe. Fortunately, U.S. Assistant Secretary for Health Admiral Brett Giroir says there will be 40-50 million tests available per month by September. That is 4-5 times today’s number—and today’s number is twice as many as any other country.

Dr. Francis Collins, who led the Human Genome Project, now leads a competitive “shark tank” enterprise at the National Institutes of Health to discover new ways to conduct tens of millions of additional accurate tests with quick results.

Schools’ COVID-19 plans should last for at least a year: The government is pursuing vaccines at warp speed, but no one expects one by August.

In the second half of the school year, schools should be able to provide more tests, more treatments, better contact tracing and we should have vaccines. It will likely be the Fall of 2021 before school life approaches normal.

There are several reasons schools have an advantage in providing a safe environment for students and faculty:

The first reason is that younger people have been less hurt by COVID-19, although Dr. Anthony Fauci has warned against “cavalierly” assuming that young people are not at risk. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention says it is “investigating reports of multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children (MIS-C) associated with coronavirus disease.”

Second, schools are generally small communities that are closely supervised and monitored. Third, outbreaks can be traced—if a child becomes sick, that child’s classmates can be tested. Fourth, individual schools can close to control the spread of the virus—while other schools remain open. Schools are not unfamiliar with outbreaks of flu and other illnesses that have resulted in the temporary closure of individual schools to prevent further spread.

But school environments pose challenges as well:

First, there’s not much extra space in a k-12 school to enable distancing—whereas there’s a lot of extra space on most college campuses.

Second, school administrators face more rigid rules as a result of state and local regulations and contracts with teachers’ unions, so making changes to the academic calendar, class times and class sizes are more difficult.

Third, creating a mask-wearing culture is harder with young children. Seeing facial expressions is also important for young children—they learn to socialize and self-regulate, so obscuring faces with masks prohibits some learning for early elementary school-aged children.

Fourth, rigorous hygiene isn’t always easy with children.

Fifth, children go home at night, potentially exposing older adults.

Sixth, even systematic testing of children is a lot of tests.

Today 91.3 percent of families with children have at least one parent employed, and

among married families with children, 64.2 percent had both parents employed, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

And many children live in environments where the school is the safest place they'll be all day.

It's also the place where almost 30 million students receive a school lunch—more than 70 percent of those students qualify for free or reduced-priced meals.

Administrators have a responsibility to make our schools among the safest small communities this fall.

In doing so, they will help our country take its surest steps toward normalcy.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAINES. I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, on a recent Saturday afternoon, the world watched as SpaceX's Falcon 9 lifted off from American soil, streaked through the sky, and sent the Crew Dragon capsule beyond the Earth's atmosphere.

By Sunday, its crew was successfully docked at the International Space Station. The following morning, Indianapolis-based Eli Lilly & Company announced the start of human testing of a potential treatment for COVID-19.

Falcon 9, the first rocket to send men to space from America in a decade was traveling at 10 times the speed of sound, and Lilly's COVID-19 therapy is moving nearly as fast. It often takes a dozen years to develop a drug. This one could be available in just months.

Neither happened spontaneously, though. They are the result of years of savvy, technological, and scientific investments, of partnerships between private industry and government. Such investments, such partnerships open new horizons in space exploration and disease fighting, and they show us the endless frontier into which American imagination and ingenuity can carry us.

We Americans have always been drawn to the frontier—yes, the natural frontier of wildernesses and unfamiliar territories from which States such as mine spring, but also the frontier that bounds what we as humans were once imagined to be capable of accomplishing after our forbearers settled across this great continent.

Americans see the heavens and don't simply wonder what they hold. We see

loved ones grow sick, and we don't just resign ourselves to the prognosis. We create cures. Americans would always rather build a rocket ship than a rest home. We are driven by a deep need to lift one another, to discover breakthroughs that will lead to the betterment of all of mankind.

And among the most powerful allies we have in accomplishing this are science and research and the innovations that they fuel.

In the 20th century, Vannevar Bush beautifully captured the essence of the American culture of discovery and innovation. He first coined the memorable term "endless frontier." Bush, you see, was a visionary, an unsung hero of World War II. He was the man who saw the importance of science and discovery in defeating the Axis Powers.

As President Franklin D. Roosevelt's unofficial science adviser, he initiated the Manhattan Project and ensured that it received top priority from the highest levels of government.

Later, in his 1945 report to the President, entitled "Science: The Endless Frontier," Bush called for an expansion of public support for science and paved the way for the creation of the National Science Foundation. He believed that America's security and prosperity depended upon premarket investment in science and technology. Basic research, in his words, was the "pace-maker of technological progress." "New products and new processes do not appear full-grown," he said. "They are founded on new principles and new conceptions, which in turn are painstakingly developed by research in the purest realms of science."

Bush was right. The years that followed proved it. The National Science Foundation was created, a space age was ushered in, a space race was won, and an evil empire was defeated—all in an era of historic prosperity that was only possible because of America's economic and technological supremacy, itself built on government-funded premarket research.

Bush originally articulated the importance of science to the Nation's fortunes in a time of peril. While the challenges we face today are of a different nature, we are again in such a time. A mysterious virus with no known cure has spread across the globe, killed thousands of Americans, and crippled our economy. A new power competition is now underway, and America's predominant challenger is an unscrupulous authoritarian regime whose values are the inverse of our own.

For proof, witness Beijing's leveraging of COVID-19 to further its goal of global dominance and authority of this new century. To meet these new challenges, we must once again—once again—show the entire world the resiliency and dynamism of the American people, the American economy, the American spirit, and the American project itself.

And to do this, we must not simply advance again toward the endless frontier but accelerate into it.

The Endless Frontier Act, authored by Senator SCHUMER and me, will provide the rocket fuel for America's innovators and visionaries. Let us resolve here today to pass it so that this generation of American doers and dreamers and their children can propel us forward and win the 21st century.

Here is how and why we should act.

The Endless Frontier Act would bolster U.S. leadership in science and tech innovation and boldly increase premarket investment in emerging tech.

It will provide \$100 billion in strategic investment in the National Science Foundation to bolster science and technology research and development.

It will deliver \$10 billion to establish regional tech hubs across the country to launch innovative companies, revive American manufacturing, and create new jobs to jump start our local communities. And in the coming years, it will strengthen American power, increase American prosperity, and carry on America's never-ending quest to continuously improve the world through innovation.

Let us pass this act. If we do, another endless frontier will be before us, and with it, a stronger, freer, more prosperous nation, and a world in which free men and women author this new century.

Dating back to the Cold War, after China had developed military might, its leaders focused on science and technology as a means to reorder the global balance of power.

Since then, Beijing has aimed to overtake America, not with weapons, but with innovation. Offensively, China is investing in 5G, quantum computing, artificial intelligence, advanced energy systems—all of which have the potential to fundamentally change this century's economic and security environment for good or for ill.

Defensively, China is shoring up domestic industries while exploiting our economic downturn and cynically using the pandemic to play the part of concerned global citizen to further its position in the world. And that is not a conspiracy theory. It is public knowledge.

A new report from the Chinese Academy of Sciences bluntly observes: "It is possible to turn the crisis [of COVID-19] into an opportunity—to increase the trust and the dependence of all countries around the world in 'Made in China.'"

Tellingly, for China, the search to find treatments for COVID-19 is not simply a race to stop the virus but a race for bragging rights and global superiority.

The CCP is dedicating millions of dollars to research into drug development. Five out of the 10 top vaccine candidates are coming from China.

As they have in other fields of research, China has recently ramped up spending on pharmaceutical research, no doubt with an eye on surpassing America in yet another field. The first COVID-19 vaccine could be the key.

If all of these trends continue, China's overall investments in research and development will surpass our own within 10 years—just as their economy becomes larger than our own.

Until now, we have primarily focused on defensive countermeasures to thwart the aggression of the CCP: blocking Huawei, tightening export controls, and improving foreign investment rules. These are important and must remain in place.

But if America is to lead the world in the 21st century, it is neither realistic nor practical to build an economic iron curtain around China.

We are not in a 20th century cold war, but we can learn and apply lessons from that Cold War. Just as we did in the 20th century, we must not simply contain a competitor but instead outinnovate and outgrow them.

Something else is in the balance here too. China longs to become the world's leader but lacks the attachment to human rights and dignity required of those that seek to fill that role. What becomes of liberty in a world led by such a power?

However imperfectly, every American generation, from the founding forward, has labored to preserve and pass down the blessings of freedom here and wherever its friends may be found, and this current generation must carry this on and provide the world with a choice—a choice between a great power that defends freedom or one that tramples upon it.

But we will be powerless to offer this alternative if we don't keep pace with China, and we will not have a shot at this unless we invest in ourselves. Implementing the Endless Frontier Act will provide that investment. It will prevent us from being outflanked, and it will pave the way for a second "American century."

One of the primary reasons why the 20th century was America's rather than Russia's was because we produced more prosperity. You see, wealth is a crucial weapon in global competition. Bold investment in premarket research, like that proposed in our Endless Frontier Act, will generate more of it and make us a wealthier nation. The connection is undeniable and historic.

When human beings began to apply science and technology to industry and in pursuit of new goods and services, of greater efficiency and output, human wealth grew by historic bounds. Cognitive scientist Steven Pinker charted this progress, and it is staggered. Human wealth barely advanced in the millennium after the year 1 A.D., and had only doubled a half millennium later.

Then the industrial revolution arrived. Between 1820 and 1900, the world's income tripled. Fifty years later, it had tripled again, and again in 25 years, and again 30 years after that. This represents a 100-fold expansion of the world's gross domestic product since the industrial revolution, thanks to advancements in science and technology.

And the technologies that ushered in this era were the result of curiosity, experimentation, failure, and ultimately, discovery. This is the formula for innovation, and it is something Americans are particularly familiar with.

We are a creative people with a penchant for plunging ahead when we have an idea and searching for a solution when we see a problem.

You know, it takes courage to be creative, and in America, we encourage and honor that courage. We celebrate those who try and fail and courageously get up and dust off their trousers and try again. We venerate our inventors—Bell, Edison, George Washington Carver, Jonas Salk, the Wright brothers, Tesla, Einstein, Page and Brin, Jobs, Musk.

We know and remember their names, and we benefit daily from their contributions. Their life's work is a monument to human potential and American greatness. Their work would not have been possible without a hallmark of American culture: breathing space—yes, breathing space. It is space for the creative process—the very process required to connect things that already exist, that no one ever thought of connecting, and to take new discoveries and turn them into new products and services.

When we join research with American creativity, we do more than produce faster cars and TVs with clearer pictures, and we do more than generate material wealth. You see, our innovators are part of something far more profound. It is an endless pursuit of human knowledge and progress and a quest that fulfills our deepest human needs as a people. That is what they are a part of. In the words of my friend Water Russell Mead, it is our "built-in human belief that through change we encounter the transcendent and the divine." Passing the Endless Frontier Act will keep this quest going, and the quest will make our lives richer in so many ways.

That image of a Falcon 9 taking off and the orange streak of its engines cutting the blue sky sparked a memory dear to so many Americans. Over 10.3 million people worldwide watched that launch. For many, it was no doubt a reminder of an era—that era when rockets regularly setting out for space from that very same station was an awe-inspiring symbol of American optimism and accomplishments.

There were images, too, from Indianapolis. There, Lilly's scientists rushed cases containing the company's potential COVID-19 treatment to the airport and sent them on their way to patients for trials. For those who saw these images, they inspired hope and amazement—hope that we can soon stop this virus and amazement that our innovators have moved so quickly to find remedies.

These are both inspiring moments for all Americans, ones that transcend so many of the differences that threaten

to divide us. They show us and they show the world what America is still capable of. They reveal the endless frontiers still before us.

Let us come together now. Let us accelerate boldly into the endless frontier. When life resumes as normal, this generation of Americans must not be content with merely recovering our losses. Instead, we must push ourselves to lead.

Now is the time to pass the Endless Frontier Act, to strengthen U.S. leadership in science and tech innovation, and to dramatically increase public investment in emerging technologies. Let us choose to lead for ourselves and for our children.

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

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

CANCEL CULTURE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, "cancel culture"—we hear that in the news a lot these days—the idea that we all need safe spaces from mean words, trigger warnings on op-eds, or TV shows that might constitute a microaggression.

This is the language of the campus social justice seminar, but increasingly it is the language of our workplace and our culture.

We saw an instance of it just last week at the New York Times. I published an op-ed there that said simply, while we respect peaceful protesters, we can have zero tolerance for looting and rioting, and if the police are overwhelmed or outnumbered, the National Guard and, if necessary, Federal troops have to restore order.

It has gotten support from a large majority of Americans, if you believe the polls. The New York Times published it. The editorial page editor defended it publicly. The publisher defended the decision publicly. But a woke-child mob at the New York Times rose up and demanded heads on pikes. They demanded that the op-ed be taken down. They demanded that the grownups—maybe I should say the supposed grownups—who run the New York Times apologize, and that is exactly what happened. In what could only be called a struggle session from the Cultural Revolution, in the greatest traditions of Mao, the publisher of the New York Times fired the editorial page editor, and he reassigned the deputy editorial page editor. He apologized—prostrated himself—in front of the woke-child mob, and he said: "We will do much better."

The new editorial page editor has told everyone at the Times: If you see anything that gives you the slightest pause, please contact me immediately. If you have any trigger warnings, don't worry; I will find a safe space for you.

The New York Times has made itself a laughing stock, but this is no laughing matter because the cancel culture threatens the very principles of free inquiry and open debate upon which our society is based.

You see other manifestations of the cancel culture all across the country today. In many cases, they have adopted the spirit of a Jacobin mob in the French Revolution. In a reign of terror, they are trying to completely erase our culture and our history. Unfortunately, many Democrats are vying to be the Robespierre for this Jacobin mob.

Look at what is happening in Seattle. Revolutionaries, anarchists have taken over city government buildings. They have taken over neighborhoods. They have declared themselves an autonomous zone. They put up a sign that says "You are leaving the United States" when you enter this autonomous zone.

The Democratic Party today, I suppose, is still the party of secession.

It is not just in Seattle. Look at what is happening to statues and monuments all around our country. In several cities, statues of Christopher Columbus have been pulled down, or they have been defaced or destroyed—statues that in most cases were put up by Italian American immigrants who were proud of their part in the great American story. This was not done in accordance with law. It was not done after thoughtful debate in city councils or State legislatures. It was done by mobs. Just last week, the Lincoln Memorial—a temple to the great emancipator—was defaced. The World War II Memorial—a memorial to those who fought and liberated the world from fascism—was defaced. Now, across the Atlantic, the ideological kin of this Jacobin mob defaced statues of Churchill. Wait until they hear about what the other guy did on the other side.

But, you know, history is not the long suit of these woke children. They didn't take history classes, apparently, in high school and college. They were too busy taking social justice seminars. You can see that, too, in Philadelphia, where the statue of Matthias Baldwin was defaced. Matthias Baldwin was a committed and devoted abolitionist who funded education for freed African Americans. He gave them jobs, and they defaced his statue.

Even more amazing, in Boston, the Shaw Memorial was defaced. The Shaw Memorial honors the 54th Massachusetts Regiment—the first African-American regiment formed after the Emancipation Proclamation, whose bravery and valor in battle on behalf of the Union cause was memorialized in the movie "Glory." Yet it was defaced by these mobs.

It is not just our history; it is pop culture and entertainment too. You may have seen the news that "Live P.D." and "Cops" television shows were canceled. "Paw Patrol" was on the cutting board too. You may know that Chase is the police cop in "Paw

Patrol." There are calls to euthanize the police dog on social media. I wish I could say I am joking, but I am not.

Legos has announced they are not going to advertise any of their police Lego sets for the next year. They are not going to take them out of distribution. They are not going to recall them from stores. No, no—woke capitalism only goes so far. They are still capitalists. They are just not going to advertise police sets anymore.

HBO announced they are not going to run "Gone with the Wind" anymore—"Gone With the Wind," for which African-American actress Hattie McDaniel won the first Academy Award, the first Oscar ever given to an African-American woman. HBO says: "No, we are going to cancel it."

If you think it is just limited to statues or TV shows or toys, you would be wrong. This woke mob could very soon be coming for any one of you.

At UCLA, a college professor has been suspended and is under police investigation because he declined to postpone final exams so students could apparently go out and participate in protests.

Another professor is being investigated for reading aloud from Martin Luther King, Jr.'s letter from a Birmingham jail because it uses offensive language—Martin Luther King, Jr.'s letter from a Birmingham jail.

A professional soccer player, Alexander Katai, was fired for his wife's tweet—not his own, his wife's tweet.

Multiple different business executives and editors at newspapers and magazines have been fired.

If you think this is only for people who are not powerful and not rich, you would be wrong. Ivanka Trump was scheduled to give a commencement speech last weekend at a Wichita technical school. The speech was canceled because she was being too controversial. It was a speech about workforce training and women's opportunities in our economy, and Ivanka Trump was canceled.

Where does this cancel culture take us? What is the logical conclusion? What is the end of the cancel culture? I will tell you what it is—it is right here in this city, Washington, the District of Columbia. That is where it will end if we don't put an end to the madness now. Just up the Mall is the Washington Monument. Are we going to tear down the Washington Monument? Are we going to rename it the "Obelisk of Wokeness?"

Up the hill is the Washington National Cathedral, where so many times we have gathered as a nation over the years to mourn our great leaders, to pray for God's protection and deliverance in moments of national strife and struggle. Are we going to rename the Washington National Cathedral the "Temple of Reason," as the Jacobins did to Notre Dame during the French Revolution?

What are we going to call this city? We can't call it Washington. We can't

call it Columbia. We have to come up with new names all around because—I will say this—the cancel culture, whether in its malice or its Jacobin forms, ultimately is animated by a single ideal: that America at its core is fundamentally irredeemable and wicked.

I reject that claim fully and wholeheartedly. America is a great and noble nation. It is the noblest Nation in the history of mankind that has struggled throughout our history, imperfectly but ceaselessly, to live up to our founding creed that all men are created equal—the single greatest defense against tyranny, against racism, against oppression. That is the stake of this debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HEINOUS ATTACK AT THE PULSE NIGHTCLUB ON JUNE 12, 2016

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, Floridians will never forget the horrific events of June 12, 2016. Four years ago, our State, Nation, the city of Orlando, and Hispanic and gay communities were attacked, and 49 innocent and beautiful lives were lost. It was an evil act. It was an act of terrorism designed to divide us as a nation and strike fear in our hearts and minds, but we didn't let it because Floridians are resilient. We came together, and we supported each other.

The weeks following the attack will always stay with me—days spent in hospitals with families, at funerals, at wakes with loved ones, and countless events throughout the community. As a father and grandfather, it was one of the hardest things I ever had to do. It was heartbreaking. Yet, in this horribly dark time, the selfless courage of so many—from community members, to law enforcement, to healthcare workers—provided a sense of hope. This incredible strength, love, and bravery uplifted the community and helped us repair and rebuild.

On the fourth anniversary of this unthinkable tragedy, the State of Florida comes together to honor the lives lost too soon, and we vow to always stand up and fight against evil and hatred in this world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 614, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 614) honoring the memory of the victims of the heinous attack at the Pulse nightclub on June 12, 2016.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to,

and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 614) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019— Continued

H.R. 1957

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, as we continue our debate today on the Great American Outdoors Act, I thought I would come to the floor one more time to talk about the benefits of this historic conservation package and what it means for the great State and the people of Colorado.

Several years back, this Congress worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass legislation by Senator SHAHEEN and me that required the Commerce Department, for the first time in our country's history, to break out the outdoor economy as a part of our economic numbers, to determine how many jobs this country had in the outdoor industry in recreation, and to determine the overall revenues generated by the recreation economy. What we discovered was what we knew intuitively: that the recreation economy is a huge part of jobs in this country, with over 5 million jobs.

In Colorado, you are looking at about a \$28 billion part of our economy. If I could, I just want to talk a little bit more about what that means for Colorado and what this bill means as applied to our State, the benefits environmentally of this legislation and the economic impact it will have.

I talked on the floor about the Great Sand Dunes National Park. Right around the year 2000, this legislation turned this national monument into a national park. Hundreds of thousands of people come to the valley to visit every year. What is neat about this is that it is not just a national park, the Great Sand Dunes National Park, but it is also an example of how the Land and Water Conservation Fund works together because it established the Great Sand Dunes National Park to make sure that the water resource was protected that is so instrumental to keeping the sand dunes in place. We used the Land and Water Conservation Fund to purchase elements of land around it, like the Baca Ranch and Zapata Ranch and other areas, to make sure we had this great resource maintained for future generations to come.

Of course, Rocky Mountain National Park is the third most heavily visited park in the Nation. Almost 5 million visitors come to Rocky Mountain National Park every year. A few years

back, there were 2.8, 3 million people. We have almost doubled the visitors in recent times, which has caused a lot of challenges for Rocky Mountain National Park. It has benefited as well from the Land and Water Conservation Fund because some of the last remaining inholdings within Rocky Mountain National Park have been purchased using the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

If you look at the Restore Our Parks Act, the money in the Great American Outdoors Act that will go toward catching up with the maintenance backlog, this park has about \$85 million worth of needs in terms of that backlog. It has \$85 million worth of projects, from visitors centers to roads and trails.

Let me show you one of those trails right here. You can see this is what it looked like. You can see the erosion and washouts. This is what happens over time with heavy use and weather.

You can see the work we have been able to do to maintain and to catch up with the needs in Rocky Mountain National Park. We can do this across our Park System thanks to the Restore Our Parks Act. We will put \$1.9 billion a year—paid for by oil and gas revenues—into our national parks to catch up with the maintenance and backlog needs at places like Rocky Mountain National Park.

It is \$85 million in Rocky Mountain National Park. It is \$7 to \$8 million in the Great Sand Dunes National Park. In Mesa Verde National Park, it is almost \$75 million. I will show you Black Canyon of the Gunnison right now. Black Canyon of the Gunnison is in need of nearly \$7 to \$8 million as well for its backlog needs.

This is a picture I actually took on my iPhone. This is a picture I had taken while attending a press conference to celebrate a Land and Water Conservation Fund purchase. You can see Park Superintendent Noble is pointing across the canyon to the land that was purchased using the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The canyon is right here. It is not over the horizon; it is right here. This land was on the rim of the canyon. It was not a part of the park. You can imagine, if somebody had decided to build something there and said "Why don't we develop that? Why don't we do something else?" what that would have meant to the national park and enjoyment of that park. Using this, they were able to get the entire rim of the canyon for the National Park System. That is where that is.

If you go to this next picture, you see it is not just about national parks. The Great American Outdoors Act is not just about Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is about our forests. It is about our national forests, our Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife, and it is about the Bureau of Indian Education.

This is actually a national monument. This is Dinosaur National Monu-

ment. If you go to Northern Colorado, Dinosaur National Monument straddles both the State of Colorado and the State of Utah. Some of the best white water rafting in the country goes through Dinosaur National Monument. This is amazing. This is absolutely cool.

You can see these archaeologists who are actually hanging on to a wall as they do their work. This is known as the fossil wall. Hundreds of millions of years' worth of fossils are in this long wall at Dinosaur National Monument. You can see the fossils and the bones in this picture, layer after layer. It is a remarkable resource in one of the most truly unique areas of Colorado. The needs here are tremendous, too, as they face erosion and challenges from visitors and access needs to some of these resources.

If you go to Mesa Verde National Park, this is truly spectacular. If you look at Mesa Verde—for those who never had a chance to go there, I hope people will have a chance to visit. This park was established in 1906. Look at this beautiful ridge. Look at the plateau. Look at the cliff dwellings. It is remarkable. It was established in 1906 to preserve and interpret the archaeological heritage of the ancestral Pueblo people who made it their home for over 700 years. The park protects nearly 5,000 known archaeological sites, including 600 cliff dwellings—some of the best and most notable preserved dwellings in the United States.

In 2019, they had about 556,000 visitors. This is in the Four Corners area of the State, surrounded by towns like Cortez, CO; Mancas, CO; Durango, CO—areas that rely on tourism and recreation and farming and ranching for their jobs.

In 2018, visitors spent about \$58 million in these local gateway regions. This supported nearly 1,000 jobs, \$22 million in labor income, \$40 million in value added, and about \$72 million in economic help in the gateway economy surrounding the Mesa Verde National Park. They operate about \$700 million worth of facilities, and they have about 10 percent of that in need of deferred maintenance. So \$76 million is their total deferred maintenance needs.

They need to rehabilitate the Chapin Mesa Civilian Conservation Corps. They need to replace the water, electric, information, and sewer systems. They need to replace the campground, water, and road systems. They need to improve the historic maintenance operations buildings. That is just some of the need at Mesa Verde National Park.

When we talk about the Great American Outdoors Act, we talk about national parks, national forests, and BLM land and monuments, but we should also talk about recreation, because so many times this gets lost in our conversation on the floor, because it is not only recreation in terms of parks and the National Forest Service, but it is sports complexes, baseball fields, soccer fields, tennis courts—the ability for

States to determine how to use these dollars. It is not just the Federal Government that takes all of this money; 40 percent goes back to the States.

This is in Runyon Park in Pueblo, CO, another southern Colorado city. Look how beautiful that is and the work we can do with the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Look at the total economic impact. I think it is important that we recognize that before coronavirus, we were working on the Great American Outdoors Act, this package that presented two great American values: the crown jewel of our conservation program, the Restore Our Parks Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to catch up with our maintenance backlog, both of which are paid for by oil and gas revenues. We talked about them, and we talked about how good it would be for our environment and the conservation and preservation for future generations. We also acknowledged, then, that there was a great economic benefit. We talked about the numbers. We talked about the recreation economy. But now that economic benefit becomes even more important because the first industries that were hit by the shelter-in-place orders and the economic shutdowns were the travel industry, hotels, restaurants, tourism, outfitters, and ski areas. In Colorado, they closed down the ski areas months ahead of time. The summer recreation start has been delayed because of lingering effects of phases in restoring our economy. So the economic benefits of the Great American Outdoors Act become all the more important.

Some of the hardest hit communities by the coronavirus in Colorado in the first wave have some of the highest unemployment levels in the State. Hotels emptied early, and restaurants emptied early. But this bill will create thousands and thousands of jobs, according to a report that was just released by the National Park Service. In Colorado, thousands of jobs will be created—in Colorado alone.

Look at the Land and Water Conservation Fund. For every \$1 million spent in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it supports between 16 and 30 jobs. Support for 16 to 30 jobs—do you know what that means in a community that may have 20 to 22 percent unemployment? Surrounded by public lands, the Great American Outdoors Act will help to put them to work while doing what we love in Colorado, and that is protecting our environment. If you look at the overall numbers that the National Park Service provided, we are going to create and help to support over 100,000 jobs through this legislation, and, again, this is legislation that is paid for through oil and gas revenues.

It was a commonsense approach back in 1965 when the Land and Water Conservation Fund was put together so that we access one resource. We deplete a resource in oil and gas. They pay a severance tax and royalty to the Fed-

eral Government, and the Federal Government turns around and uses that to protect our other resources in other areas, national parks and national forests. That is what the bill does through the Great American Outdoors Act. It creates opportunity.

John Gayle, conservation director of the Backcountry Hunters & Anglers and a Colorado resident says: “The Great American Outdoors Act not only creates permanent certainty for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, America’s most successful conservation and access program, it also ensures sound stewardship of our public lands and waters.”

Carlos Fernandez, Colorado State director of the Nature Conservancy says:

The Great American Outdoors Act is critical to Colorado’s recovery from this crisis.

Of course, he is talking about COVID-19.

Our mountains, trails, fields and streams have been a welcome respite for many during the pandemic, but local economies have struggled. Fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund and investing in our national parks will put Coloradans back to work, protecting important landscapes, investing in their care, and creating more outdoor recreation opportunities throughout the State. These are time-tested, effective investments in conservation that will strengthen Colorado’s economy and amazing outdoors.

Larry Selzer, the president and CEO of the Conservation Fund said that the “momentum to bring a vote on the Great American Outdoors Act to the Senate floor is critical to the future vitality of America. Advancing legislation in both houses to fully fund LWCF, as well as to address the maintenance backlog on our public lands, is a huge step to support our public lands and rekindle and grow local outdoors and recreation economies.”

Will Shafroth, president and CEO of the National Park Foundation—Will’s family is legendary in Colorado politics—says this:

The National Park Foundation is thrilled that the Great American Outdoors Act is moving closer to becoming law. Years in the making, this bipartisan bill would go a long way toward addressing the critical maintenance needs of our national parks. With the funds made available through this bill, we will ensure that these special places are even more special, remain accessible to all Americans, and continue to serve as economic engines for local communities.

Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership:

The Great American Outdoors Act is smart conservation. Senate passage of this historic and bipartisan bill will improve our natural resources and enhance access for American hunters and anglers. It also makes lasting investments in our outdoor recreation economy at a time when we need to get Americans back to work.

Benji Backer, president and founder of the American Conservation Coalition:

Our national parks and public lands are part of our heritage as Americans. By protecting and investing in them we will ensure that generations to come will benefit from

America’s best idea. The American Conservation Coalition is proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act because it will protect this heritage and support the hundreds of thousands of Americans whose livelihoods are connected to our national parks.

This list goes on and on, from the Archery Trade Association to the Outdoor Industry Association. The Outdoor Industry Association said:

The outdoor industry applauds the U.S. Senate for seizing the opportunity to pass the Great American Outdoors Act, a landmark piece of bipartisan legislation. Along with the social and health benefits that being outdoors provides, there is also a strong economic case for doing this now. The outdoors are bipartisan, and investing in LWCF means investing in local economies and creating thousands of jobs, both of which we desperately need right now to help the country bounce back from COVID-19.

There is the Corps Network, the Outdoor Recreation Roundtable, and the RV industry also. The Presiding Officer has a significant RV industry in the great State of Indiana.

The National Marine Manufacturers Association—believe it or not, we have marine manufacturing in Colorado, even though we are a pretty dry, landlocked State.

Look at the Motorcycle Industry Council, the Specialty Vehicle Institutes of America, the Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association, and the Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation. Jeff Crane said: “The Great American Outdoors Act represents the largest commitment to public lands in our lifetime.”

“The Great American Outdoors Act represents the largest commitment to conservation and public lands in our lifetime.”

The National Wildlife Federation: “Now when we need it most, the Great American Outdoors Act will put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work restoring public lands infrastructure, expanding healthy outdoor experiences, and restoring wildlife habitat, all of which will help local economies recover across the country.”

Suzanne O’Neal—I know Suzanne well—the executive director of the Colorado Wildlife Federation, said: “This commonsense legislation is long overdue to help our national parks and other public lands meet the burgeoning demand of increased numbers of hikers, anglers, campers, and wildlife watchers who have been flocking to Colorado’s outdoor spaces in recent years.”

I talked about that, the fact that Rocky Mountain National Park has gone from 2.8 million to nearly 5 million visitors. It is the third-most visited national park in the country.

What happens when one area of the State gets heavily visited? It is not like they just stay in one area. They actually start going to other areas of the State. For instance, if you are in Colorado, you go to the national park, and maybe it is busy one day. So you decide to go a little bit farther. You go over toward Walden or you go over to the North Sand Dunes area or maybe

you spend a little bit of time in the White River National Forest, one of the most heavily visited forests in our State. The Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forest and the Pike and San Isabel National Forests are also some of the most heavily visited forests in the country. They are seeing more and more visitors because all of the other public lands are under pressure. When they are under pressure, that means they are more used, and when they are more used, they are experiencing more wear and tear and they are being loved to death. So we need to provide a way to fund it. That is what the Great American Outdoors Act does.

There is the National Parks Conservation Association, the American Horse Council, and the Trust for Public Lands.

Teresa Martinez, the executive director of the Continental Divide Trail Coalition, said: "In the Rocky Mountain West, public lands and trails are vital to our region's economy and our quality of life."

The Nature Conservancy's Sally Jewell, former Secretary of the Interior, signed a letter with six other Secretaries of the Interior to talk about the importance of this bill. Two of them are from Colorado. Secretary Ken Salazar and Secretary Gale Norton are talking about the need for this legislation.

The American Society of Landscape Architects—the list goes on and on of people who support this legislation. They support it because we value the outdoors. We value our environment, and we value our public lands.

Colorado has long been the gateway to public lands in this country, but now it is the headquarters to our Nation's public lands with the Bureau of Land Management headquartered in Grand Junction, CO.

So these two bills put together represent that chance in a lifetime, as we have heard from many of the supporters of this legislation. In Colorado it was called "the holy grail of conservation legislation" by the Durango Herald this morning.

It is an opportunity for every State to benefit. I have a list of every State in the country right here and the work they have done. I will just pull one out. In Alabama, if you look at Alabama, the national parks backlog is nearly \$30 million. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided Alabama with \$165 million in funding over the last five decades. Alabama National Forest, Blowing Rock Cave National Wildlife Refuge, Clear Creek Recreation Area—that is just Alabama.

Let's just pull another one out and see: Florida. Florida has received \$1.06 billion in funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund over the last five decades. There is the Big Cypress National Preserve, Everglades Headwater National Wildlife Refuge, Apalachicola National Forest—I hope I got that one right—and the Canaveral National Seashore, plus 27 other areas.

They have a \$240 million backlog in deferred maintenance projects, with \$75 million in the Everglades National Park. The Dry Tortugas National Park is \$63 million in need. Gulf Islands National Seashore is \$60.6 million in needs.

All of these States have benefited from coast-to-coast, from sea to shining sea, from Hawaii to Maine and Florida to Alaska. Those are the States that have benefited from the legislation covered by the Great American Outdoors Act.

In Colorado alone, the popularity of our outdoor recreation and public lands continues to grow. Over the last 5 years, visitation numbers in national parks has continued to increase. National park visitation in 2019 overall surpassed 2018 visits by more than 9 million visits. That is 327 million recreation visits across the country, over 1.4 billion recreation visitor hours, 13.8 million over the United States. That is 2019.

And 2020, of course, is going to look a little different. Some of our national parks are not opened yet. Some of them are staging their openings. Rocky Mountain National Park is open, but its reservations are reduced, and the entries are reduced to accommodate the need to protect people during this pandemic. These numbers are going to be different.

So that means that places like Estes Park are going to have fewer people in their restaurants and fewer people in their hotels. Fewer people are stopping at the saltwater taffy shop on Main Street in Estes, and fewer people are doing things like bumper boats and putt-putt golf along the way.

The Great American Outdoors Act is one of those pieces of legislation that brings everybody in the Chamber together for a bipartisan opportunity to help these communities at a time that they need it the most. By helping the land, we are helping the communities, because it is there for future generations and because it belongs to future generations.

This really is an opportunity for this Nation to come together at a time of great need economically and spiritually, and, quite frankly, to succeed.

I am reminded also at this time about something I read on the floor earlier this week by one of the moving leaders of Rocky Mountain National Park. He talked about how in our national parks and trails and forests, we find the space we need to think, the space we need to hope, to provide courage, and that they can provide a little bit more kindness, that what they give to us is a little bit more kindness. I said often throughout the COVID-19 experience that we have to keep in mind, as we learned in Sunday school, that our struggles and tribulations give us perseverance, and that perseverance leads to courage, and courage leads to hope.

So as we think about what Enos Mills, the father of national parks, said

about the trails bringing back kindness that we all need, I think about other areas of our National Park System and some of our land areas and our national historic sites that maybe someday can benefit from the Great American Outdoors Act. I think about a specific site in southeastern Colorado known as Amache. I have legislation in that is a resource study on whether or not Amache, CO, should be considered as part of the national park system.

Let me tell you the history about Amache. There is a monument down the road from this building, just a couple blocks away from here. It was the site in 1943 of a Japanese-American internment camp. With Executive order 9066, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said that Japanese people would be ripped from their homes unconstitutionally and put into these camps.

In 1943, there was a high school established at Amache, and a woman by the name of Marion Konishi Takehara became a valedictorian of the high school that they had created. In the speech she wrote for her valedictorian speech, she talked about what the country meant to her today. Did the country mean the same things it meant to her before she was behind the searchlights, removed from her home? Did it mean justice and equality and fairness? Did she believe in America? She went on to talk about all of the challenges and struggles and things in our history that we know are the darkest moments of our Nation—the original sin of slavery, the continued discrimination faced by African Americans in our communities, the treatment of others in our society, waves of immigrants. She talked about how the United States has learned from every one of those moments, and we can overcome them all because America is where we learn from our mistakes in the past, and we take the actions to correct them, and we get back to the idea of justice and fairness and equality.

I don't know about you, but I think that is the kind of spirit and the kind of hope and the kind of belief and faith in this country that we need right now as we face some of the biggest challenges this generation has ever seen, confronting the issues of racism, confronting the issues of inequality.

Our national parks, our historic areas, and our public lands provide us with one more opportunity, one more chance to not forget the dark moments as we look for greater inspiration ahead, as we use this to learn from the past, to reach our highest peaks as a nation. That is the inspiration of the Great American Outdoors Act—the work we can do with the Land and Water Conservation Fund to bring our parks up to snuff for future generations.

I know my colleague from the great State of Iowa is on the Senate floor. I thank him for his support in the work we have been doing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 3, this year, the Associated Press released an article detailing China's stonewalling and delay tactics in withholding crucial data from the World Health Organization. That information that was held was about the novel coronavirus that caused COVID-19.

Now, this article gives us a glimpse behind the scenes of the World Health Organization, and there are a lot of questions raised about the World Health Organization today in regard to their relationship with China. The political leaders at WHO pursued a strategy of placating China in a seemingly haphazard attempt to coax China's leader into cooperating more fully.

Now, despite red flags raised by medical experts within the organization about the lack of data coming out of China and also serious doubts about the Chinese Government's claim that human-to-human transmission was not of any concern, WHO leadership, through all of that, continued lauding China's approach and transparency on this whole virus issue.

Many career officials openly voiced their frustration with how the World Health Organization leadership lacked the willingness to push China to hand over vital information about the virus. Remember, the World Health Organization did publicly push China when it withheld information on the SARS outbreak in 2003 but didn't seem to be as interested pushing China as much this time.

The Chinese Government then refused to share data about COVID-19 test results that would have allowed researchers around the world to make independent assessments of the virus's spread.

Now, weeks passed before the Chinese Government allowed the World Health Organization to see the map of the virus genome, and that genome was created by Chinese researchers. So they had the information where other people could start out to try to find a vaccine. By that time, the virus was already spreading around the globe, which has led to countless needless deaths and immeasurable economic damage globally that now rests on the shoulders of the Chinese for that happening.

I am glad that the World Health Organization member countries approved an investigation as to how the organization handled COVID-19. I hope this will be a truly independent investigation that will prevent future mishaps.

Now, in the meantime, we already know enough about the actions by the World Health Organization management to warrant immediate changes. Politics must never again get in the way of those medical professionals in the organization who are actually dedicated to fulfilling the World Health Organization's mission to share accurate

and timely public health information and at the same time save lives.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RACISM

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, last week I attended a memorial service for my constituent Mr. George Floyd, who was murdered by Minneapolis police. Like so many Minnesotans, my heart is broken for Mr. Floyd and his family and for a Black community that has been here too many times. I will once again add my voice to the chorus demanding that the police officers responsible for his death face justice.

But I keep finding myself thinking that Mr. Floyd's death wasn't just a tragedy and it wasn't just a crime. It was a failure. It was our failure. Systemic racism is built into every level of our society, and for 400 years, Black and Brown and Indigenous people have paid its price.

Racism isn't just evil, though it is. It is dangerous. And racism isn't just a moral issue, though it is. It is a public health issue. And the death of Mr. Floyd, like the deaths of so many Black and Brown people before him, is an indictment of our failure as policymakers to fulfill our first and most important duty, which is to protect the lives of the people whom we serve.

Black lives matter. We need to say it loud and often, with strength and with purpose, and if we truly mean it, then we need to be very clear about why it is that so many Black and Brown lives are being stolen, and that means we can't just point to systemic racism writ large. We have to talk about the police.

This is about the impunity with which police officers are allowed to kill Black and Brown Americans. This is about a society in which police departments have become fundamentally unaccountable institutions. This is about the fact that law enforcement in America does not deliver equal justice for all.

The institutional racism that plagues American law enforcement is real. This is not just a few bad cops. It is the entire culture of policing—a culture that far too often encourages violence, condones abuse, and resists reforms and accountability at every turn.

This culture kills, and it will continue to do so unless we stop it. If we can't see that, if we can't say it, if we aren't ready to use our power and our privilege to address this unforgiveable failure, well, then we might as well say nothing at all.

So why is it so hard for us to talk about these issues? Why is it so hard to even admit that there is something

dangerously wrong about the role that police play in our society?

Well, I think, in part, it is because of the respect that we have for police officers themselves. We ask these men and women to put their lives on the line every single day. Their job is to run to trouble, and hundreds of thousands of police officers in my community and in all of yours fulfill their duty with skill and with courage every day.

But I think there is something else lurking behind our inaction. The vast majority of policymakers, especially here in Washington, are White, and the vast majority of the interactions that White people have with police officers are positive.

When we are scared or threatened or hurt, well, police officers come to help. And when we hear the siren or we see a blue uniform, we breathe a sigh of relief, and it is uncomfortable for White people to acknowledge that this feeling of relief is really about privilege. It is uncomfortable to imagine giving up some piece of that privilege.

After all, we all want clean, safe streets. We all want quiet, orderly neighborhoods. We want to be able to call 911 when we are in danger and know that the police officers will rush to our aid.

We may even catch ourselves worrying that a police force held accountable for its abuse of power against Black and Brown bodies will be a police force a little less empowered to protect us.

Often, when White people talk about racism, we define it as a hatred that lurks within people's hearts, and then we search within ourselves and we can feel satisfied that we are free from prejudice. But racism—colleagues, is manifested as behavior—behavior that hurts, that kills. Who even knows what is in "how to change hearts and minds"? But we do know, I think, let's say: Let's start with changing behavior.

So this is something that I think about a lot as a Minnesotan. In my home State we pride ourselves on our legacy of progressive activism. We believe deeply in civic participation, and we are proud to have the highest voter turnout in the whole country. We are home to a diverse array of communities—African American, Somali, Hmong, Latinx, Native, and more—all people who belong here just as much as anyone else.

And we are home to some of the Nation's worst racial disparities. It is not just that Black men are more likely to be stopped, more likely to be searched, more likely to be assaulted and killed by police officers. A Black or Brown or Native child growing up in the neighborhood where George Floyd was murdered can expect worse education outcomes, worse health, fewer opportunities than a White child that lives just a few miles down the road.

The truth is that for all of the progress that we have made in America over the course of my lifetime and for

all of the hearts and minds that have changed, racism was built into our systems from the very beginning. While it is still present in everything from healthcare to education, to housing and environmental policy, it jumps off the page when you look at our Nation's criminal justice system.

Consider this. African Americans make up less than 14 percent of the population, but they account for 23 percent of fatal police shootings and nearly one-third of our prison population.

Studies repeatedly show that Black people and White people use drugs at roughly the same rate, but Black people are more than twice as likely to be arrested for drug offenses and nearly four times as likely when it comes to marijuana.

No matter where you look, our criminal justice system unfairly targets Black and Brown and Native people, threatening their freedom and often their lives, and you can't just blame that on racist cops. That is us doing that. Even if we harbor no hatred in our hearts, we are responsible for the racist impact of a system that was built historically by White Americans to serve White Americans.

We are the beneficiaries of a system that killed George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Atatiana Jefferson, Sandra Bland, Aiyana Stanley-Jones, Rekia Boyd, Jessica Hernandez, Eric Salgado, Philando Castile, Jamar Clark, and so many others.

So that is a hard thing to admit, but right now hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens are demanding that we face this ugly truth.

The people marching in our streets have watched us forgive ourselves time and again for failing Black and Brown Americans, like George Floyd, and they are angry, they are grieving, and they are exhausted, and this time they will not be denied.

It may make us uncomfortable to hear this anger, to see the images on television, to experience this turmoil when our country is going through so much already, but that is the whole point of protest. This crisis has long deserved our attention, and because we withheld that attention, these protesters are demanding it now.

We cannot claim to support the goal of justice if we object to being confronted with the reality of injustice. We cannot walk away from this moral crisis. We have done that too many times after too many deaths, and every time we do, we fail the next Black or Brown American who dies in police custody.

I just can't live with that. We have to make a change, and this time, White people have to get past our discomfort. Black and Brown people have been trying for too long to tell us that systemic racism isn't just limiting their opportunities. It is killing their children.

To the communities of color in Minnesota, whom I am proud to represent, I want you to know that I hear you and that I will do everything I can to make

sure that everyone here in Washington hears you too.

Most of all, we have to devote our time, our energy, our resources, our platforms, our power, and our privilege to helping this movement succeed.

As Pastor Billy Russell from the Greater Friendship Missionary Baptist Church in Minneapolis said to me, "we need to make it right. It's not right now, but we need to make it right."

I want to tell my Minnesota community, my colleagues, and the American people exactly how I want to use my power and my privilege to help make it right.

In the coming weeks, my office will be moving forward with legislative action focused on three priorities: first, fundamentally transforming the role of the police in our society from the way we fund and train and equip officers to the relationships between departments and the communities that they serve. We must rethink the responsibilities we assign to the police and the authority we give them to fulfill those responsibilities. We need to imagine and reinvent American policing from the ground up.

Second, we must fix the systems in police departments that obstruct accountability and transparency at every turn. Our system effectively puts cops above the law by insulating them from civil and criminal liability for their actions. This leads people of color to conclude that they can't trust the police, and it leads the police to conclude that they will never face consequences for crossing the line. They are both right, and this means something is wrong. If we want to change the way officers act, we need to change the rules that shield them from accountability. Accountability and preventing this misconduct from being ignored will not only hold police departments responsible for perpetuating violence and unequal justice, but it will help prevent violence and injustice the next time.

The Justice in Policing Act, led by my colleagues Senator HARRIS and Senator BOOKER, is an important step forward. I am proud to support it, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in. Racism is about behavior. We can't legislate what police officers believe, but we can and we must legislate how they behave.

Third, restoring the communities that have been torn apart by injustice—in the Twin Cities, neighbors are already coming together to clean up the damage sustained by the unrest and upheaval of the last 2 weeks, but the task of making our communities whole goes far beyond repairing the physical damage. We need a new and sustained push for racial and economic justice, not just law enforcement but in healthcare and education and in housing and in environmental policy.

The people I spoke to when I was home last weekend are grieving, they are angry, and they are hurt, but most of all, they are exhausted. Communities of color have spent years fight-

ing to be heard, fighting for justice, fighting for resources, fighting for survival. As their Senator, it is my job to carry that fight here to Washington in the Senate.

Four hundred years of structural racism cannot be overcome with a single piece of legislation or even by a single generation of legislators, but we can't let the enormity of the task blind us to the urgency of this work.

The last 2 weeks have been extraordinarily difficult for Minnesotans and for our country. But, throughout history, the hardest times have always been the times of the greatest progress. I choose to find purpose in making sure that, in this moment, we lead to real progress towards justice and equality.

That is why I came to the floor today. No statement of intent, no matter how thoughtful, will change the reality of this crisis, but I want this statement to be on the record, part of my record as a U.S. Senator. I want to be accountable for these commitments. I want Minnesotans to hold me accountable. I want to be a part of holding this body and all of us in the Senate accountable.

This, then, will be the first in a series of floor speeches I intend to deliver examining the systemic injustice that plagues American policing and plagues Native, Black, and Brown communities more broadly. It will be about the steps we need to take to address this injustice: redefining the role of the police, reinforcing accountability for police officers, and restoring the communities I am so blessed to serve.

This is a big fight. The scale of the injustice is overwhelming. It can be hard to know where to start, but the people who took to the streets last week—in the Twin Cities, in communities large and small across Minnesota, and in cities across this country—are a movement for change, and they are showing us the path forward. This path requires us to be courageous, requires us to be humble, and requires us to be uncomfortable, but it is a path rooted in love and in trust and in hope.

We saw it in the way the protesters brought joy to the most serious of fights they faced. We saw it in the way they stood up to those who would do damage to their communities and to their cause. We saw it in the way they kept their focus, even in the face of unimaginable brutality.

So many Minnesotans have shown such courage and grace. I am proud to be your Senator, and I am proud to be your neighbor. I am committing myself to the path that you are forging. I hope my constituents, my colleagues in the Senate, and all of my fellow Americans will do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Maine.

H. R. 1957

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting the Great American Outdoors Act, a bill to provide full funding for

the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to address the deferred maintenance backlog for our national parks.

Under the expert leadership of Senators GARDNER, MANCHIN, and DAINES, 59 bipartisan Senators have cosponsored this bill that will allow landowners, States, local communities, and conservation partners to plan for the future and to restore our national parks.

More than 50 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act established America's most successful conservation and outdoor recreation program. There is truly nothing else like it. The fund was designed to ensure that outdoor recreational lands would be secured for future generations.

I remember, in one of my first years in the Senate, working with my colleague from Colorado, Senator and later Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, as we sought to boost the funding for the stateside part of the program.

If you look at a map of the United States and put a pin in every place where there was a Land and Water Conservation Fund stateside supported program, you would find that every single county in the country had at least one project. Oftentimes, people do not realize that local ballpark or the trails that run along a local stream or lake are the result of funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and those are projects that are designed by local people, selected by local people, and then the Federal Government helps in the funding to acquire and maintain the land.

Just last year, this important program was permanently authorized, and now we have the opportunity to ensure for the American people that this program will have consistent funding to play the strongest possible role in preserving open spaces, special lands, and revitalizing communities for years to come.

Investments in this landmark conservation program support access to the outdoors for all Americans, as LWCF, as I have mentioned, has invested in literally every county in our country. Its funding has been used to open up key areas for hunting, fishing, and other recreational access; to support working forests and ranches and protect them from development; to acquire inholdings and protect critical lands in national parks, national wildlife refuges, national forests, Civil War battlefields, and other Federal areas; and, as I mentioned, my favorite part of the program, which is the stateside part of the program, which supports State and local projects, from ballparks to recreational trails.

Over the past five decades, Maine has received more than \$191 million in funding from LWCF. Examples of this funding include the Cold Stream Forest, a Forest Legacy Program project in Somerset County to preserve a beautiful area that continues the long and proud Maine tradition of conservation,

public access to recreation, and working forests.

In addition, we have the Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge in southern Maine, where a once-undeveloped 110-acre tract along the coast in Biddeford was preserved for natural habitat and expanded recreational access.

Of the more than 850 Land and Water Conservation Fund sites in Maine, 650 are community-based projects, from Riverside Park in Fort Kent in northern Maine to Haley soccer fields in Kittery, right near the New Hampshire border.

I want to repeat that statistic again. Out of the 850 Land and Water Conservation Fund sites in the State of Maine, 650 are community-based projects, like the park in Fort Kent that I mentioned and the soccer fields in Kittery.

In its more than 50-year history, however, this program has been funded fully only twice at the authorized level of \$900 million. I believe that Congress should fully fund this program to deliver on the promise that was made to the American people back in 1964 to take a portion of the proceeds from natural resource development, such as offshore oil drilling, and invest a portion in conservation and outdoor recreation.

I do want to recognize two of my colleagues who have other ideas—Senator CASSIDY and Senator WHITEHOUSE—for bringing up the issue of funding for coastal States. Representing a coastal State, I agree that we need to do more for our coastal States, and I support their efforts to ensure additional funding that can be directed to coastal States and coastal communities. I believe, however, that that issue, regrettably, is going to have to be dealt with at a later time, but I do support their effort.

Furthermore, another important piece of this bill addresses our deferred maintenance backlog on our Nation's public lands. Now, what I am most interested in here is our national parks. Our national parks have a huge maintenance backlog, and that includes at Acadia National Park, a true gem of a park on the coast of Maine where we have seen record numbers of visitors in recent years. This bill will help Acadia National Park tackle the more than \$60 million of maintenance backlog work—on trails, roads, bridges, buildings—to ensure that every visitor can experience the absolute beauty of this true gem of a national park on the Maine coastline.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is telling that the bill we are considering this week called the Great American Outdoors Act was written behind closed doors and has now been hermetically

sealed, walled off from amendments, by the people's elected representatives.

Forget the theatrics in Seattle; this bill is the real Capitol Hill autonomous zone. In its current form, this bill enables the Federal Government, if it is enacted, to purchase new lands in perpetuity, without accountability and without oversight or any measures to make sure that it can actually care for the land that it owns, perpetuating and worsening our already highly problematic Federal public lands policy.

This policy will have one overarching impact: to make life easier for politicians and bureaucrats and harder for the American people whom they, ostensibly, serve.

This is not the way the Senate is supposed to run. The point of this body, its whole reason for existence, is to take imperfect bills, bring them to the floor of the Senate, and then come together so that we can hone and fine-tune them, so that we can debate them and discuss them, so that we can identify their weak points and make them stronger—or at least less weak.

The Senate is supposed to have an open debate and amendment process precisely so that we can raise concerns and we can find solutions and arrive at genuine, rather than forced, compromise and consensus. This week, I have been encouraged to discover just how many of my colleagues want to do just that. Many of my colleagues from different States and from both parties are filing amendments in response to this bill. Some of those amendments would significantly change it; others would present simply small tweaks to tighten up the language or to provide for better congressional oversight so that the American people are guaranteed that what it says in the law is going to reflect what happens on the ground. These amendments have already been written. They are waiting for consideration.

Anyone watching C-SPAN 2 today will notice there is nothing else happening on the Senate floor—I mean, literally nothing else happening on the Senate floor. In fact, I would note for the record that there are exactly three Members of the Senate in the Chamber right now—two on the floor and one at the Presiding Officer's desk. There is literally nothing else happening on the Senate floor. There is literally no other business with pressing deadlines pending before this body right now. The House of Representatives is adjourned and is apparently set to remain adjourned until June 30, so it is not as though we have any realistic deadline with the other side of the Capitol.

The Senate, right now, would simply rather do nothing than vote on amendments that those of us from the West, Senators from the gulf coast and from various States around the country, would like to propose and have, in fact, proposed.

I myself have proposed several. One of my amendments would require State legislative approval for any land acquisition proposed in that State so that

land acquisition would be something Washington does with the States rather than to the States.

Many people don't realize there is a big disparity among and between the States with regard to how much Federal land is owned. In every State east of Colorado, the Federal Government owns less than 15 percent. In every State Colorado and west, the Federal Government owns more than 15 percent. The average is more like 50 percent in the Western United States, and in many of those States, including my own, it is more like two-thirds of the land.

In these States and particularly the rural communities and those rural communities in particular where there is the highest concentration of Federal land, there is also poverty—poverty that is not just correlated with or coincidental to the Federal land ownership, but it is causally connected to its widespread existence.

Another of my amendments would require the Federal Government to dispose of current Federal lands before acquiring new ones, forcing land agencies to exercise fiscal responsibility and prioritize which lands they want to keep under their control.

So getting back to referring a few minutes ago to those areas, particularly those rural areas in my State, places like San Juan County, UT—San Juan County, UT, happens to be the poorest county in the State. It is also a place where the Federal Government owns 95-plus percent of the land. This is not a coincidence.

So there ought to be something in place that requires an offset so that when the Federal Government buys new land under the Land and Water Conservation Fund or otherwise, it has to offset it by disposing of land elsewhere.

There also ought to be some mechanism in place so as to give the State's sovereign lawmaking body, the State legislature, the ability to accept or reject the proposed expansion of the Federal land footprint in that State.

It is really easy for my colleagues from certain parts of the country—particularly those living east of the Rocky Mountains—to suggest that, you know, Federal land ownership is a great thing. First of all, a lot of people who say that do live east of the Rocky Mountains, and a lot of people who say that also incorrectly imagine that Federal public lands are more or less just national parks or declared wilderness areas. They are not.

In my State, most of the Federal land is not a national park, is not a national recreation area, is not a declared wilderness area; it is just garden-variety BLM or Forest Service land that is chronically environmentally mismanaged, and that leads to chronic environmental and economic problems.

I also have a number of other amendments that would reform the NEPA process—the process under the National Environmental Policy Act—to

help address the maintenance backlog on neglected land that Washington, DC, already owns and controls from its perch generally thousands of miles from the land in question.

Finally, I have an amendment to support Utah's interests under the Antiquities Act. Right now, other States have received protection and are protected from unilateral land grabs by the Federal Government for designation of national monuments. This is important, you see, because when they designate Federal land as a national monument, that changes the way that land can be accessed, the way it can be used. It goes from one Federal land classification to another. It is one of the strictest classifications in the sense that it is very, very difficult to use that land or for local affected populations to have influence over that land once it becomes a monument.

This is significant for Utah because 28 percent of the national monument acreage designated within the 50 States over the last 25 years has been in Utah. My State is due for the same types of protections that are already in place in Wyoming and in Alaska. Those States in years past have received far too many monument designations against their will. Eventually, they received statutory protection.

Utah has borne far more than its share of the burden in the designation of national monuments—monuments designated that way, by the way, by Presidents who were acting in open willful defiance of the will of the locally affected populations.

I believe that this is one of the most important changes we need to see in Federal lands policy. I will continue to fight for it until we achieve justice for Utah. In fact, this change could be achieved through a single 1-page bill, one mostly consisting of two words. Inserting the words “Or Utah” enables Utah to receive the same protection from hostile designation of national monuments by a President not interested in the will of the local population.

As important as all of these amendments are to me and my State, I am not even asking for the right to propose all of them this week. I am willing to set aside some of my priorities in order to help my colleagues pursue theirs and, most of all, to help the Senate as an institution to get back to the essential work that the Senate and the Senate alone can do. The Senate was created to be the place—the one place in our constitutional framework—where our diverse, divided Nation could come together, where we could air our disagreements and find common ground.

Every time we have a national controversy, a lot of people throw around the word “conversation.” We need to have a conversation about race, about police brutality, about freedom of speech, about the environment, about the national debt. The list goes on and on. These are all things about which we

need to have conversations. This isn't just a media trope. Senators say it too. I agree. We need to have conversations about each of these and so many other important national issues.

Guess what. This, right here, is literally the room where America is supposed to have these conversations. This place right here, within these four walls, is where these conversations are supposed to happen. It is not supposed to be done only on Twitter. It is not supposed to be done only on cable news shows. It is supposed to happen right here on this floor.

Yet here we are on a Thursday afternoon at 4:23, 4:24 p.m. Look around. Three Members are in the Chamber—two on the floor, one in the Chair. That is it.

This is where the conversation is supposed to happen. It is not occurring—not this conversation, nor any other, not on the Senate floor, not in the middle of the week. With a whole lot of things going on in the world, we are not having it.

We are not even having it on this piece of legislation, which, significant as it is, is dwarfed in comparison to the magnitude of many other issues that we have to deal with. That doesn't mean we don't need to deal with this legislation. We do. But as long as we are going to deal with it, as long as we are being asked to pass it, we need to at least have a conversation about it, and we are not doing that.

The only reason that the U.S. Senate was given the powers that we have in this body by the Founders and by our constituents is to facilitate those vital conversations. This isn't the New York Times op-ed page. We are not supposed to be afraid of debate here. The Senate is here to provide the venue where all Americans and all views can be heard, to hash out our differences and arrive at a consensus and compromise in the public eye.

It is especially important to do this in the Senate because this is the place where each State has equal representation. Big, heavily populated States have two Senators. So do small, sparsely populated States have two Senators. This, by the way, is the one type of change that cannot be made to the Constitution. It is the one type of constitutional amendment that is, itself, preemptively unconstitutional. You can't pursue article VI of the Constitution or amend the Constitution in such a way—even if you follow the article V amendment procedures, you cannot amend it in a way that changes the principle of equal representation in the Senate among and between the States.

It is especially important to have these debates and discussions when it comes to legislation like this one, like the Great American Outdoors Act, that, while important to the entire Nation in many respects, affects some States differently than it does others. This bill has a very different impact in Utah than it does in Colorado or in Montana or in Tennessee or in Maine. It is very, very different.

This is why we have the Senate—so that we can air out these grievances, so that we can air out our differences, so that we can make improvements to legislation.

Perhaps we can't improve it. There are a lot of things about this bill I don't like. There are other things about it I can live with. Yet if we can't have the conversation, we don't have the ability to amend or improve the legislation. As a result, the conversation doesn't happen. And most of the American people are excluded from this debate and this discussion and this conversation entirely.

This is where these conversations are supposed to occur, where we can arrive at consensus and compromise in the public eye. And this, I should note, is not for our convenience and comfort. Rather, the Senate's purpose as a deliberative body is to add another layer of republican and democratic legitimacy to the very laws we pass. The House exists to assert immediate public opinion on the basis of the proportional representation they have on that side of the Capitol.

The Senate exists to identify broad-based compromise and consensus that is essential to the political legitimacy in a nation as diverse as ours, and to do so in a way in which each State is equally represented. That is why we require supermajorities to end debate here. That is why we have 6-year terms. It is not to serve us. It is, rather, so we can serve everyone else.

But right now, we are abusing our constitutional privilege. We are willfully taking the powers of the American people—the powers that they gave us, that they have given us—to deny them their right to a diverse, deliberative, transparent, accountable process. We are doing this for no other purpose than for our own convenience. No wonder they can't stand us.

But it is not too late. It is not even too late for this week. There is still plenty of time to salvage this process, to flex our badly atrophied legislative muscles and to get to work.

After speaking with my colleagues all week, and, frankly, all of last week on these topics, I believe the consensus concerns about this bill are as follows: one, the inequity of natural resource revenue-sharing between the Federal Government and the States; two, the cost of the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund; three, the cost of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or LWCF; four, the implications of an ever-expanding Federal land ownership; and, five, transparency for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

We could pick just one amendment for each of the aforementioned categories—just one for each of those categories. We could have just five amendments all together. By so doing, we could make significant progress on this legislation. More than that, we could strengthen our legislative muscle memory and take a step toward restor-

ing the vital deliberative powers of this body.

The Senate has long called itself the world's greatest deliberative body. These days, when it doesn't debate, when it shuts out amendments from individual Members—keeping in mind that this is supposed to be one of the two fundamental rules of the Senate, where each Member has access to unlimited debate and unlimited amendments—when it does this, it is neither great nor deliberative. It is not living up to its name, to its history, to its traditions, to its capacity, nor to its constitutional purpose.

Five amendments are not a lot, especially considering this legislative text bypassed the committee process all together in the first place. This bill, as a bill, was never even processed by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, on which I serve. It bypassed that committee all together. It didn't go through it. Even if the Senate votes on these amendments and votes them down—notwithstanding the fact that we bypassed the committee—it is here now. There is nothing in the Constitution that says it has to go through committee. It is better if we do. We didn't here. We can still deal with some of the concerns that individual Members have. This is the appropriate place to do that, after all, with or without committee action.

Regardless of the outcome of those votes, even if the Senate votes those amendments down—every one of them—at least we will then be on record about our priorities and about our positions. At least then we have a chance to weigh in and say: Here is what I liked about the bill, and here is what I didn't like about the bill.

That, in turn, helps us to communicate to the public about why we either do or don't support whatever legislation is intact at the end of that process. That, in turn, would strengthen the bonds of accountability between the government and the governed, and, I would hope, restore some of the public trust that Washington, DC, has squandered for the last several decades.

If we require Senators to speak on their amendments and then move to a vote, we could dispose of all five of these amendments in just a few hours. We could do this today. We could have done it earlier today. We could have done it at any moment yesterday. It is just not too much to ask. We have to give this, like all legislation, the due consideration and the careful deliberation that it deserves and that the American people deserve.

Now, more than ever, our country needs us to be able to come together, work together, and find solutions to the problems that we face. I believe this bill presents us with an opportunity to do precisely that. I am hopeful that my colleagues and I will get the chance to take it. This is what we need to do.

We know that the Senate in the past has functioned in such a way as to

allow every Member of this body to represent his or her State. We also know that can't really happen in a way that our system has always contemplated unless every Senator has a chance to weigh in on and to propose improvements to each bill and not be shut out of a process. What we get when we jettison that is, instead, a process by which a small handful of individuals will write legislation, that legislation gets airdropped on to the Senate floor in a hermetically sealed Chamber, and then Members are told: You have to vote for this entire package or against this entire package. You have a simple binary choice: Take it all or leave it all.

That isn't fair. The American people deserve better. We have settled. It is time for us to no longer settle, but to expect more, to expect the Senate to do its work.

Consistent with that, I think it is important for us to propose alternatives. I have nothing but a desire to see these things debated and discussed. In order to do that, I am proposing a solution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendments and call up the following amendments en bloc: Kennedy amendment No. 1599, which would allow Gulf States to receive a greater portion of revenues produced from energy sources off their coast; Cruz amendment No. 1651, which would reflect honest budgeting practices, direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell off excess Federal lands to the public as the "pay for" for this legislation, subject all Trust Fund spending to congressional oversight through the appropriations process, and strike the provision that allows the Trust Fund to receive credit for interest that will not really be earned based on money that does not really exist; Braun amendment No. 1635, which would prevent unrelated spending increases in the future by reducing the discretionary budget limit by \$450 million; Lee amendment No. 1647, which would prohibit the Federal Government from making acquisitions using LWCF funds until they have received from the State, where the proposed acquisition would be located, notice that the State has enacted legislation approving the acquisition; and finally, Lee amendment No. 1639, which would require reports to Congress on costs of acquisition, maintenance, and administration of lands obtained under the LWCF, reports to States and local units of government regarding lost property taxes due to LWCF land acquisitions, and reports to Congress on Restoration Fund projects to be funded, currently being funded, and the amount of money expended for that project, as well as an estimate of expenditures needed to complete each project.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the amendments in the order listed with no intervening action or debate, and that the amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative

vote threshold for adoption; finally, that following disposition of the amendments listed, the remaining pending amendments be withdrawn, with the exception of the substitute amendment No. 1617, and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the substitute amendment No. 1617.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to note now for the record that there are exactly two Senators remaining in the Senate Chamber. It is now 4:38 p.m. Now we are three again—now four. We have four Senators in the Chamber at 4:39 p.m. on a Thursday. This is not the end of the week, unless perhaps you are in the U.S. Senate.

There is no reason why the Senate shouldn't be convening and debating amendments right now in order to do this. There is no valid reason why Members who understand and appreciate the legitimate concerns that are the focus of this or any other piece of legislation ought not be able to raise concerns with that legislation and offer up amendments to improve the legislation in question, especially as is the case here.

There are particular States, including my own, that would be disproportionately disadvantaged and harmed by this legislation. It is interesting to note that the Federal Government owns more of my State than in almost any other State, than it does in any of the States of any of the sponsors or prominent cosponsors of this legislation. Some of the cosponsors, in fact, are people who live in States where the Federal Government owns very little land. Look, I don't complain—no fault. In some cases our disagreements here represent differences in our background or differences in the preferences of our constituencies, but as much as anything, I think they stem from and reflect differences in the States that we represent, not just the preferences of the voters, but also the way the public land is owned—the extent to which Federal public land is owned and the impact that it has on our local economies. This is a big deal.

So like I say, I don't fault them. I regard each of the people behind this legislation as beloved friends and colleagues and as people who I deeply respect and trust and admire. They are people with whom I have agreed and cooperated with on countless instances on many wide-ranging topics.

They are not wrong to want to pass legislation that they believe is correct. They are, however, grossly mistaken in believing that it is appropriate in this circumstance to shut out Members of this body who have a different point of view, to exclude them from the debate process.

One could argue and some might argue in connection with this: Fine, let's debate it. We are debating it right now. What is debate after all other than giving speeches in a legislative body?

That is what we are doing, and that statement is true as far as it goes. Nevertheless, in order for that debate to have full meaning, we need to follow our own rules, and we need to allow Members, pursuant to our rules—and not just our rules, but also our precedents—our time-honored traditions and the spirit of comity that once inhabited and pervaded every corner of this room. It is that spirit of comity, those traditions, and those rules that really contemplate a much more collegial environment, one in which we don't come to the floor with legislation and say: That is it. There is no more. That is it. This legislation was written as if on stone tablets. There is no more to be written. This book is sealed. You can't have anything more to say.

That is not how colleagues treat each other. That is how one would treat a subordinate, and frankly, I think it is insulting—not to me but to those I represent and to those represented by my colleagues doing it.

What I find also offensive is the notion that it is so important somehow and so urgent to pass this legislation that we do so now, and that we not wait until next week to consider it. But it is apparently not important enough to allow individual Members to introduce amendments—even amendments crafted in good faith, amendments that wouldn't do any structural damage to the bill, amendments that may or may not pass, but that haven't been written by the principal authors and principal proponents of this legislation. This institution is better than that, and I thought we were. I think we owe each other more than that.

Look, this isn't always going to be the case in every single piece of legislation. There are a number of things that are passed by this body by unanimous consent. Others that come to the floor will receive an overwhelming vote one way or another and don't necessarily, in every circumstance, trigger the need for amendments. Those are, in some cases, matters that are relatively non-controversial. I see no reason for an open amendment process if we were, for example, to declare June 2020 to be National Sofa Care Awareness Month. I don't think anybody is going to care that much about that legislation, certainly not enough to care deeply about filing amendments. In other cases, some legislation might have been adequately vetted through a process of committee action and public debate to the point where maybe no one really sees the need for additional amendment by the time it gets to the floor. But that is not always going to be the case. It should come as no surprise with a piece of legislation like this one, sweeping in its effect, adding to our already unaffordable mandatory

spending, putting Federal land acquisition on an equal footing with programs like Social Security and Medicare by making it mandatory. Any time you trigger any of these alarm bells, it ought to send a signal that this is not an appropriate moment to expect that no Member from any State will have any different perspective. It is not right. Deep down they know it is not right.

I have seen each of my most vocal proponents of this legislation on the receiving end of this very kind of strategy. I have stood with them as they have stood against it, even when I don't agree with their substantive policy agenda, even if I don't agree perhaps with their strategic plan in question, but I stand with them anyway because they are my colleagues. They are my friends. It is what colleagues do for each other. You see, the difference between a colleague and a subordinate is that you don't purport to tell a colleague what he or she can do if you don't have the authority to do that. You don't act offended if your colleague doesn't agree with you, and you don't try to silence your colleague. That is how you treat a subordinate.

It has happened for far too long here. I have been here for 9½ years, and I have seen it under Democratic leadership and I have seen it under Republican leadership. It is not how it used to work here. It is not how it should ever work. I find it revolting. It is one thing to say: I want to vote on this legislation. It is quite another thing to have the gall to say: I want to vote on this legislation, but I don't want anyone else to have any say on what this legislation says, and I don't care what this does to another State. I don't care that there are other parts of other States in the Union, represented by my friends and my colleagues, where people will suffer in this legislation. I don't care—not my problem. I so don't care that that is a problem for somebody else, that I am going to make sure that the other person can't care and that he can't even make changes to this legislation.

If I were their subordinate, perhaps I would understand. As their colleague, I don't. This isn't how you treat a colleague. This isn't how colleagues interact in a body that considers itself deliberative and collegial. So say what they want about this being bipartisan, about there having been a collegial process about this bill's creation—let them say what they want about that. Make no mistake. This is wrong, what they are doing. I am not even talking right now about the merits of the bill. I disagree with the bill. I don't like the substantive policy end that it seeks to achieve, but I am not talking about that right now. What I am saying is wrong and even outrageous is the gall, the temerity that they have to tell colleagues that they don't have an equal seat at this table, that their election certificate somehow matters less.

Sooner or later, I believe that our best days lie ahead of us. I am an optimist at heart. Optimism is something that is hard to have at a moment like this, when you have been completely shut out of a legislative debate. But the reason I am optimistic here has to do with a very simple reality. Sooner or later, in a system like this one, Members will find a way with the system of rules of the Senate and as authorized by the rules and procedures and traditions of the Senate. They will find a way to get around it, and I think you will see a growing dynamic in which Members will reach across the aisle in order to solve this very problem.

This problem is not a Republican problem distinctively. It is not a Democratic problem distinctively. We have seen it under the leadership of both parties, regardless of who has the majority. This is a problem that Senators have among and between themselves, and I think in time you will see more and more Members coming to each other's defense, regardless of political ideology and regardless of the substantive ends that we achieve in a piece of legislation. I think the sun is setting or at least preparing to set on the days of locking out individual Members from the amendment process. It isn't right, and deep down we know it is not.

I will note that other than the Presiding Officer, at 4:53 p.m. on a Thursday, I remain the only Member of the U.S. Senate within this Chamber—just the Presiding Officer and me. That is it.

We could be voting now. We could have started voting hours ago. We could have started voting yesterday. We could have voted on all of these amendments. For all I know, all of the amendments that I am proposing could have been considered and voted down and they would have had their way. So what difference would it make? I am not certain whether they would all fail. It is not up to me for all to fail. Thirdly, even if they did all fail—every last one of them—at least then Members of this body would be able to face their constituents at the end of that process and be able to say: Look, I liked this legislation. Even though it had these problems, the reasons to support it outweighed those for opposing it.

Or they would be able to say: Look, I tried to make it better. I failed. These problems remained. So I voted against it.

That increases accountability, rather than decreasing. That is good. That is good for a constitutional republic like ours. It is essential for the U.S. Senate. It is how it is supposed to work.

So we could have done that yesterday. We could have done that this morning. We could still do it right now. We could start that process right now in a matter of hours. We would have debated, discussed, and voted on these amendments. Then we could move on. We could put this whole thing behind us. We could do it right now.

They are hearing nothing of it, which begs the question: Why? Who benefits from this? The only people who benefit are the small handful of individuals who, on any particular occasion, happen to be involved in this decision making and become more powerful. But they do so in a dishonorable way, at the expense of all of their colleagues, at the expense of their relationship with their colleagues, but most damning of all, at the expense of their relationship and obligations to the voters who elected them—and I mean those in every State.

I am sure they think they are doing the right thing, that the end justifies the means. Nobody is immune to that line of thinking. It is something we have to be conscious of. The circumstance doesn't make it OK. This is wrong. We can do better. We can, we must, and together, we will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

ISSUES FACING AMERICA

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, we have a lot of problems in America today—a pandemic, a recession, a surge of violence in our major cities drowning out a nationwide call for justice and hope. We have work to do in this body and this city to solve these problems and to heed that call.

Our voters sent us here to make things better, to rebuild, to heal, but that is not what we are doing. No, for the last several weeks, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their allies in the media and some professional political activists on a payroll have been trying to divide us against each other, to paralyze us, to stoke resentment of our fellow citizens and hatred of this Nation that we call home.

It is really remarkable, if you think about it. Just a few short weeks ago, we were united in outrage at the murder of George Floyd. We were united in impatience for justice for his family. And nothing has changed about that. All people of good will still want justice to be done. I do. But the call of the marchers has been weaponized by partisans who want nothing more than to say that only some Americans really support equal justice under the law; only some institutions of government are really committed to that cause; only one party can be trusted to govern in good faith; only one political coalition is righteous enough to rule over the other.

You don't hear talk of unity when watching MSNBC or reading the New York Times these days. Instead, those outlets are drawing up a new list of villains—not Floyd's killer. No, not him. We are way past George Floyd now, I guess. No, we are talking about new grievances, structural evils endemic to America itself—the police, the military, the flag, oh, and of course the President. It is always about the President.

Actually, what it is really about is the President's voters. It is about the

people who elected him. It is about the red States, like mine. It is about the people who live there. The elite media, the woke mob—they don't like these people, and they want the rest of America to dislike them too. This is why they are telling us that it wasn't a homicidal cop who killed George Floyd. No, his death now is the product of systemic racism, we are told, and anyone who doesn't acknowledge their role in his death, anyone who doesn't bend their knee to this extreme ideology, is complicit in violence.

It is not enough, apparently, to bring Derrick Chauvin to justice for his crimes. No, now we have to defund all the police. There is no scab they will not pick at, no divide they will not exploit, no controversy they will not gin up to make us hate each other. Well, we cannot take their bait.

In the last weeks, we have seen a professor put on leave for quoting the words of Martin Luther King, Jr. Not woke enough. We have seen the New York Times fire its opinion page editor for daring to publish the words of a Republican Senator. He forgot the party line. We have seen a literal insurrection in the streets of Seattle, a break-away Antifa enclave ruled by a self-described warlord—you cannot make this stuff up—lauded now, in some quarters at least, as an experiment in post-police governance.

We have had a bill introduced in the House to bring that experiment in chaos to our cities and towns all across the country and to demonize the fine men and women who put their lives on the line day and night to protect protesters' rights to demand justice.

The madness is accelerating this month, but the radical left has been at this for a while.

The New York Times won a Pulitzer Prize for the 1619 Project—a propaganda campaign designed to recast America's founding as an evil event and American democracy as a system of violent racial oppression. It won that prize despite wide criticism by historians who objected to its historical revisionism.

Now, with the Pulitzer's seal of approval, the Times is developing a 1619 grade school curriculum so that our children will be indoctrinated to hate this country at taxpayer expense. They want to do to our public schools what they have already done to the universities.

What does any of this have to do with healing our Nation? What does it have to do with bringing about that more perfect union, whose achievement is our shared ambition and shared obligation as Americans? The answer is, nothing. And that is the point.

As has been widely reported, this week one of my Senate colleagues introduced a measure to strip all military installations and bases in this country of reference to Confederate soldiers or Confederate history. And for what purpose? To achieve justice for

George Floyd? To bring our Nation together? No, I don't think so. The purpose was to erase from history—erase every person and name and event not righteous enough—and to cast those who would object as defenders of the cause of slavery, to reenact in our current politics that Civil War that tore brother from brother and divided this Nation against itself.

You would think, the way some in the media talk about this country, that they are sad we are still not fighting the Civil War. They would like us to fight a new civil war in our culture day and night, without end.

I would suggest to my colleagues that the Civil War not only gave us villains, it also gave us heroes and a more perfect union to love. Maybe we should learn from those heroes.

We should learn from Lincoln, who called our Nation to unity at Gettysburg. "It is for the living," he told us, "to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation shall have a new birth of freedom and that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

If you visit Gettysburg, you will find monuments to the dead of free States and slave States alike, and you will see children who are brought there by their parents after long car drives from their homes, drawn in by these old symbols and memorials to the lessons those teach about our Nation's new birth of freedom.

The Americans who visit these hallowed grounds all across our country want to know why this Nation fought a war against itself, why brothers could not live under one flag together. We teach them there in those places how we became a better nation through the crucible of that terrible war, and we teach them there to be proud that we did so.

That hard-fought pride in the shared struggle that unites us is now fading. That story is being erased. A nation united in the cause of justice is dividing, and we are increasingly at war with ourselves. This cannot continue. This great Nation and its good people cannot continue our life of freedom together if we vilify and destroy each other from within.

Now, before we vote on this floor on the National Defense Authorization Act, I will offer an amendment to undo this effort at historical revisionism. I will offer it not to celebrate the cause of the Confederacy but to embrace the cause of union—our union, shared together as Americans.

It is time for our leaders to stop using their position here to divide us.

Let us work together instead to build on the history and the responsibility that we share as Americans to continue that unfinished work of this Nation that we call home.

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. 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, I just want to make sure that people understand we are tracking a 1 a.m. vote before I get into some of these bills. Again, we are tracking a 1 a.m. vote.

CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF CUBAN DEMOCRACY ACTIVIST JOSE DANIEL FERRER AND COMMENDING THE EFFORTS OF JOSE DANIEL FERRER TO PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN CUBA

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 467, S. Res. 454.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 454) calling for the immediate release of Cuban democracy activist Jose Daniel Ferrer and commending the efforts of Jose Daniel Ferrer to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms in Cuba.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic and with an amendment to the preamble to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

Whereas José Daniel Ferrer García is a Cuban democracy and human rights activist who has dedicated his life to promoting greater political pluralism and respect for fundamental freedoms in Cuba;

Whereas Mr. Ferrer was born in Cuba on July 29, 1970, in the province of Santiago de Cuba;

Whereas, in the late 1990s, Mr. Ferrer joined the Christian Liberation Movement (MCL), a peaceful political movement led by late Cuban activist Oswaldo Paya;

Whereas, through coordination with the MCL, Mr. Ferrer helped lead the Varela Project, an initiative to collect the signatures of citizens to petition the Government of Cuba for democratic reforms and protections for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly;

Whereas, in March 2003, as part of a series of sweeping arrests of 75 democracy activists, Mr. Ferrer was arrested by Cuban authorities for his work on the Varela Project and sentenced to 25 years in prison;

Whereas, in March 2004, Amnesty International declared the group of 75 democracy activists, including Mr. Ferrer, to be prisoners of conscience and called for their immediate and unconditional release;

Whereas, in 2009, Mr. Ferrer was honored with the Democracy Award given annually by the National Endowment for Democracy;

Whereas, in March 2011, as part of an agreement brokered by the Catholic Church, Mr. Ferrer refused to abandon his homeland and was released from prison to remain in Cuba;

Whereas, in August 2011, Mr. Ferrer founded the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU), a non-violent political movement dedicated to promoting human rights, democratic principles, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba;

Whereas, on June 7, 2012, Mr. Ferrer testified via digital video conference at a hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

Whereas, since he was released from jail in March 2011, Mr. Ferrer has been frequently harassed, regularly surveilled, and repeatedly jailed by Cuban authorities for his role in UNPACU;

Whereas, on October 1, 2019, Mr. Ferrer was imprisoned arbitrarily by Cuban authorities for his leadership of UNPACU and outspoken advocacy for human rights and democratic principles in Cuba;

Whereas, on October 1, 2019, Cuban authorities detained 3 other members of UNPACU, Fernando González Vailant, José Pupo Chaveco, and Roilan Zarraga Ferrer;

Whereas the family of Mr. Ferrer was permitted to visit him only twice while he was imprisoned arbitrarily, and the wife of Mr. Ferrer reported that she saw evidence that he had been physically abused and mistreated;

Whereas, on April 3, 2020, Mr. Ferrer was arbitrarily convicted and sentenced to 4 years and 6 months of house arrest for the purported crimes of "injuries" and "privation of liberty";

Whereas, on April 3, 2020, Mr. González Vailant, Mr. Pupo Chaveco, and Mr. Zarraga Ferrer were also arbitrarily convicted to multiyear sentences of house arrest; and

Whereas, since he was placed under house arrest, Mr. Ferrer has informed international media outlets that during his time in prison he was subjected to "torture" and "constant humiliation", and denied access to food and medical treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

That the Senate—

(1) condemns the arbitrary conviction, sentencing, and imprisonment of leading Cuban democracy and human rights activist José Daniel Ferrer and calls for his immediate and unconditional release;

(2) calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all members of the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU) that have been arbitrarily imprisoned;

(3) commends Mr. Ferrer for his unwavering commitment to advance democratic principles, human rights, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba; and

(4) recognizes the important contributions of UNPACU and all of its members for their efforts to promote greater respect for democratic principles, human rights, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions 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 resolution (S. Res. 454), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, and the preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 454

Whereas José Daniel Ferrer García is a Cuban democracy and human rights activist who has dedicated his life to promoting greater political pluralism and respect for fundamental freedoms in Cuba;

Whereas Mr. Ferrer was born in Cuba on July 29, 1970, in the province of Santiago de Cuba;

Whereas, in the late 1990s, Mr. Ferrer joined the Christian Liberation Movement (MCL), a peaceful political movement led by late Cuban activist Oswaldo Paya;

Whereas, through coordination with the MCL, Mr. Ferrer helped lead the Varela Project, an initiative to collect the signatures of citizens to petition the Government of Cuba for democratic reforms and protections for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly;

Whereas, in March 2003, as part of a series of sweeping arrests of 75 democracy activists, Mr. Ferrer was arrested by Cuban authorities for his work on the Varela Project and sentenced to 25 years in prison;

Whereas, in March 2004, Amnesty International declared the group of 75 democracy activists, including Mr. Ferrer, to be prisoners of conscience and called for their immediate and unconditional release;

Whereas, in 2009, Mr. Ferrer was honored with the Democracy Award given annually by the National Endowment for Democracy;

Whereas, in March 2011, as part of an agreement brokered by the Catholic Church, Mr. Ferrer refused to abandon his homeland and was released from prison to remain in Cuba;

Whereas, in August 2011, Mr. Ferrer founded the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU), a nonviolent political movement dedicated to promoting human rights, democratic principles, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba;

Whereas, on June 7, 2012, Mr. Ferrer testified via digital video conference at a hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

Whereas, since he was released from jail in March 2011, Mr. Ferrer has been frequently harassed, regularly surveilled, and repeatedly jailed by Cuban authorities for his role in UNPACU;

Whereas, on October 1, 2019, Mr. Ferrer was imprisoned arbitrarily by Cuban authorities for his leadership of UNPACU and outspoken advocacy for human rights and democratic principles in Cuba;

Whereas, on October 1, 2019, Cuban authorities detained 3 other members of UNPACU, Fernando González Vailant, José Pupo Chaveco, and Roilan Zarraga Ferrer;

Whereas the family of Mr. Ferrer was permitted to visit him only twice while he was imprisoned arbitrarily, and the wife of Mr. Ferrer reported that she saw evidence that he had been physically abused and mistreated;

Whereas, on April 3, 2020, Mr. Ferrer was arbitrarily convicted and sentenced to 4 years and 6 months of house arrest for the purported crimes of "injuries" and "privation of liberty";

Whereas, on April 3, 2020, Mr. González Vailant, Mr. Pupo Chaveco, and Mr. Zarraga Ferrer were also arbitrarily convicted to multiyear sentences of house arrest; and

Whereas, since he was placed under house arrest, Mr. Ferrer has informed international media outlets that during his time in prison he was subjected to "torture" and "constant humiliation", and denied access to food and medical treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the arbitrary conviction, sentencing, and imprisonment of leading Cuban democracy and human rights activist José Daniel Ferrer and calls for his immediate and unconditional release;

(2) calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all members of the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU) that have been arbitrarily imprisoned;

(3) commends Mr. Ferrer for his unwavering commitment to advance democratic principles, human rights, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba; and

(4) recognizes the important contributions of UNPACU and all of its members for their efforts to promote greater respect for democratic principles, human rights, and fundamental freedoms in Cuba.

RECOGNIZING THE 199TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 470, S. Res. 523.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 523) recognizing the 199th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 523) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 27, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 474, S. Res. 567.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 567) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the preamble be agreed

to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 567) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 7, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:21 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 7:59 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALEXANDER).

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today because I am concerned about the Great American Outdoors Act in its current form. It spends billions on places where Americans vacation but absolutely nothing protecting the areas where 42 percent of Americans live, which are the parishes and counties on coastlines. Of course these parishes and counties are in coastal States, and 85 percent of Americans live in coastal States.

To repeat, the Great American Outdoors Act mandates spending billions on the outdoors where Americans vacation but does absolutely nothing to protect the outdoors where Americans live.

Tonight, I will speak to why that is a problem for coastal States like my State of Louisiana and how one amendment, the coastal amendment, addresses this disparity.

These are uncertain times. Coronavirus continues to kill. Our country struggles to confront and address the issues raised by the George Floyd killing. Hindsight is 20/20, but we wish that we had stockpiled more personal protective equipment. We wish Minneapolis had instituted police reforms. If wise action had addressed these issues before, then these issues might be better now.

It highlights the need for wise public policy—looking beyond the immediate and thinking about that which may occur. On the other hand, there are some things that occur that we know are going to happen because they happened before, so 20/20 hindsight is not needed. Coastal flooding is an example. Hurricanes happen regularly. Sea levels are rising. There will be more coastal flooding, more pictures of families on life rafts, the Cajun Navy in small boats doing rescues, the Coast Guard

and helicopters pulling Americans up in harnesses. We know this will happen again. We actually have the opportunity to proactively address it.

When the basics of the Great American Outdoors Act were being considered in committee, there was another bill passed to address coastal issues. The authors of the Great American Outdoors Act don't live in coastal States, or if they do, their States benefit greatly from the Great American Outdoors Act legislation. But that leaves the rest of us wondering, is it right to care more about parks than about people? Because that seems to be the priority the Senate is going on.

Let's establish context. The Senate is nearing a vote on the Great American Outdoors Act. The bill dedicates billions in funding for deferred maintenance, mostly in national parks where Americans vacation and predominantly in seven States. It also puts an additional \$900 million in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is used to buy more land for the Federal Government, principally in Western States.

I have no problem with the idea behind the bill. National parks are national treasures. Americans flock to them to learn about history and to experience the natural majesty of our great country. I know some of the floor speeches extolling this bill have shown grizzly bears and mountains and pine trees and such like that. I am with it. I love them. I think they are beautiful. But I do take issue with how the bill ignores the environmental needs of coastal States in favor of fixing broken toilets and leaky roofs, because I can show the needs of coastal States, not in terms of grizzly bears and pine trees and majestic mountains but in terms of people being flooded out of their homes because of the lack of investment in coastal resiliency.

As a pictorial of where the money is spent from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the blue States, mostly inland—they have West Virginia kind of poking out there, but it is not a coastal State—the coastal States actually don't do very well at all, do they. Even though this is where 85 percent of the American people live—the coastal States—we can see that the remaining 15 percent live in States that get the bulk of the funding.

Coastal per capita spending in the Land and Water Conservation Fund is \$7.53, but if you look at what inland States receive, it is \$17.66 on a per capita basis. There is a lot of benefit in living here if you are putting more money into the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but if you live on a coastline threatened by flooding, the benefit is not there, and that is my concern with this bill.

Again, let's establish these facts: 42 percent of the population lives in parishes and counties directly on a coastline; 82 percent live in coastal States. These figures—\$17.66 spent on the inland and \$7.53 spent on the coastal—

show a stark disconnect between protecting Americans from flooding where they live, work, and help others earn a living and spending money to fix up the parks where they occasionally visit.

To repeat, more money is being spent on places where people vacation, not protecting where they live.

That is the Land and Water Conservation Fund aspects of it. Let's talk about the parks with the deferred maintenance.

These are the seven States that do pretty well. They do fantastic. Sixty percent, roughly, of the money will go to these—including Washington, DC—these States that are highlighted; everyone else, not so much. In fact, if you are in Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa, only 0.2 percent of the Nation's deferred maintenance is in those States. So out of the billions being spent in this program, 0.2 percent will go to those States collectively. Clearly, there are winners and losers.

I spoke of Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas. Other States also get far less. The coastal States of Georgia, South Carolina, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Minnesota, Delaware, Maine, and other coastal States do very poorly.

Midwestern States like Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska I have already mentioned, and why is this important? Well, I will mention it again in a little bit, but I have been to some of those coastlines. They are kind of going away too. If you go to a barrier island in Georgia, they are having to build seawalls because the waves are now crashing on beautiful homes, threatening to wash them away into the sea. Beautiful homes, threatening to wash them away into the sea.

We should be spending money not just on parks but also where people live. That would be wise public policy.

All the coastal States I just mentioned, including those which do receive disproportionate benefit from the Great American Outdoors Act, would also benefit, as would the Gulf Coast States, if we invest collectively as a nation in coastal resiliency. The reason this is so important—failure to invest in coastal resiliency costs lives, costs communities, costs taxpayers, and costs us a lot. Land lost due to rising sea levels and other factors threaten the safety of the 42 percent of Americans who live in a county or parish directly on a coastline.

We know that if you invest in coastal resiliency and flood protection on the front end, you can save billions on the back end protecting against the next hurricane or flood event.

Again, we are spending billions on parks we occasionally visit, but there is nothing in this bill on where we live, raise families, and make our livelihoods.

Perhaps the greatest irony is how the Great American Outdoors Act is funded. The bill takes up to \$1.9 billion a year in revenue generated from energy production principally from the Gulf of Mexico to spend it on the deferred

maintenance, again, principally in seven States that I just pointed out. Ninety percent of that revenue is from the Gulf of Mexico. So the State—my State, for example—that produces the energy with the resources that disproportionately fund programs in parks where people occasionally visit is the one which has its needs unaddressed.

In my State of Louisiana, this is particularly troublesome. We are the hardest hit State in the Nation by land loss, so much so that if nothing is done, the energy infrastructure that comes off of the coast of Louisiana to support the oil and gas development that supplies the revenue for the Great American Outdoors Act—that energy infrastructure will be threatened, which means that the goose laying the golden egg dies, along with my working coast and the communities of the people who live there.

If it seems like I am passionate about this, by golly, I am. By golly, why do people care more about parks than they do about people? That just disturbs me.

But it isn't just the energy infrastructure lost; it will be lives and livelihoods, communities and community—again, by the way, costing taxpayers a lot of money.

Let's have some examples of this. Hurricane Katrina. Federal taxpayers had to pay \$125 billion in Louisiana, Mississippi, and other parts of the gulf coast for recovery; Hurricane Harvey, \$125 billion in Texas and Louisiana; Hurricane Maria, \$90 billion in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Hurricane Sandy, \$65 billion in the Mid-Atlantic—New York, New Jersey; Hurricane Irma, \$50 billion in Florida; Hurricane Ike, \$30 billion in Louisiana and Texas. I could mention Rita. I could mention many others that have cost the Federal taxpayers billions in order to help States recover.

The combined cost of hurricane damage from every storm since 1990 is nearly \$685 billion. Not all of this damage could have been avoided. It is clear that it couldn't have been. But a lot could have been. If the marshes south of New Orleans had not been allowed to erode away, they would have instead eroded the power of Katrina, decreasing its force when it hit New Orleans, perhaps preserving those levies. If we put money up beforehand, it saves us so much on the back end.

The coastal amendment does not ask for billions. I feel like it should, but I know I couldn't get it. I am only asking that some money in this bill be included for coastal resiliency. I will say it once more: If we are spending billions on where people vacation, shouldn't we spend something on resiliency for the parishes and counties where 42 percent of Americans live? Should we care more about parks than we do about people?

These numbers I just went through—they are not just numbers; they represent people. I see their pictures. I see

the lives lost. I see the communities completely upended, taking years to recover—and by the way, communities that are vitally important not just to themselves but to the entirety of the United States.

Ocean and coastal communities, including the Great Lakes, account for 82 percent of the U.S. population and economy. NOAA reports that the ocean economy contributes 2.3 percent of the Nation's employment, 1.6 percent of GDP, 3 million jobs, 154,000 businesses, \$129 billion in wages, and \$304 billion in goods and services. These jobs are threatened when sea levels rise and erosion and flooding occur. Their contribution to our economy is threatened.

By the way, I mentioned that energy production is threatened, and if we cannot produce energy, there is no funding mechanism for the Great American Outdoors Act.

We are spending money where people vacation, not where they live and work.

I will just use my own State as a case in point of the need for coastal resiliency.

Will you look at that map? This is a reasonable scenario of what will happen to Louisiana if there is no investment in coastal resiliency. The red is the land that is lost.

This is New Orleans. It effectively becomes an island protected by levees, and all of this is lost. Oh, well. That is Louisiana. It may not matter. Second most productive fisheries—in fact, the most productive fisheries in the lower 48; Alaska beats us—but in the lower 48, the most productive fisheries. Port systems that are throughout here support the economy of all of the inland waterways. These commodities that flow around the world at a competitive price advantage because of our fish and port system—threatened because of the absence of sustainability. And I could go on.

We are losing roughly—by the time I finish talking, Louisiana will lose roughly a football field worth of land. Goggle Maps can't even keep up—it will show you land, and it is open water. So if you have ever gone fishing in the gulf, you are watching your little radar right there, and you think you are about to hit something, and it is just open. That land has melted away, and the maps can't keep up.

So what is at risk? Oil and gas production. I have mentioned that. But oil and gas production do not do it justice. All of this is pipelines and energy infrastructure that benefit not just Louisiana; it benefits the entire country.

I am a physician. This is the way I look at it: If your body needs energy, so does our modern economy. And to the degree that we have oil and gas, jet fuel, plastics, resins, natural gas coming from around the country, it principally comes from here. To the degree that we support jobs by exporting clean-burning natural gas around the world to replace coal in, say, China so

that hopefully they have fewer emissions blowing over into the United States, it disproportionately comes from this gulf coast. This is what is sustained. This is what is at risk if we don't invest in coastal resiliency—energy assets such as pipelines, refineries, oil export sites, natural gas market centers, processing facilities, liquefied natural gas export facilities, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and ports like Port Fourchon that keep the gulf economy running.

Again, the majority of this infrastructure is based off the coast of Louisiana. Without investment in flood protection and rebuilding barrier islands, this critical part of the American economy—not to mention the funding stream for the Great American Outdoors Act—remains exposed and at risk.

Again, these aren't just numbers; these are people. There are 375,000 jobs directly tied to the oil and gas industry across the Gulf States, and it doesn't include the jobs that are secondary there just because of the oil and gas industry stimulating demand on commercial goods and services.

But it doesn't stop there. I mentioned the port structure being threatened.

By the way, somebody from Kansas, Iowa, or Nebraska might be saying: You know, I don't do well at all in the Great American Outdoors Act, but how does what Senator CASSIDY is talking about help me? I don't live on a coastline.

Yes, but your commodities go around the world through the port system that is based on the gulf coast, and this shows it.

After Hurricane Katrina and our port system in south Louisiana was so damaged, this is what happened to the export of commodities from the heartland: Corn exports down 23 percent; barley, 100 percent; wheat, 54 percent; soy, 25 percent. Total grain exports were down 24 percent. Those aren't just numbers; those are families who suddenly are struggling because they thought they had their budget worked out, and now their exports are down 100 percent.

That lower Louisiana, lower Mississippi port system is the reason we can ship our grains around the world at competitive prices relative to other countries. Without that port system, our farmers are at a disadvantage.

So it isn't just advocating for coastal resiliency for my State because I want those communities to be preserved and for the energy infrastructure we rely upon to, among other things, fund this bill we are about to vote on, it is also vital to the livelihood of these farmers and their families and their economy in these inland States. If we don't protect that port system by investing in coastal resiliency, their livelihoods will be affected.

Investing in coastal resiliency protects all these endeavors and prevents the astronomical costs associated with

severe flooding events and hurricanes, and it can be done.

I mentioned earlier about how you invest a little bit on the front end, and you can save billions on the back end.

Terrebonne Parish recently put up a new flood system, and they put it up after a flood event in which a major portion of their lower parish flooded. They then built the flood system, and then they subsequently had another high-water event. Ten thousand homes that would have flooded did not flood because of that new flood wall.

We invested in coastal resiliency. The Federal taxpayer, through the National Flood Insurance Program, saved millions—hundreds of millions. More importantly, lives were saved and communities were saved, and a vibrant community, with workers who go offshore to produce the energy that is funding the Great American Outdoors Act, was able to pick up and continue with their life without disruption.

I am speaking of Louisiana; it could be any coastal area across the United States. So investing in coastal resiliency protects all these endeavors.

I am not saying take any money away from the Great American Outdoors Act. The coastal amendment, if folded in, doesn't touch a dime of the billions going to the parks. All I am asking is to have some revenue to go to save the lives and the livelihoods of all these people, the 42 percent of Americans who live in coastal communities.

Instead, we spend it all on parks, pot-holes, broken toilets, and leaky roofs. I have heard the argument that if you fix that leaky roof in time, you save more money down the road, and I accept that argument. I am just applying it to where people live. If we do something for coastal resiliency now, we save not just a leaky roof and not just a little bit of money. We save a community, we save lives, and we save lots of money.

I recently spoke to 20 parish residents. As folks know, in Louisiana, we don't have counties. We have parishes. I had another call with 100 different business leaders, and they just plead for fairness to the gulf and to coastal parishes and counties. And what is unfair, you ask? Again, if you live in a coastal area that generates the billions being spent in the Great American Outdoors Act, you are upset to learn that the Senate is passing a bill spending more money on vacation spots than on protecting your homes, jobs, and environment.

It is not just the Louisiana coast. I have a friend who lives in Seal Beach, CA. I visited him a couple of years ago, and he said that water was coming up and flooding buildings it never had before. Well, in showing you that coastal resiliency investment can work, now Seal Beach, apparently, spends \$1 million a year building berms to protect from winter storms driving it in.

So, first, coastal resiliency can work. But, two, sea levels are rising, and the beach is shrinking. It will require more

of Seal Beach to build those berms to protect those buildings. Now, that is just Seal Beach, but it does show you that resiliency can be effective, but it also shows you that it is needed.

I also walked, as I told you before, along those barrier islands in Georgia, and I am just struck. Oh, my gosh, I couldn't afford those beautiful homes. They had to build sea walls because the high tides are higher now and threatening the foundations of those buildings. This bill invests nothing to protect the beaches and the outdoors where people live.

I am told that the Army Corps of Engineers—this is hearsay. I think it is true, but I don't know. It is a reliable source. The Army Corps of Engineers has recently proposed building a \$3.5 billion floodgate to protect the Miami harbor. I have also read that property values are declining on Miami Beach because as sea levels rise, the people who are insuring them and may be purchasing are afraid that they will be inundated by rising sea levels.

When I drive along the Mississippi gulf coast, they have homes elevated 12 or 15 feet in the air. It is kind of a testimony to the threat that our new environment poses to those who live on the beach. It kind of reminds me of a picture I saw of Venice, Italy, where they used to have shops on the ground floor, but now the ground floors are empty because sea level has risen and flooding has extended. So now there is such regularity of flooding that Venice no longer uses the ground floor.

Now, we are not Venice in our country. We are not built in the middle of a marsh, but we are built and 42 percent of us live in a coastal parish. This is a threat. It does not take 20/20 hindsight. We can see that this is going to happen. We already hear the Army Corps of Engineers planning for this. We see property values declining. We see flood walls being built, and we scratch our chin and know that ultimately it will not be enough.

The Senate could be investing in that coastal resiliency, not just, to say, in my State of Louisiana, where we are actually generating the funds that would be used for the Great American Outdoors Act, but, no, we are not. We are fixing potholes and parks where people visit but not investing in coastal resiliency where they live.

What does the coastal amendment do? Because I do think this could fix this. Again, there are nationwide benefits. Let me repeat. It doesn't take a dime away from the Great American Outdoors Act. There will still be the billions going for the parks. But what this does do is it sends money to spend on coastal resiliency where people live. It ensures the stability of the port system in the Lower Mississippi and down in the Texas gulf coast to help America's farmers export. It helps treat the Gulf States fairly, which really disproportionately do not benefit from these two acts that they are funding. Everybody wins.

Indeed, if you are a State like California or North Carolina that does really well under the Great American Outdoors Act, you also get money for your coastline. We are not being prejudicial. We are just trying to do something to help create coastal resiliency in the parishes and counties where 42 percent of American people live, as opposed to not spending a dime to help protect it.

Now, I said at the beginning of this speech about the coastal amendment—I just went over it—how does it functionally work? This amendment removes the cap on the amount of money Gulf States receive from energy production on the Outer Continental Shelf and makes more leases eligible for the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, or, as it is known, GOMESA, which thereby generates more money for a State like Louisiana.

Simultaneously, by raising this cap, it puts more money into the current fund for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. But, under the Great American Outdoors Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is getting an additional \$900 million a year in perpetuity automatically, and Congress has no role over it after this bill passes. Any dollars that would additionally go to LWCF, above the \$125 million it currently receives, would instead flow into a coastal fund, and that is the coastal fund that would help resiliency in all of our coastal States.

Now, I can't say how other States would spend it, but in Louisiana, our State constitution requires that if we get money from GOMESA, from the revenue sharing, that we in Louisiana dedicate these funds to turning the tide against land loss to preserve our wonderful and ecologically diverse wetlands, which also blunts the effects of hurricanes.

Now some might say: Why should anybody get this? It is Federal land. Well, I will point out that there is actually a cap on the amount of revenue the Gulf States receive from oil and gas revenue and from oil and gas production in the Federal lands off our coast, which limits the amount we can receive. There is no such limit in any other State.

If you are in a Federal land in New Mexico, you get 50 percent of the total generated. I think I read last year that New Mexico got \$1.5 billion from shared royalty leases on Federal lands within New Mexico. I think Louisiana got \$95 million. Wait—\$1.5 billion and \$95 million. We got a coast; they don't. We got people; they don't. We are funding 90 percent of the Great American Outdoors Act; they are funding a fraction.

Now you know why my parish residents feel anger that the needs of our vanishing coastline are totally ignored, and not just ours but those of every coastal parish—those coastal parishes in which 42 percent of Americans live and who are wondering: Do we care more about parks than we do about people?

We can care about parks, but shouldn't we also care about people?

Now, the coastal amendment, if added to the base bill, I can say, would pass with bipartisan support. I will say once more: It does not take any money away from the billions going to public parks in the Great American Outdoors Act. It doesn't take any money away from buying more lands out in the Western States. What I am trying to do is to bring fairness and equity into this equation by directing dollars to all coastal States, including the Great Lakes States. Senators from both sides of this aisle represent States which would benefit. It doesn't matter whether you are from a coastal State. You would recognize that it is wise public policy.

I suggested inserting the coastal amendment into the Great American Outdoors Act, into the base bill. The COASTAL Act was originally written with DOUG JONES, the Senator from Alabama, and had bipartisan support in the Energy Committee from Senator ANGUS KING from Maine.

Since, the coastal amendment has been modified. My Democratic colleague, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, who is from Rhode Island—a State greatly threatened by rising sea levels—suggested that we create revenue sharing for wind energy. As we look forward into the next economy, we see that offshore wind will be a significant source of electricity for States like his, in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and other New England States. So we would use revenue sharing from offshore wind energy to also contribute to coastal resiliency.

Now, that still is a little ways off. At first, it would principally be additional dollars coming from the Gulf Coast, but ultimately it would be the north and the south combining to benefit all coastal States, whether they were in the Northeast or in the South. Wherever you live on a coastline, including the Great Lakes, it would benefit from inserting the COASTAL Act into the great American Outdoors Act.

All I can say is, I would like to think that Senators—Republicans and Democrats alike—can see what is at risk: lives, jobs, and energy production. In funding for the Great American Outdoors Act, if you don't give a twit about the coastal areas, at least you are concerned about the funding for the act. Again, if we only invest where people vacation instead of investing in coastal resiliency, we do a disservice to the States, in those coastal States is where over 80 percent of Americans live.

Now, by the way, we can have common ground on issues of the environment. Earlier today, one of the Great American Outdoors Act authors, Senator GARDNER from Colorado, addressed this Chamber to say that his bill is smart conservation. Let me say that two of my best friends here are Senator GARDNER and Senator DAINES, and we are on the other side of this issue. But if you are from their State, my gosh, you just better give them a real shout-

out, because they have done a good job for your State. I don't feel good about the job for my State of Louisiana, but, you, by golly, better feel good about the job they have done for your State.

I would add that I think that Senator GARDNER's bill and my amendment work together on important issues of conservation and environment. I am told that 800 environmental groups support the Great American Outdoors Act as is and don't want any changes. I find that hard to believe. Is there really an environmental group out there that doesn't want to invest in coastal resiliency, that hasn't looked at the devastation of Katrina, of Rita, of Ike, of Maria, of Irma, and doesn't recognize that taking care of the environment is essential to our coastal regions? I am sure that if you poll those 800 groups and say we are going to spend additional dollars on those coastal parishes where Americans live, they would stand up and applaud. And if we put it in there, they will support this bill.

Now, I will say the GOMESA States is an irony here. They are often at odds with these environmental groups because the environmental groups claim that GOMESA incentivizes drilling or that we are spending money in a revenue sharing program funded by oil and gas, but, needless to say, that argument is out of the window.

The Great American Outdoors Act has the exact same funding source as GOMESA, and it is supported by all the anti-fossil fuel environmental groups because they want to take care of parks. Well, I want to take care of people, and I also want to take care of your parks, but my first priority is that working family. My first priority is that family which wakes up every day and struggles to make ends meet and wants their child to have a better future than they, but then they learn there is high water coming and they might be flooded and that better future is flooded away. I care about that family. We, in the Senate, should care about that family. We should not care for parks more than we care for people.

The coastal amendment supports the environment. As I said earlier, it goes directly to coastal resiliency initiatives that include recovering lost land and supporting the wetlands. I am not at odds with environmentalists. As I said before, every environmentalist is going to support restoring the wetlands of Louisiana. I am just asking that we be allowed to support that coastal environment. For people who live along the coast, these coastal systems are the ecosystems that make our homes special. It is why I look at those marshes in Louisiana, and, to me, they are just as beautiful as that grizzly bear and that pine tree and that majestic mountain. It is all part of God's creation, if we don't let it wash away. This is more than potholes. It is more than leaky toilets and leaky roofs. It is about preservation and about it not being here in 50 years if we do not act

now. We spend billions on the environment where people vacation but not anything on the environment where they live.

So here is where we are in this debate. We have established that over 80 percent of our fellow Americans live in coastal States and stand to benefit very little from the Great American Outdoors Act. Oh, yes, if you live in the beach of North Carolina, you are kind of glad that the people in the Rocky Mountains and the Smoky National Parks have a little bit more tourism, but your home is the one being washed away. And if you are in Seal Beach and your taxes are going up because they have to build a bigger and bigger berm every year because the winter storms are that much worse, or you are kind of glad in Yosemite—I am glad Yosemite is getting money, by the way. I love Yosemite. But on the other hand, it doesn't help you with your taxes. It doesn't help you with your building getting flooded. You begin to wonder, if you see a picture of Venice, is that what your home will look like in 25 years—a major investment of your life getting flooded so regularly that it loses all its value. Apparently, that is what they are looking at in Miami. That is what we hear in this debate.

We have established that most of the country that lives in coastal States stands to benefit very little from the Great American Outdoors Act. We have established that failing to invest in coastal resiliency leads to death—death. Think about Hurricane Katrina. It threatens millions of jobs and billions of economic activity. We have established that both the coastal amendment and the Great American Outdoors Act help the environment. They really do. We have established that that one amendment, the coastal amendment, added to the Great American Outdoors Act can address funding and equity—stop. Here we have billions for the Great American Outdoors Act and here will be a few million. So there isn't any semblance of equality between the funding that I am proposing for coastal resiliency where 42 percent of Americans live and the billions going to the parks that we visit occasionally, but at least there is some money going for coastal resiliency where most Americans live.

From where I am standing, including the coastal amendment in the Great American Outdoors Act is a win-win. The Great American Outdoors Act passes with funding to address the needs of national parks and funding for coastal resiliency. It has bipartisan support. Democrats and Republicans can come together on it. The cause is just. If you just think about that family, the cause is just. The support is there, but the ability to vote on it is not.

The bill's authors will not allow this amendment to come to the floor included in their package. This is a disservice to the 82 percent of the country

who live in coastal States and face the threats of hurricanes and flooding. I am asking that the Senate do what the Founders envisioned us doing. Consider ideas, vote on them, try and expand ourselves beyond our narrow parochial interest, and think about all Americans, not just those Americans that live in your State. Put people before parks.

That is not to say, with 20/20 hindsight, we know we should have invested in coastal resiliency because look at the pricetag of not doing so, because we have already seen that pricetag. Instead, let's think, going forward, that we are going to make the investment now because we see that investing can save millions—if not billions—of dollars, and I only speak of dollars. I should speak only of lives because sometimes I just think we take lives for granted. I don't. We should invest in coastal resiliency most of all to protect those lives, those families, and those futures.

I hope that we will include this. I hope the idea will be considered. It is germane. It is bipartisan. It will pass.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak this evening about something very important to me and those whom I represent. We know the gulf coast is paying for the bill, and it is not getting a fair share. All I am asking is that we amend the underlying bill to spend money now on resiliency projects so we don't spend billions later on flood and storm recovery and perhaps thousands on funerals.

It deserves a vote. It would pass. It protects so many lives and takes nothing away from the Great American Outdoors Act, but it does establish that we in the Senate care about people and parks and that we not just care about where we vacation but we wish to protect where we live. I encourage my colleagues to consider what I have said tonight.

If you have heard this by other means, contact your Senator. Ask them what they think. I would hope they would ask whether it is appropriate for our country to spend billions on vacation spots, which are wonderful vacation spots, but spend nothing to prevent flood and devastation.

Scripture says that if you build your home on shifting sand, the house will collapse. It is better to build it on a firm foundation.

I would also add once more that we built this funding on the shifting sand—the literal shifting sand—of a Louisiana coastline, which is smaller since I began to speak, by about the size of a football field. That shifting sand supporting that infrastructure, which is shifting out into the Gulf, will erode not just my coastline but also the ability to pay for the Great American Outdoors Act. Even if someone does not care about the 42 percent of the Americans who live in coastal parishes and counties, they should care about that.

I hope others join my coalition. I call upon the bill's authors to include this

in the underlying amendment. It needs to be considered for the good of all Americans who call the coast home. I think it needs to be considered for the good of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I want to congratulate my colleague from Louisiana, one of the most diligent Members of the U.S. Senate. He complimented the occupant of the Chair, Senator GARDNER from Colorado, for doing a great job for his State. I think Senator CASSIDY did a good job advocating for his State. But he left a little bit of perspective out on what he offered, and I would like to add some perspective.

As he was speaking, I was thinking about the creation of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. This occurred in the 1930s. During the Great Depression, when everyone was worried about a job and everyone was worried about our country, the people of North Carolina and Tennessee appropriated through their State legislatures \$2 million each. Then John D. Rockefeller, Jr., heard about the effort, and he said: "I will give \$5 million if the States will match it."

So you had four—two from North Carolina, two from Tennessee—and then they set out to raise another \$1 million. They raised that from schoolchildren. They collected pennies and dimes and quarters in the middle of the Depression to create the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

At the time they did that, what did the people of Tennessee and North Carolina do? They gave it to the people of the United States of America. They gave it to all of us. They didn't charge for it. In fact, they said: "The only way we will give it to you is if you will not put an interest fee on it."

They didn't say: "Only Tennesseans, only North Carolinians can come." They didn't say: "We don't want anybody from Louisiana coming to the national park and the Great Smokies or from Colorado or from any other State." They gave it to the people of this country.

And what has happened? There are now 14 million people a year who come to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. We only have 6 or 7 million in Tennessee, so we have a lot of people. We have a lot of interlopers, don't we? We have a lot of people who don't live where our park is, who use it. We are happy about that. We are proud of it. We are glad we gave it to the country, and we are glad Ken Burns includes it among one of the great treasures that he calls America's Best Idea. It is a park for the country given by the people of Tennessee and North Carolina and the schoolchildren, and we didn't object to everybody enjoying it.

I believe I voted every single time that the coastal States have been deci-

mated by a hurricane. The Senator from Louisiana talked about \$685 billion. I didn't say, as a Senator from Tennessee: "You know, we don't have a coast. We don't have an ocean. It wasn't us. Hurricanes don't come here. Don't charge me."

We gladly paid our share of the bill because we are part of one country. We are part of one country. That was four people, right? Six hundred and eighty-five billion dollars for people who were hurt, not just paid for by people who live on the coast but by people who live in Colorado and Tennessee and Iowa and places where there is not a coast—because we are one country.

So the idea that we should only favor those items that come just from our State is not a very good argument for coastal resiliency because, if the Senator from Louisiana wants to bring that bill up based on the argument he made, why should anybody who doesn't live on a coast vote for it? I voted for it in committee because I thought it was an important issue, even though we don't have a coast. He is a very skillful advocate, a very diligent Senator. He is doing a good job of talking for his State, but he is missing the point.

His other point is, let's add it to this bill. Well, the Senate floor is littered with bills that never made it through here because they got loaded down with too many good ideas. People say: "Well, there is a train that is likely to get to the station, let's load it up." And what happens? It just slows down, and after a while, it stops, and nothing happens. Because people have said: "If I don't get what I want on the train, I am not for anything."

That is why the Land and Water Conservation Fund has never been permanently funded. This was an idea Congress passed in 1964, 60 years ago. In 1985 and 1986, I was chairman of President Reagan's Commission on America's Outdoors. It looked at what we should do in the great American outdoors. We didn't say the great Tennessee outdoors or the great Louisiana outdoors or the great Colorado outdoors. We looked at the great American outdoors. We looked at the great American outdoors and said: "What can we do so our children and grandchildren can enjoy what we have enjoyed?"

The people of Wyoming aren't the only ones who enjoy Yellowstone—or the people of Montana. Three or four million people a year go to a western park like that. They travel from all over the country to go there.

When I look at the Great Smokies in football season, when we play LSU, those Tigers arrive on Tuesday. Well, the game is not until Saturday. Why do they come? Because they want to go to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. We don't put up a big sign and say: "Sorry, you didn't pay for it. We gave it to the country. It is not for you." They like it, and we like to have them there.

So the point, though, was that sometimes you have a good idea, and if you add one more good idea to a piece of legislation, it sinks the whole ship. That would be the case here. The Senator from Louisiana is talking about a very big idea: What do we do about revenue sharing from oil and gas revenues and coastal resiliency and climate change? He didn't say too much about climate change, but if his sea level is rising, it is probably because of climate change, so maybe we ought to think about that too. So if we are going to bring up this whole issue of coastal resiliency, my guess is that some Senators will say: "All right, let's talk about a moratorium on oil and gas drilling. Let's talk about a fairer share."

Ninety percent of the drilling in Alaska goes to Alaska. Fifty percent of the drilling in Wyoming goes to Wyoming. Twenty-seven percent of the drilling 3 miles off the coast of Louisiana goes to Louisiana. If it is in the Federal lands beyond 3 miles, 37½ percent is split up among four States. That is the area where the oil comes from, but that land belongs to all 46 States. So we could have a pretty good debate about that, about the moratorium.

Then someone would say: "What about the oceans? The oceans deserve some of the care that comes from drilling in the oceans, drilling in the water, so let's talk about the oceans." If we got into a moratorium on oil and gas drilling, adding the oceans, changing revenue sharing, there is no more difficult issue in the U.S. Senate than to adjust and say: "Well, Louisiana gets 27 percent, maybe it ought to go to 40. Alaska gets 90, maybe Wyoming should go up to 90." There is no more difficult issue than that to deal with. It sunk a lot of bills to bring that up.

I remember the member of the congregation who was disappointed because the preacher only preached a verse from the Gospel of Luke. Well, you can't preach the whole Bible in one sermon, and we can't pass every good idea in one bill. In fact, we have two bills together here that are, by themselves, about enough to stop the train before it gets to the station.

Everybody here knows that it has been since 1964 that people have tried to pass the Land and Water Conservation Fund funding, even though the idea—money from environmental burden, that is drilling offshore—for an environmental benefit—that is to let States and the Federal Government buy land that is treasured, as Senator DAINES from Montana says, 80 percent of the access good fishing in Montana comes with Land and Water Conservation Fund money. So that bill has been out there a long time.

How long have we tried to fix the national parks and the boat ramps and the wildlife refuges and the roads and the national forests and the Indian schools, which are in shambles in many cases? Decades. We have been going

and using up our parks and our public lands, and we haven't been maintaining them.

Again, you don't just get to go to the public land in Kansas, if you are from Kansas, or to the Great Smokies, if you are from Tennessee or North Carolina, or to Yellowstone, if you are from Wyoming or Montana—all of us go to that, and we have let them run down. That is about people. That is about people.

Here we are in this big COVID-19 crisis. What does everyone want to do today more than anything else? Get outdoors. Get out of the house. Here you are, cooped up with teenagers or Grandma or all of you, just a few people sitting there for 3 months. You want a little space.

The people who go to these open spaces are the people who live on the coast. They live in the big cities. They want a little variety in their lives, and we are glad for them to have it. When they go, they don't want a bathroom that doesn't work or a visitors center that is in shambles. They don't want a pothole in the road or a trail that is worn down. They would like to have a place they could enjoy, that is in good shape, and they can go home.

I think about the campground on Chilhowee Mountain just outside the Smokies. There might be a few campers from Louisiana who like to come up there whenever we play LSU. I don't know, but probably there are. Well, it has been closed for 2 or 3 years because the sewage system doesn't work. That is at least 500 families who don't get to have the opportunity to do that.

I am sympathetic to the Senator from Louisiana. I think he is one of our most able Senators. He is making a very forceful argument for a real problem: coastal resiliency. But I don't buy this idea that just because this bill doesn't fix that problem we should jeopardize this bill.

Think about it. We have the President of the United States, who personally is interested in this bill. His Secretary of the Interior came down to Tennessee to see me 2½ years ago. It is the first administration that said: "We are going to look at the money we get from energy exploration, and after we give some to Louisiana and after we give some to Wyoming and after we give some to Alaska and the other coastal States, we are going to take half of what is left for 5 years, and we are going to use it to fix all of those things that need to be fixed in our national treasures."

I said: "OK, if the President is going to support it and his Office of Management and Budget is going to be the first Office of Management and Budget to allow money to be spent in that way, I am going to get behind it."

Then I came up here and fell into some pretty good company; the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Montana, Senator WARNER from Virginia, and Senator PORTMAN from Ohio were already working on the subject. Senator KING of Maine, Senator HEIN-

RICH, Senator CANTWELL were involved in the land and water. It became absolutely clear that, if we didn't put these two bills together, none of them—neither of them—would pass. If they didn't go together, neither of them would pass.

We consulted with all of the people in the Senate who were working on this. There wasn't complete agreement. There were a number of Senators who had other amendments that they would have liked to have, Senators whom I greatly respect and whose amendments I would probably support by the one. But as we looked at it and as we consulted with the more than 800 groups—the sportsmen, the anglers, the environmental groups—we all agreed that our only chance to get both bills was to put them together and say to the Senate: "Let's vote on it; let's send it to the House to see if they will vote on it; and after 60 years of trying, maybe we can get a good result."

I think that is why we got 80 votes. The first time, this came up on a procedural vote, and 79 the second time it came up.

A number of Senators have gone home tonight because this is a late-night vote. The reason we are having a late-night vote is because those who agree with Senator CASSIDY have insisted on taking the maximum amount of time. That is their right to do, so we are here. If we succeed tonight, then we will have three votes on Monday, all of which are very important votes. So we are close to getting this train to the station.

Senator CASSIDY has made an eloquent appeal to add an idea that is good, but an idea that is big and complex and deserves its own day in the Sun, just as it came to our Energy Committee, of which I sit and he sits. I voted for it at that time, but we just can't add it to this bill and get this train to the station. That is the fact of the matter.

As much as I respect him and his ideas, I hope that he and others who agree with him would say: "Look, this is our one chance to get this kind of funding to make our national parks and all the rest of our public lands—the boat ramps, the trails, the roads, the sewage—our one chance to begin to fix the maintenance over a 5-year period of time instead of 10, 15, 25 years, or never. It is our one chance to do that."

I am sure it is our one chance to get the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanently funded, as Congress agreed to do in 1964 and as President Reagan's Commission on America's Outdoors, which I chaired in 1985 and 1986, recommended as its No. 1 priority.

Let's not try to preach the whole Bible in one sermon. We have two good big ideas. Together, they make the most important piece of conservation legislation in a half century.

You say: "Well, Senators are always exaggerating." I don't try to exaggerate too much, and I defy anyone to point me another bill that does more. I

know we have been working on land and water since 1964. That is more than a half century. I know that this deferred maintenance has been building up for a long, long time. It is the single biggest problem the national parks and our public lands have.

I think 95 percent of the American people would wonder why we can't pass it in 5 minutes. The reason is, there are lots of good ideas here, and if you load them all up in the same wheelbarrow or on the same train, the wheelbarrow collapses, and the train doesn't get to the station. That is where we are. That is where we are.

I hope that, with respect to the good ideas advocated tonight by the Senator from Louisiana—I know he will keep at it. I am on the same committee he is. I have voted for his idea before. I think it deserves its day in the Sun, and I will help him do that, but I would like to ask him to help us finish the job here on the most important piece of conservation legislation. I want him to know that those LSU Tigers are always welcome in the Great Smoky Mountains, even if we bought it and paid for it and gave it to the whole country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 17, the motion to invoke cloture on the Gardner amendment in the nature of a substitute, No. 1617, to H.R. 1957. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted yea.

REMEMBERING HECKY POWELL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, even during this pandemic, people have been forming lines—6 feet apart and masked—at the corner of Emerson and Green Bay Road in Evanston, IL, to pick up Hecky's Barbeque. They come for the pulled pork, chicken wings, and especially the sauce. And for years, Hecky Powell was there with his family's recipes, his hard work, his smile, and his wisdom. Sadly, on May 22, Hecky passed away from pneumonia after a diagnosis of COVID-19. He used to say that people kept coming in for the sauce—that is what made the food great. Well, part of what made Evanston great was Hecky. For 37 years, he brought good barbeque, leadership, and kindness to Evanston, and today we pay tribute to him.

Harry William "Hecky" Powell was born in 1948 at Cook County Hospital.

Verna, his mom, had to give birth there because there was no room at the Community Hospital of Evanston, the only hospital in town that accepted Black patients. Hecky was one of nine siblings. He had a successful career in public service, serving as the director of several nonprofit agencies.

One day, Hecky got an idea for a restaurant. He was dating Cheryl Judice, a sociologist who would later become his wife. They didn't know much about food, but Hecky's mom did. Verna had lost her job at a restaurant, and his dad was unemployed at the time. So when the restaurant next to Hecky's office went on the market, he figured he would buy it, and his parents could actually run the restaurant. On October 13, 1983, Hecky's Barbeque opened up with only \$100 in the register. Many of the first recipes came from Verna and his Creole grandmother's native New Orleans.

Everyone enjoyed Hecky's. Chicago Bears legend William "The Refrigerator" Perry was an early customer, drawn to the sauce-drenched ribs, fries, and two slices of Wonder Bread. Chicago Bulls great Scottie Pippen had Hecky's cater the team's private plane on occasion. When the Northwestern Wildcats faced off with the University of Southern California Trojans in the Rose Bowl in 1996, then-mayor Lorraine Morton and Hecky bet the mayor of Pasadena that the Wildcats would win. The Trojans won 41 to 32, and Hecky made ribs and chicken for the entire Pasadena City Council.

But it was more than a restaurant. Hecky used his place to help high school kids learn responsibility and social skills, giving many of them their first jobs. He worked long hours, starting early in the morning, but he always had fun. No task was too small. He was cook, cleaner, and manager alongside his mother and the kids he was mentoring.

Hecky was a champion for local youth. In 1994, he founded the Forrest E. Powell Foundation. Named after his father, the foundation offers grant and scholarship opportunities. In 2016, he started the Evanston Work Ethic Program, which helps young people prepare for vocational or trade school.

In 2011, Hecky left work early, thinking he had the flu. He made light of it, but his wife knew better. He later was diagnosed with liver failure and told he had 6 to 7 months to live.

Hecky resolved that he was going to be fine and against tough odds, he lived to receive a liver transplant in 2015 and was able to get his life back. Hecky then joined the Northwestern Medicine Transplant Advisory Council Board to help people get their own lives back too.

For all this work, Hecky received the key to the city of Evanston in 2014, Abner Mikva Lifetime Achievement Award in 2015, and the street in front of the restaurant was officially renamed "Hecky Powell Way." A person did not know Evanston until they experienced it with Hecky.

When the COVID-19 pandemic reached Evanston, Hecky stepped up. Hecky's kept the whole staff on payroll and donated meals to hospital workers, shelters, and the Evanston Fire Department. Hecky, as the unofficial mayor of Evanston, was the face of the community poster that read "No Mask, No Sauce."

Evanston has lost a true leader of the community. He was kind and generous without ever asking anything in return. I was honored to count Hecky as a friend and enjoyed many great times together with him. Squeezing in a stop at Hecky's was part of every Evanston visit.

This June 19, people will celebrate with Hecky's Juneteenth Strawberry pop. For years, Hecky was part of the Jubilee, celebrating the arrival of news in Galveston, TX, that the Civil War was over and President Lincoln had issued his Emancipation Proclamation. He was Evanston's biggest supporter of making Juneteenth a holiday. This year, Evanston has its first Juneteenth Parade, and Hecky was going to be a big part of it, so it is fitting that the community will be dedicating part of the celebration to him.

Hecky is survived by his wife Cheryl, seven children, Sharmin, Terry, Dawn, Joy, Hecky Junior, Jason, and Gigi, as well as his mother and seven siblings.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL THOMAS BERGESON

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Bergeson, of the U.S. Air Force, and the deputy commander of United States Central Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, FL. Lieutenant General Bergeson is one of our Nation's finest military officers, and he will retire from Active military service on September 1, 2020, bringing to a close 35 years of distinguished service to our great Nation.

In 1985, Lieutenant General Bergeson commissioned as a second lieutenant upon graduation from the U.S. Air Force Academy. He commanded units at every echelon from fighter squadron to a numbered Air Force. Lieutenant General Bergeson also held various staff assignments, including positions as chief of aviation, strategic operations, Multi-National Forces-Iraq; senior defense official and defense attaché in the UK; and director, Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, at the Pentagon.

Prior to his current assignment, he served as the deputy commander, United Nations Command Korea; deputy commander, U.S. Forces Korea; commander, Air Component Command, South Korea/U.S. Combined Forces Command; and commander, 7th Air Force, Pacific Air Forces at Osan Air Base. Over the course of his career, Lieutenant General Bergeson flew numerous fighter aircraft to include the F-15, the F-22, and the A-10. He is a graduate of the NATO Defense College

in Rome and the Harvard Kennedy School of Government.

At a time of great uncertainty in the world, particularly in the Middle East, Lieutenant General Bergeson served as a critical leader in Central Command, a combatant command that has an enormous influence and presence in some of the most volatile parts of the globe. Lieutenant General Bergeson is an exceptional leader and an American patriot who is committed to our Armed Forces, our national security, and our Nation. It is for Lt. Gen. Tom Bergeson that we, with profound admiration and deep respect, pay tribute to for all he has done for the defense of our Nation for over three decades as a leader and selfless servant.

Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to recognize Lieutenant General Bergeson's long and decorated career. On behalf of a grateful nation, I commend Lieutenant General Bergeson for his dedicated service to the United States of America. I also wish to recognize the sacrifices and contributions made by his wife, Pam, and his children, Erik and Kristin. I extend my best wishes to Lieutenant General Bergeson and his family and wish them the best in retirement and the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN MARITIME WORKFORCE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I offer remarks to honor the men and women of the American maritime workforce and to thank them for their service. June 5, 2020, marks the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the U.S. Merchant Marine Act of 1920. Commonly referred to as the Jones Act, the act has served over the last century as the foundation of the Great Lakes and domestic shipping industry. This vital maritime law ensures that cargo moving between domestic ports is carried aboard vessels that are American-built, American-owned, and American-flagged, which in turn strengthens and supports U.S. homeland security while driving economic benefits to local communities. Each and every day, 365 days a year, the Jones Act functions to protect our Nation's 95,000 miles of coastline and inland waterways, limiting inland access to foreign vessels and crews while mariners serve as the eyes and ears to strengthen border and homeland security.

America's dependence on the Great Lakes and the seas is integral to our economic health and our sovereignty. Nowhere is this more evident than in my own State of Michigan. According to The American Maritime Partnership, Michigan's Great Lakes domestic maritime industry contributes \$2.8 billion annually to our State economy, including 12,140 jobs and \$703.6 million in worker income. With 37 deep-draft ports, Michigan has more than the 7 other Great Lakes States combined.

Over the last 100 years, the men and women of the U.S. maritime workforce

have also unfailingly answered the call to duty, providing vital services to support the Nation in times of crisis. Their service was never clearer than during the activation of civilian merchant mariners amidst the Second World War. These men and women moved critical supplies to overseas troops and allies, while enduring the highest rate of casualties of any service. More recently our domestic maritime workforce has respond swiftly to a range of crises facing the Nation, including facilitating the largest boatlift in world history following 9/11 and the current and ongoing delivery of essential medical supplies and goods to communities in need during the COVID-19 pandemic.

On this week's centennial anniversary of the Jones Act, I thank the men and women of the U.S. maritime industry for their service, and I vow to continue to work here in the Senate to uphold the integrity of the act's protections for our Michigan and Great Lakes workforce.

REMEMBERING JOE VANDEVER, SR.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I pay tribute today to Joe Vandever, Sr., who was one of the last surviving Navajo Code Talkers.

Joe was born February 5, 1923, into the Red Running Into the Water People clan, born for Two Who Came to the Water clan. He passed away 5 days shy of his 97th birthday, on January 31, 2020, in Haystack, NM.

Joe enlisted in the Marines when he was 19. He went through boot camp at Camp Pendleton and spent 6 months of intensive training learning the code and how to operate communications equipment to become a Navajo Code Talker.

Navajo Code Talkers transmitted key military information through a code based on the Navajo language that the Japanese never broke. They participated in every major Marine operation in the Pacific theater and gave the Marines a critical advantage throughout the war. However, when they returned, they couldn't talk about their work, which remained classified until 1968.

In 2001, Navajo Code Talkers, including Joe, received the Congressional Silver Medal.

Joe epitomized the bravery and skill of the Navajo Code Talkers. Joe's Navajo name means "going places," and he certainly did during the war. Serving in the 6th Marine Division from 1943 to 1946, Joe was stationed on 16 battleships—serving from Samoa to Guadalcanal to Guam to Japan to China. Joe translated messages from Navajo to English and set up communications posts on the frontlines.

Joe was a spiritual man, and he provided spiritual support for others in his Marine division. He liked to tell a story about how he knew he would come home from the war. Before he left, he had been blessed in a ceremony.

When he was in Guam, a bird he called a sheep-face bird—which was a Cassin's kingbird—came to him. There were no sheep-face birds in Guam, and that bird gave Joe a sign he would return home safely. And he did.

After he returned, Joe honored his Navajo traditions as a medicine man. He held many different jobs over the years—working at an oil refinery, in construction, and as a miner, prospector, farmer, and chauffeur. For 14 years, he was employed at the Gallup Indian Medical Center as a custodian.

Joe was fiercely proud of the Navajo language. According to Joe, "Our language is powerful," and "we [won]the war with our tongue." He wanted younger generations to learn the language and counseled them: "Don't ever leave your language."

Joe was a loving family man. After the war, he came home and married Bessie, to whom he was married for 73 years, until she passed away on September 24, 2019. He and Bessie had 9 children, 36 grandchildren, 55 great-grandchildren, and 1 great-great-grandchild. He inspired them and encouraged them to pursue higher education, and he was beloved by them all.

Joe lived a long life, and a good life—with kindness, optimism, good humor, integrity, and commitment and love for family and community. His light will continue to shine bright in his children and his future generations. I am honored to pay tribute to Joe Vandever who faithfully served our Nation and his family and Tribe.

TRIBUTE TO DARRELL WILLSON

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today I rise to acknowledge the service of Mr. Darrell R. Willson, who is retiring as the Administrator of the National Gallery of Art in July after a 50-year career serving the public.

Mr. Willson has spent the three past decades with the gallery overseeing the backbone of its operations—protecting and preserving its historic buildings, working to expand its footprint, and ensuring that it maintains a world-class staff. As an executive officer of the institution, he has worked closely with gallery leadership, executive branch officials and Congress—including with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations—to ensure that the gallery has had the people and resources it needs to fulfill its mission. During his tenure, the gallery has completed more than \$400 million worth of renovations to the East and West Buildings and welcomed visitors to new public spaces such as the Sculpture Gallery and the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain. In short, his work has provided the gallery with a stunning backdrop to showcase its collection of more than 150,000 sculptures, paintings, drawings, and photographs to the American public.

His work with the National Gallery of Art is not the only contribution on Mr. Willson's resume that deserves rec-

ognition. Prior to joining the gallery, Mr. Willson worked for a decade at the Art Institute of Chicago, rising through the ranks to become executive director of protective services. He also served the public as a local law enforcement official with the Waukegan, IL, police department. And of course, these positions are all in addition to his most important role—his service as a husband, a father, and a grandfather.

Mr. Willson deserves to take great pride in all of these important accomplishments—especially his tireless work in support of our Nation's great arts and cultural institutions—as he retires from the gallery. On behalf of the Senate, I send him our thanks and warmest congratulations for a job well done.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING RAVI ZACHARIAS

• Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, the State of Georgia and truly the entire world lost an exceptional beacon of goodness and faith when Ravi Zacharias passed away on May 19, 2020. However, our loss is Heaven's gain. Ravi was a man of deep faith, love, and service to others. He embodied the command of Jesus in Mark 16:15 to "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to all creation."

Ravi first came to know the teachings of Jesus Christ when he was 17 years old, when a nurse read the Word of God to him while he was recovering from a suicide attempt. From that day forth, Ravi made it his mission to share with others the joy and faith which had rescued him from despair.

In 1971, when he was just 25 years old, Ravi traveled to war-torn Vietnam, where he ministered in hospitals, military bases, and prison camps. The trip nearly cost him his life. Yet he went on to travel to every corner of the world sharing the Gospel.

In 1983, Reverend Billy Graham personally invited Ravi to speak at the inaugural International Conference for Itinerant Evangelists in Amsterdam. This helped Ravi develop a new passion for apologetics. Not only did he want to spread the Gospel, he wanted to help train others how to defend their faith in a rapidly secularizing world. A year later, Ravi founded Ravi Zacharias International Ministries to carry out this mission.

Over the years, Ravi continued sharing faith and love around the world through speaking engagements, books, and radio appearances, reaching untold numbers of people in need.

Ravi built incredible institutions for sharing the Christian faith. He founded the Oxford Centre for Christian Apologetics. He founded Wellspring International, a humanitarian group helping women and children around the world. In 2017, he founded the Zacharias Institute to teach apologetics in Atlanta, Georgia.

Ravi spent the last 36 years of his life in Atlanta. He is remembered as a man of kindness, joy, and steadfast devotion to his faith. He leaves behind his beloved wife Margie and three children: Sarah, Naomi, and Nathan, all of whom are carrying on his incredible legacy of faith and service.●

TRIBUTE TO LEE AXDAHL

● Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I recognize Lee Axdahl for his years of leadership to the State of South Dakota and our Nation as a strong advocate for highway safety.

Lee has always been a leader. Before becoming involved in highway safety, he had a successful career in radio broadcasting where he won numerous broadcast journalism awards, owned several radio stations, and served as president of the South Dakota Broadcasters Association.

Lee got his start in highway safety in 2007 when he began working at the South Dakota Office of Accident Records as the statistical program manager. In 2010, when I was working as Governor of South Dakota, I appointed Lee to serve as director of the South Dakota Highway Safety Office. He was subsequently reappointed by Governors Dennis Daugaard and Kristi Noem.

Under Lee's leadership, South Dakota has experienced record-low traffic fatality levels, including a 22-percent decline in 2019. Under his leadership, the State of South Dakota has secured a record five highway safety programming commendations in its most recent National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Management Review.

Over the years, Lee has worked to implement the State's award-winning "Grim Reaper" public awareness campaign and advocated for expansion of South Dakota's innovative 24/7 sobriety program to reduce impaired driving. He also modernized South Dakota's crash reporting abilities by adopting an electronic system, which has improved data submission periods from more than 4 months to less than 7 days.

Lee's impact on highway safety has extended beyond South Dakota. He has served on the board of directors and executive committee of the Governors Highway Safety Association—GHSA—most recently having served as its treasurer. In this role, he has mentored new highway safety directors from other States by offering insight into the successes of South Dakota. Additionally, he has served as the Federal Reauthorization Subcommittee chair for the GHSA, where he improved the Nation's transportation policy in the FAST Act.

I commend Lee Axdahl for his service to South Dakota and our Nation. I wish him the best in his future endeavors.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to

the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:14 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1548. An act for the relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 732(a) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 116-113), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board for a term of 6 years: Ms. Catherine Feingold of Takoma Park, Maryland and Mr. Frederick Gibson Ross of Berkeley, California.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1548. An act for the relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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-4807. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a legislative proposal to implement an essential benefit for the Federal agents currently employed in the Office of Secure Transportation (OST) at the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4808. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2019 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments from the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, the three national security laboratory directors, and the Commander, United States Strategic Command (OSS-2020-0399); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4809. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Management

Priorities and Allocations System (EMPAS)" (RIN1660-AB04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4810. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Home Loan Bank Housing Goals Amendments Final Rule" (RIN2590-AA82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4811. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Under Section 6033 Regarding the Reporting Requirements of Exempt Organizations" ((RIN1545-BN28) (TD 9898)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4812. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4813. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Governors, United States Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Postal Services' Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4814. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the six-month period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4815. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments; Annual Adjustments" (RIN1076-AF49) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2020; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4816. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tribal Transportation Program; Inventory of Proposed Roads" (RIN1076-AF45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2020; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4817. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Education Contracts Under Johnson-O'Malley Act" (RIN1076-AF24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2020; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4818. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards, Assessments, and Accountability System" (RIN1076-AF13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2020; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4819. 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 "Petition for Rule-making to Amend 49 CFR Part 1250" (RIN2140-AB44) (Docket No. EP 724 (Sub-No. 5)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4820. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, six (6) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ENZI for the Committee on the Budget.

*Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Cory T. Wilson, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

*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. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3938. A bill to extend Federal guidance concerning the use of certain alcohol-based hand sanitizer during the coronavirus public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3939. A bill to establish the Interagency Working Group on Coastal Blue Carbon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 3940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain amounts from the tested income of controlled foreign corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER:

S. 3941. A bill to reopen the United States by rescinding, modifying, waiving, or providing exemptions from regulations and other requirements that may inhibit economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER:

S. 3942. A bill to establish the position of Chief Pharmaceutical and Medical Supply Chain Negotiator in the Office of the United

States Trade Representative, to be responsible for conducting trade negotiations and enforcing trade agreements related to acts, policies, and practices of foreign governments that fail to appropriately reward United States innovation with respect to pharmaceuticals, to advance domestic production of life-saving medicines, and to secure the United States medical supply chain to eliminate reliance on foreign governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3943. A bill to amend the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to establish an online service platform for volunteers in the National Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 3944. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reduce the production and use of certain single-use plastic products and packaging, to improve the responsibility of producers in the design, collection, reuse, recycling, and disposal of their consumer products and packaging, to prevent pollution from consumer products and packaging from entering into animal and human food chains and waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for relocating manufacturing of pharmaceuticals and medical supplies and devices to the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3946. A bill to require certain helicopters to be equipped with safety technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KAIN:

S. 3947. A bill to amend the provisions relating to the higher education emergency relief fund to clarify the flexibility provided to institutions and for students under the fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 3948. A bill to amend the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act to extend the deadline for a report by the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3949. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account during the Coronavirus Emergency Period; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 3950. A bill to establish a panel of constitutional experts to recommend to Congress an appropriate process for providing for the case of the death of a candidate in a contingent presidential or vice-presidential selection; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 3951. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a virtual health pilot program to facilitate utilization of remote patient monitoring technology to maintain or expand ac-

cess to health care services for individuals in rural areas during the COVID-19 emergency period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. SASSE):

S. 3952. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign persons that have engaged in significant theft of trade secrets of United States persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3953. A bill to require pilot programs in connection with Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units at Historically Black Colleges and Universities and minority institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 3954. A bill to require States to make distributions from the State's Coronavirus Relief Fund payment to local governments that did not receive a direct payment from the Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3955. A bill to prohibit no-knock warrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3956. A bill to incentivize banning of chokeholds and carotid holds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 614. A resolution honoring the memory of the victims of the heinous attack at the Pulse nightclub on June 12, 2016; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 615. A resolution recognizing the 70th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War and the transformation of the United States-South Korea alliance into a mutually beneficial, global partnership; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. Res. 616. A resolution designating June 12, 2020, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 685

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 685, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General.

S. 1071

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2434

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2434, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 2622

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2622, a bill to provide greater controls and restrictions on revolving door lobbying.

S. 2681

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, his name and the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2681, a bill to promote and ensure delivery of high-quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes.

S. 3217

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3393

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3393, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 3432

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3432, a bill to support the advanced manufacturing technologies program of the Food and Drug Administration, to establish National Centers of Excellence in Advanced Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, and for other purposes.

S. 3485

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3485, a bill to expand the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to expand revenue sharing for offshore wind, to reauthorize the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3599, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce during the COVID-19 crisis by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 3685

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3685, a bill to provide emergency rental assistance under the Emergency Solutions Grants program of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in response to the public health emergency resulting from the coronavirus, and for other purposes.

S. 3701

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3701, a bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to promulgate regulations to provide support to institutions of higher education for the provision of certain equipment and services to students of those institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 3713

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3713, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to provide to certain members of the National Guard serving on active service in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) the transitional health benefits provided to members of the reserve components separating from active duty.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to require Federal law enforcement officers, including contract employees, and members of the armed forces engaged in crowd control, riot control, or arrest or detainment of individuals engaged in civil disobedience, demonstrations, protests, or riots to visibly display identifying information.

S. 3912

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3912, a bill to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies.

S. 3917

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3917, a bill to establish a home-based telemental health care demonstration program for purposes of increasing mental health services in

rural medically underserved populations and for individuals in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations.

S. 3923

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3923, a bill to provide emergency relief to youth, children, and families experiencing homelessness, in light of the health and economic consequences of COVID-19.

S. RES. 406

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 406, a resolution recognizing that for 50 years, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its ten members, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam, have worked with the United States toward stability, prosperity, and peace in Southeast Asia, and expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States will continue to remain a strong, reliable, and active partner in the ASEAN region.

S. RES. 509

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor 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. 511

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 511, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in helping save the lives of children and protecting the health of people in developing countries with vaccines and immunization through GAVI, the Vaccine Alliance.

S. RES. 533

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 533, a resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

S. RES. 542

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 542, a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Dachau concentration camp during World War II.

S. RES. 566

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 566, a resolution commemorating the 80th Anniversary of the Katyn Massacre.

S. RES. 613

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

SCOTT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 613, a resolution calling for justice for George Floyd and opposing calls to defund the police.

AMENDMENT NO. 1601

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1601 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1602

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1602 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1619

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1619 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1620

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1620 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1624

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1624 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1625

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1625 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3938. A bill to extend Federal guidance concerning the use of certain alcohol-based hand sanitizer during the coronavirus public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3938

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hand Sanitizer Guidance Extension Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. FEDERAL GUIDANCE ON HAND SANITIZER.

(a) EXTENSION OF FEDERAL GUIDANCE.—The Food and Drug Administration guidance entitled "Guidance for Industry: Temporary Policy for Preparation of Certain Alcohol-Based Hand Sanitizer Products During the Public Health Emergency (COVID-19)", initially released on March 23, 2020, and updated on April 15, 2020, and on June 1, 2020, shall remain in effect until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECT OF EXTENSION.—During the 2-year period described in subsection (a), the Food and Drug Administration shall permit the production, sale, and use of hand sanitizer, consistent with the guidance described in subsection (a), provided that such hand sanitizer is manufactured using only the following ingredients in the preparation of the product:

(1)(A) Subject to subsection (c), alcohol (ethanol) that is not less than 94.9 percent ethanol by volume; or

(B) United States Pharmacopeia grade isopropyl alcohol.

(2) United States Pharmacopeia grade or Food Chemical Codex grade glycerin (glycerol).

(3) Hydrogen peroxide.

(4) Sterile water meeting United States Pharmacopeia specifications for purified water.

(c) ETHANOL PRODUCED IN CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Ethanol produced in facilities normally producing fuel or technical ethanol may be used as described in subsection (b)(1)(A) only if such ethanol—

(1) meets United States Pharmacopeia or Food Chemical Codex grade requirements;

(2) has been screened for any other potentially harmful impurities not specified in the United States Pharmacopeia or Food Chemical Codex requirements; or

(3) has otherwise been approved for use by the Food and Drug Administration.

(d) AUTOMATIC EXTENSION.—The effective period of the guidance described in subsection (a) shall automatically be extended for 1 additional year if the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that a public health emergency exists at the time that the 2-year period described in subsection (a) expires.

(e) EXEMPTION.—If the Commissioner of Food and Drugs determines that a public health emergency requires that the requirement for the use of denatured alcohol be reduced, or requires a waiver of any other requirement with respect to hand sanitizer under the guidance, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs may waive or reduce such requirement, as applicable.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like most other sectors of our economy, agri-

culture has taken a huge hit from the coronavirus. The pandemic has caused significant market volatility, sending many commodity futures prices plummeting.

Increased consumer demand for beef led to significant increases in boxed beef prices, while cattle prices plummeted, which led to significant gaps between cattle producer and packer profit margins. To make the situation worse, temporary closures and reduced processing capacity at U.S. meatpacking plants as a result of the virus further diminished demand for livestock and depressed prices. This has aggravated an already difficult situation for farmers and ranchers.

Unlike the majority of the economy, which was thriving before the coronavirus pandemic, the agricultural economy has been struggling for a while. Low prices, extended trade disputes, and natural disasters have meant a tough few years for farmers and ranchers even before the coronavirus hit. Now things are even more challenging.

Agriculture is the lifeblood of my State of South Dakota. So supporting farmers and ranchers during the crisis has been one of my top priorities. I fought to get agriculture relief money included in the Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security Act, or the CARES Act, which was signed into law in late March. The final bill included \$14 billion to replenish the Commodity Credit Corporation to allow the Department of Agriculture to provide income and price support for farmers and ranchers, plus an additional \$9.5 billion in emergency support for agricultural producers affected by the pandemic.

Days after the bill passed, I led a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue urging him to use a portion of the funds to provide support for hard-hit cattle producers. In mid-April, the Department of Agriculture responded to that letter and other petitions by announcing that it would issue \$16 billion in direct payments to agriculture producers affected by the virus. Signups for this funding began at the end of May, and, as of June 8, South Dakota agriculture producers had received approximately \$80 million.

Over the past 2 months, I kept in constant contact with the Department of Agriculture and others to amplify producers' concerns and to urge swift relief. I have also been focused on developing additional legislation to help farmers and ranchers weather this crisis.

Last week, I introduced legislation to allow emergency haying and grazing on Conservation Reserve Program acres for the duration of this crisis. Under current law, ag producers can hay or graze their CRP acres during weather-related disasters without a reduction in their CRP payments. My legislation would extend that provision to cover pandemics, including the COVID-19 pandemic.

Thanks to low prices and a reduction in capacity of meatpacking plants as a result of the pandemic, farmers and ranchers are having to hold on to their livestock for longer than expected. This bill would help ensure they have adequate forage for their animals.

Earlier this week, I introduced another bill, the Paycheck Protection for Producers Act, which would help more farmers and ranchers benefit from the Paycheck Protection Program. The coronavirus relief legislation that we passed in late March established the Paycheck Protection Program, which provides forgivable loans to small businesses to help them keep their employees on their payroll during this crisis. Self-employed Americans, which describes many farmers and ranchers, are eligible for these loans, but, in practice, the program's guidelines have excluded a lot of agricultural producers.

Low commodity prices and a challenging planting season meant that many farmers and ranchers had a negative income in 2019. And right now, the program's guidelines excludes farmers and ranchers without employees with a negative net income for last year. My legislation would allow more farmers to access the Paycheck Protection Program by allowing them to use their 2019 gross income instead of their 2019 net income when applying for a loan. I am hoping to get both of these bills through Congress in the near future.

In addition to direct relief, another thing that we can do to support our Nation's agriculture producers is to support the ethanol industry. Ethanol and biodiesel producers buy up a significant amount of American corn and soybean oil, but decreased demand for fuel as a result of coronavirus has significantly diminished this crucial market for our farmers, and that is why, in addition to direct relief measures for farmers and ranchers, I have also focused on what we can do to support the ethanol industry.

American ethanol has stepped up to help during the coronavirus crisis by providing ethanol or alcohol for hand sanitizer. Thanks to the FDA's temporary policy for preparation of certain alcohol-based hand sanitizer products during the public health emergency, qualifying ethanol can be used as an alcohol content in hand sanitizer.

I imagine there are few Americans who haven't significantly stepped up their purchase of hand sanitizer during the current crisis. In addition to measures like social distancing and mask wearing and frequent hand washing, it is key to preventing the spread of the virus. When water and soap are not immediately available, hand sanitizer can step in as a substitute. We need a steady supply of hand sanitizer to help curtail virus transmission.

To help us meet this need and support our Nation's ethanol producers, today I am introducing the Hand Sanitizer Guidance Extension Act of 2020. Put simply, my bill will extend the FDA's temporary ethanol-based hand

sanitizer policy for at least 2 years. This will give ethanol producers that have made investments or changes in operations to meet the need for hand sanitizer a longer time to recoup their investment costs.

I recognize that there is ongoing deliberation with the FDA about denaturants and other accepted chemical limits for hand sanitizer ethanol, and my bill would not hinder those discussions. My bill would simply provide ethanol producers with a baseline of certainty while still allowing the FDA to make case-by-case approvals and to waive or reduce other requirements as necessary to meet the public health emergency.

Now, the amount of ethanol required for hand sanitizer is just a drop in the bucket for our ethanol producers, and I am committed to finding additional ways to bring this clean American-grown fuel to market. Every little bit helps, and this legislation will at least give a small measure of certainty to producers while helping to meet the nationwide demand for hand sanitizer.

The coronavirus crisis has highlighted just how much we rely on our Nation's agriculture producers. I am grateful every day for their work, and advocating for them will continue to be one of my top priorities. I am committed to helping our farmers and ranchers through the challenges they are facing and seeing our Nation's agricultural economy thrive.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL,
Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY,
and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3946. A bill to require certain helicopters to be equipped with safety technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Helicopter Safety Act."

On January 26, 2020, a helicopter carrying nine Californians flew into foggy weather, ultimately crashing minutes later. Los Angeles and the world soon learned that among the crash victims were basketball legend Kobe Bryant and his daughter Gianna.

And in the time since, we have learned the names and stories of John, Alyssa, and Keri Altobelli; Sarah and Payton Chester; Christina Mauser; and Ara Zobayan. These were spirited friends and family members connected by their love of sport, traveling to a weekend basketball tournament.

The sudden and shocking nature of the accident touched many, and I have been moved by the public remembrances in Los Angeles and elsewhere in honor of the victims.

But this tragedy is one that could have been averted. While the National Transportation Safety Board is still investigating the incident, a preliminary report indicates the helicopter was flying through thick clouds and fog, yet was not equipped with a terrain aware-

ness and warning system among other safety technology. This technology provides pilots real-time, in-flight warning signals and an image of surrounding terrain.

Since 2006, the National Transportation Safety Board has recommended to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that all new and existing helicopters capable of carrying six or more passengers be equipped with terrain awareness and warning system technology. However, FAA has only required these warning systems for air ambulances.

The lack of a terrain awareness and warning system left the pilot vulnerable, without an adequate understanding of his surroundings. This technology has become standard on new helicopters from Airbus, Bell, Leonardo, and Sikorsky since December 2018.

This bill also requires crash-resistant flight data and voice recorders. Otherwise known as black boxes, this technology is important for when accidents do happen and mistakes are made. It would allow agencies like the NTSB to have a better understanding of the incident and provide more information to the FAA to prevent future accidents.

It is clear that additional steps are needed to ensure that helicopters can fly safely, both for the sake of passengers and those on the ground. Our bill offers a commonsense approach to preventing further accidents like this one. It would simply direct the FAA to implement the National Transportation Safety Board's recommendations to require terrain awareness and warning systems and flight data and voice recorders on all helicopters carrying six or more passengers.

I appreciate the hard work of the National Transportation Safety Board in developing these important recommendations, and it is long past time that the FAA heed its call.

My thoughts continue to be with the victims and their loved ones impacted by this heartbreaking accident. Our bill would help prevent future tragedies like the one that occurred this past January and it is critical that Congress pass it swiftly to ensure that such loss of life was not in vain.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 3947. A bill to amend the provisions relating to the higher education emergency relief fund to clarify the flexibility provided to institutions and for students under the fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, on March 27 Congress passed the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act in response to the ongoing public health and economic crisis resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. The CARES Act included a Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund, which

provided nearly \$14 billion in funding to ensure institutions of higher education could make the transition to distance learning, provide students with essential supports and resources, and cover the enormous costs they've incurred during this time. Unfortunately, the Administration has not followed Congress' intent to provide these colleges and universities with the increased flexibility they need to meet the needs of their students.

This is why I'm introducing the Coronavirus Relief Flexibility for Students and Institutions Act, which would fix several implementation issues with the higher education funds in the CARES Act by providing institutions of higher education and students with the flexibility Congress intended. This bill would make an additional 7.5 million students eligible for emergency financial aid by expanding eligibility beyond just those who have filled out a FAFSA and are eligible under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. Additionally, it would allow institutions of higher education to use CARES Act funds to cover revenue losses incurred as a result of COVID-19, rather than limiting the funding to the U.S. Department of Education's narrow interpretation that funds can only be used for new expenses associated with the transition of instruction to distance learning. It would also ensure that colleges hardest hit by COVID-19 are receiving the support they need by requiring an application to demonstrate such needs, rather than providing all colleges with \$500,000 in taxpayer funds regardless of size.

In this difficult time, colleges desperately need the flexibility to best serve their students. This bill will help ensure that Secretary DeVos and the U.S. Department of Education follow Congress' intent to stabilize our institutions of higher education that are hurting from COVID-19 and provide emergency financial aid for the students who need it, not just those that who have met bureaucratic requirements. I hope the Senate passes this bill quickly to ensure that institutions have the flexibility and supports they need to continue providing high quality and equitable access to education for all students as we continue to weather this pandemic.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):
S. 3949. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account during the Coronavirus Emergency Period; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise at a time of crisis. For several months now, our Nation been dealing with two simultaneous crises—a global health pandemic that has claimed the lives of over 115,000 Americans and over 400,000 people across the globe—and an economic crisis that has cost over 40 mil-

lion Americans their jobs. We are also now dealing with a crisis of racial division and anger over the killing of George Floyd on Memorial Day.

As our Nation reels from the difficulties of the past few months, it's time to focus on what we can do to recover. One challenge that we've faced this year is the closures of schools all across the Country. Suddenly, because of the coronavirus pandemic, over 76 million American students of all ages were faced with finishing the school year at home—including over five million students in my home State of Texas—away from many of the resources that school provides.

To say that has been a staggering shift for many students and families is an understatement. That is why today, I'm introducing a bill to temporarily expand 529 accounts so that parents of children who are now learning from home as a result of the coronavirus pandemic can cover educational expenses such as tuition, books and other instructional materials, online educational materials, tutoring, standardized test fees, and educational therapies for students with disabilities.

This bill, the Helping Parents Educate Children During the Coronavirus Pandemic Act, is a version of a bill I introduced last year, the Student Empowerment Act, which would allow 100 percent of American students to use 529 accounts to help pay for K-12 education. The Helping Parents Educate Children During the Coronavirus Pandemic Act has the benefits of the Student Empowerment Act, but is tailored to navigate the educational challenges the coronavirus pandemic poses to students nationwide.

These bills would extend 529 accounts to cover educational expenses of all sorts, allowing public school families (who do not pay tuition) to participate. Around 90 percent of America's students attend public school, so this change would help many Americans afford all the associated costs of an education.

These bills would also make 529 accounts more accessible to low-income and middle-income families, public school families, families who send their children to religious schools, and homeschool families who need help paying for their child's K-12 education.

We've come a long way in making a quality education attainable for American students, but we have more to do. That is why I'm working to help parents, guardians, and students across the country access the tools they need to continue school at home as long as we have a public health emergency because of the coronavirus pandemic.

In closing, I want to thank the educators and parents who over the past three months have made education a priority for millions of American students. Your hard work and dedication to ensuring your students continue to learn despite the challenges of a global pandemic is a good example for us all that we must keep going, we must

move forward, and that one day, we will emerge from these challenges stronger than before.

I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 614—HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HEINOUS ATTACK AT THE PULSE NIGHTCLUB ON JUNE 12, 2016

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 614

Whereas, on June 12, 2016, a gunman inspired by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria targeted the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, where he killed 49 innocent victims and wounded dozens more in a despicable attack;

Whereas the attack at the Pulse nightclub was an attack on the LGBTQ community, the Hispanic community, the City of Orlando, the State of Florida, and the United States;

Whereas the Orlando community continues to mourn the tragic loss of life, but has demonstrated remarkable strength, unity, and resilience in the aftermath of the horrendous event;

Whereas June 12 is designated as "Pulse Remembrance Day" in the State of Florida to honor the victims and survivors of the senseless attack;

Whereas the people of the United States continue to pray for those affected by the tragedy; and

Whereas June 12, 2020, marks 4 years since the lives of the 49 innocent victims were tragically cut short by the senseless act of terrorism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 49 victims killed in the attack at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, on June 12, 2016, and offers heartfelt condolences to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(2) honors the dozens of survivors of the attack and pledges continued resolve to stand against terrorism and hate; and

(3) expresses gratitude to the brave law enforcement and emergency medical personnel who responded to the attack.

SENATE RESOLUTION 615—RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OUTBREAK OF THE KOREAN WAR AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNITED STATES-SOUTH KOREA ALLIANCE INTO A MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL, GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 615

Whereas June 25, 2020, marks the 70th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War, when the armed forces of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) attacked the Republic of Korea (South Korea) on June 25, 1950;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 83 on June 27, 1950, recommending "Members of the United

Nations furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea” and Resolution 84 on July 7, 1950, recommending Members make military forces and other assistance available “to a unified command under the United States of America”;

Whereas, on July 27, 1953, an Armistice Agreement was signed by United States Army Lieutenant General William Harrison, Jr. representing the United Nations Command with the Korean People’s Army and the Chinese People’s Volunteer Army to “insure a complete cessation of hostilities and of all acts of armed force in Korea until a final peaceful settlement is achieved”;

Whereas the Armistice Agreement remains in force today and by its terms has neither formally ended the Korean War nor constituted a permanent settlement of peace on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas, on October 1, 1953, a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and South Korea was signed in Washington, D.C. (5 UST 2368), with ratification advised by and consented to by the Senate on January 26, 1954, and the treaty remains in force today “to strengthen their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security”;

Whereas, during the Korean War, 1,789,000 United States soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines served in theater, 36,574 paid the ultimate sacrifice with their lives in defense of freedom in South Korea, and more than 7,500 members of the United States Armed Forces remain classified by the Department of Defense as Missing in Action;

Whereas, on October 7, 2016, H.R.1475, entitled the “Korean War Veterans Memorial Wall of Remembrance Act” was introduced in the 114th Congress by Representative Sam Johnson of Texas and became Public Law 114-230;

Whereas, according to House Report 114-433, the Korean War Veterans Memorial Wall of Remembrance Act (Public Law 114-230) authorizes a Wall of Remembrance to be added to the Korean War Veterans Memorial with the names of those that died in theater, are listed as missing, or were prisoners of war, and would also list the number of personnel that were part of the Korean Augmentation to the United States Army (KATUSA) program;

Whereas the Korean War is no longer “The Forgotten War” but “The Forgotten Victory” and June 25, 1950, is considered the symbolic start of the ironclad United States-South Korea alliance that was forged in blood;

Whereas, in the 70 years since the outbreak of the Korean War, the United States-South Korea alliance has transformed itself from a security relationship into a comprehensive global partnership;

Whereas South Korea is considered one of the greatest post-World War II success stories, and its continued partnership with the United States remains the linchpin of United States foreign policy in Northeast Asia;

Whereas the United States and South Korea have stood shoulder to shoulder in all four major conflicts the United States has faced since the Korean War, while maintaining peace on the Korean Peninsula and contributing to global prosperity through the shared values of democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and a free market economy;

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to maintain its forward deployed presence in South Korea through United States Forces Korea (USFK), a premier Joint force that is “well led, disciplined, trained and ready to Fight Tonight and win”;

Whereas the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) calls for the strengthening and broadening of diplomatic,

economic, and security ties between the United States and South Korea;

Whereas the 70-year transformation of the United States-South Korea alliance into a mutually beneficial partnership has recently led to important coordination and cooperation in confronting global pandemics, including H1N1 in 2009 and COVID-19 in 2020;

Whereas the Government of South Korea has made significant contributions to the global community in combating COVID-19, including the manufacture and export of Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) test kits to the United States Government and various State governments, including Colorado;

Whereas, on May 8, 2020, the Government of South Korea donated 500,000 masks to be distributed to Korean War veterans throughout the United States, including the Navajo Nation, in a gesture of gratitude and in commemoration of the seventieth anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War; and

Whereas, on May 10, 2020, the Government of South Korea donated 2,000,000 masks to the United States to help fill shortages in hospitals most impacted by COVID-19: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that the United States-South Korea alliance serves as the linchpin of regional stability and mutual security in Northeast Asia;

(2) reiterates that the United States and South Korea share an enduring interest in the continued strength of the bilateral alliance, including deepening the military, diplomatic, economic, and cultural ties between the United States and South Korea, as well as broadening alliance cooperation to confront 21st century challenges, such as global health, the environment, and energy security;

(3) emphasizes that the United States-South Korea alliance espouses shared democratic values and remains committed to human rights, the rule of law, and free market principles and therefore plays an expanding role in stability and security far beyond the Korean Peninsula;

(4) reaffirms that the Governments of the United States and South Korea must pursue a coordinated policy of diplomatic engagement, economic pressure, and military deterrence to achieve peace and the denuclearization of North Korea;

(5) emphasizes that United States Forces Korea (USFK) remains prepared in presence and disposition to counter any attempted third-party aggression or coercion, and relies on the vital contributions of the dedicated Korean national employees of USFK; and

(6) reaffirms that the United States-South Korea alliance is a critical force to uphold the post-World War II liberal global order built by our two nations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 616—DESIGNATING JUNE 12, 2020, AS “WOMEN VETERANS APPRECIATION DAY”

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 616

Whereas women have formally been a part of the United States Armed Forces since the establishment of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901 but have informally served the United States since the inception of the United States military;

Whereas women have served the United States honorably and with valor, including—

(1) as soldiers disguised as males during the American Revolution and the Civil War;

(2) as nurses during World War I and World War II; and

(3) as combat helicopter pilots in Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of April 2020, women constitute approximately 17 percent of United States Armed Forces personnel on active duty, including—

(1) 21 percent of active duty personnel in the Air Force;

(2) 20 percent of active duty personnel in the Navy;

(3) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Army;

(4) 9 percent of active duty personnel in the Marine Corps; and

(5) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard;

Whereas, as of April 2020, women constitute nearly 21 percent of personnel in the National Guard and Reserves;

Whereas, as of April 2020, women comprise nearly 25 percent of the personnel in the National Guard and Reserves activated to support COVID-19 response efforts;

Whereas, in 2020—

(1) the population of women veterans reached 2,000,000, which represents an exponential increase from 713,000 women veterans in 1980; and

(2) women veterans constitute more than 10 percent of the total veteran population;

Whereas the United States is proud of, and appreciates, the service of all women veterans who have demonstrated great skill, sacrifice, and commitment to defending the principles upon which the United States was founded and which the United States continues to uphold;

Whereas women veterans have unique stories and should be encouraged to share their recollections through the Veterans History Project, which has worked since 2000 to collect and share the personal accounts of wartime veterans in the United States; and

Whereas, by designating June 12, 2020, as “Women Veterans Appreciation Day”, the Senate can—

(1) highlight the growing presence of women in the Armed Forces and the National Guard; and

(2) pay respect to women veterans for their dutiful military service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates June 12, 2020, as “Women Veterans Appreciation Day” to recognize the service and sacrifices of women veterans who have served valiantly on behalf of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1660. Mr. HOEVEN 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. KAINÉ, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the

SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1672. Mrs. LOEFFLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1673. Mrs. LOEFFLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1674. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1675. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1660. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. COMPLIANCE WITH BLM PERMITTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law but subject to any State requirements, a Bureau of Land Management drilling permit shall not be required under the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or section 3164.1 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), for an action occurring within an oil and gas drilling or spacing unit if—

(1) less than 50 percent of the minerals within the oil and gas drilling or spacing unit are minerals owned by the Federal Government; and

(2) the Federal Government does not own or lease the surface estate within the boundaries of the oil and gas drilling or spacing unit.

(b) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects the right of the Federal Government to receive royalties due to the Federal Government from the production of the Federal minerals within the oil and gas drilling or spacing unit.

SA 1661. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms.

WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following:

“CHAPTER 2004—NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

“Sec.

“200401. Definitions.

“200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund.

“§ 200401. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) ASSET.—The term ‘asset’ means any real property, including any physical structure or grouping of structures, landscape, trail, or other tangible property, that—

“(A) has a specific service or function; and

“(B) is tracked and managed as a distinct, identifiable entity by the applicable covered agency.

“(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means—

“(A) the Service;

“(B) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(C) the Forest Service;

“(D) the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(E) the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(3) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).

“(4) PROJECT.—The term ‘project’ means any activity to reduce or eliminate deferred maintenance of an asset, which may include resolving directly related infrastructure deficiencies of the asset that would not by itself be classified as deferred maintenance.

“§ 200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund’.

“(b) DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, there shall be deposited in the Fund—

“(A) from fees collected under section 803(e) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(e)), \$5 per entrance fee (as defined in section 802 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6801)), adjusted annually for inflation;

“(B) from fees for the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass collected under subsection (a) of section 805 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804) (excluding any fees for a discounted pass collected under subsection (b) of that section), \$20 per each nondiscounted America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass;

“(C) from fees collected under subparagraph (B)(i)(III) of section 217(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)) for use of the electronic system for travel authorization established under subparagraph (A) of that section, \$16 per travel

authorization, adjusted annually for inflation; and

“(D) from fees collected under section 22.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, for visa applications submitted by non-immigrants seeking temporary admission to the United States for businesses or pleasure under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(B)) (commonly referred to as B-1 and B-2 visas), \$25 per application, adjusted annually for inflation.

“(2) INCREASE IN PARK ENTRANCE FEES AND THE AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—THE NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS.—

“(A) INCREASE IN PARK ENTRANCE FEES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall increase each entrance fee (as defined in section 802 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6801)) established for a System unit under section 803(e) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(e)) by \$5.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—The Secretary shall annually adjust the increase in the amount of each entrance fee required under clause (i) for inflation.

“(B) INCREASE IN AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—THE NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting jointly (referred to in this subparagraph as the ‘Secretaries’), shall increase the fee for the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass (as established under section 805(a)(5) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(a)(5)) (excluding any fee for a discounted pass made available under subsection (b) of that section) by \$20.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—The Secretaries shall annually adjust the increase in the amount of the fee required under clause (i) for inflation.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

“(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

“(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

“(3) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be used for priority deferred maintenance projects in the System, in the National Wildlife Refuge System, on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, and in the National Forest System, as follows:

“(A) 70 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Service.

“(B) 15 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Forest Service.

“(C) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(D) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management.

“(E) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

“(B) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—The amounts remaining in the Fund after the allocations required under subparagraph (A) may be allocated for transportation projects of the covered agencies, including paved and unpaved roads, bridges, tunnels, and paved parking areas.

“(C) PLAN.—Any priority deferred maintenance project funded under this section shall be consistent with an applicable transportation, deferred maintenance, or capital improvement plan developed by the applicable covered agency.

“(f) PROHIBITED USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts in the Fund shall be used—

“(1) for land acquisition;

“(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

“(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

“(g) SUBMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a list of projects to be funded for fiscal year 2021 that—

“(1) are identified by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture as priority deferred maintenance projects; and

“(2) as of the date of the submission of the list, are ready to be implemented.

“(h) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of projects to be funded from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year.

“(i) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under this section, consistent with the allocations to covered agencies under subsection (e)(1).

“(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (c) shall be allocated by the President.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(j) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public cash or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

“(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

“(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

“(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) credited to, and form a part of, the Fund; and

“(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

“(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

“(k) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.”.

(2) CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

“2004. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund ...200401”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 805(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(b)(1)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “(excluding the portion of the cost of the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass that is attributable to the increase under section 200402(b)(2)(B)(i) of title 54, United States Code)”.

(b) INCREASE IN CERTAIN VISA APPLICATION FEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall amend section 22.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, to increase the application fee for visa applications submitted by nonimmigrants seeking temporary admission to the United States for businesses or pleasure under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(B)) (commonly referred to as B-1 and B-2 visas) by \$25 per application, which amount shall be adjusted annually for inflation.

(c) INCREASE IN FEES FOR USE OF THE ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION.—Section 217(h)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), in the second sentence, by striking “The initial fee shall be the sum of—” and inserting the following: “Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act, the fee collected under this subparagraph shall be an amount that is equal to the sum of—”;

(B) by striking subclause (I) and inserting the following:

“(I) an amount not to exceed \$17, as determined by the Secretary, which shall be for

disposition in accordance with clause (ii)(I);”;

(C) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) \$16 per travel authorization, adjusted annually for inflation, for disposition in accordance with section 200402(b)(1)(C) of title 54, United States Code.”; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(I) TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND.—Amounts”; and

(B) in subclause (I) (as so designated), in the second sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(II) FEES FOR THE SYSTEM.—Amounts”.

(d) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including whether this section and the amendments made by this section have effectively reduced the priority deferred maintenance backlog of the covered agencies (as that term is defined in section 200401 of title 54, United States Code); and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study under paragraph (1).

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON PARTNER'S DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY PARTNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) LIMITATION ON PARTNERSHIP ALLOCATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any qualified conservation contributions of any partnership (whether directly or as a distributive share of such contributions of another partnership), no amount of such contributions may be taken into account under this section by any partner of such partnership as a distributive share of such contributions if the aggregate amount so taken into account by such partner for the taxable year would (but for this paragraph) exceed 2.5 times such partner's adjusted basis in such partnership (determined as of the close of such taxable year and without regard to such contributions). The preceding sentence shall apply only with respect to the first 3 taxable years of such partner which end after the date on which such partner first became a partner in the partnership.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any partnership if substantially all of the partnership interests in such partnership are held by individuals who are related within the meaning of section 152(d)(2).

“(C) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary to carry out, and prevent the avoidance of, the purposes of this paragraph.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years ending after December 23, 2016. No inference is intended as the appropriate treatment of contributions made in taxable years ending on or before such date or as to any activity not described in section 170(h)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section.

SA 1662. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted

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

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following:

“CHAPTER 2004—NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

“Sec.

“200401. Definitions.

“200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund.

“§ 200401. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) ASSET.—The term ‘asset’ means any real property, including any physical structure or grouping of structures, landscape, trail, or other tangible property, that—

“(A) has a specific service or function; and

“(B) is tracked and managed as a distinct, identifiable entity by the applicable covered agency.

“(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means—

“(A) the Service;

“(B) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(C) the Forest Service;

“(D) the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(E) the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(3) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).

“(4) PROJECT.—The term ‘project’ means any activity to reduce or eliminate deferred maintenance of an asset, which may include resolving directly related infrastructure deficiencies of the asset that would not by itself be classified as deferred maintenance.

“§ 200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund’.

“(b) DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, there shall be deposited in the Fund—

“(A) from fees collected under section 803(e) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(e)), \$5 per entrance fee (as defined in section 802 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6801)), adjusted annually for inflation;

“(B) from fees for the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass collected under subsection (a) of section 805 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804) (excluding any fees for a discounted pass collected under subsection (b) of that section), \$20 per each nondiscounted America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass;

“(C) from fees collected under subparagraph (B)(i)(III) of section 217(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)) for use of the electronic system for travel authorization established under subparagraph (A) of that section, \$16 per travel authorization, adjusted annually for inflation; and

“(D) from fees collected under section 22.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, for visa applications submitted by non-immigrants seeking temporary admission to the United States for businesses or pleasure under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(B)) (commonly referred to as B-1 and B-2 visas), \$25 per application, adjusted annually for inflation.

“(2) INCREASE IN PARK ENTRANCE FEES AND THE AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—THE NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS.—

“(A) INCREASE IN PARK ENTRANCE FEES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall increase each entrance fee (as defined in section 802 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6801)) established for a System unit under section 803(e) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(e)) by \$5.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—The Secretary shall annually adjust the increase in the amount of each entrance fee required under clause (i) for inflation.

“(B) INCREASE IN AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—THE NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting jointly (referred to in this subparagraph as the ‘Secretaries’), shall increase the fee for the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass (as established under section 805(a)(5) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(a)(5))) (excluding any fee for a discounted pass made available under subsection (b) of that section) by \$20.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—The Secretaries shall annually adjust the increase in the amount of the fee required under clause (i) for inflation.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

“(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

“(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

“(3) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be used for priority deferred maintenance projects in the System, in the National Wildlife Refuge System, on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, and in the National Forest System, as follows:

“(A) 70 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Service.

“(B) 15 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Forest Service.

“(C) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(D) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management.

“(E) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

“(B) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—The amounts remaining in the Fund after the allocations required under subparagraph (A) may be allocated for transportation projects of the covered agencies, including paved and unpaved roads, bridges, tunnels, and paved parking areas.

“(C) PLAN.—Any priority deferred maintenance project funded under this section shall be consistent with an applicable transportation, deferred maintenance, or capital improvement plan developed by the applicable covered agency.

“(f) PROHIBITED USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts in the Fund shall be used—

“(1) for land acquisition;

“(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

“(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

“(g) SUBMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a list of projects to be funded for fiscal year 2021 that—

“(1) are identified by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture as priority deferred maintenance projects; and

“(2) as of the date of the submission of the list, are ready to be implemented.

“(h) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—The President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of projects to be funded from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each

project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year.

“(i) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under this section, consistent with the allocations to covered agencies under subsection (e)(1).

“(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (c) shall be allocated by the President.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(j) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public cash or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

“(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

“(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

“(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) credited to, and form a part of, the Fund; and

“(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

“(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

“(k) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.”.

(2) CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

“2004. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund ...200401”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 805(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(b)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “(excluding the portion of the cost of the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass that is attributable to the increase under section 200402(b)(2)(B)(i) of title 54, United States Code)”.

(b) INCREASE IN CERTAIN VISA APPLICATION FEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall amend section 22.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, to increase the application fee for visa applications submitted by nonimmigrants seeking temporary admission to the United States for businesses or pleasure under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(B)) (commonly referred to as B-1 and B-2 visas) by \$25 per application, which amount shall be adjusted annually for inflation.

(c) INCREASE IN FEES FOR USE OF THE ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION.—Section 217(h)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), in the second sentence, by striking “The initial fee shall be the sum of—” and inserting the following: “Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act, the fee collected under this subparagraph shall be an amount that is equal to the sum of—”;

(B) by striking subclause (I) and inserting the following:

“(I) an amount not to exceed \$17, as determined by the Secretary, which shall be for disposition in accordance with clause (ii)(I);”;

(C) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) \$16 per travel authorization, adjusted annually for inflation, for disposition in accordance with section 200402(b)(1)(C) of title 54, United States Code.”; and

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(I) TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND.—Amounts”; and

(B) in subclause (I) (as so designated), in the second sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(II) FEES FOR THE SYSTEM.—Amounts”.

(d) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including whether this section and the amendments made by this section have effectively reduced the priority deferred maintenance backlog of the covered agencies (as that term is defined in section 200401 of title 54, United States Code); and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SA 1663. Mr. ENZI 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. KAINÉ, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following:

“CHAPTER 2004—NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

“Sec.

“200401. Definitions.

“200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund.

“§ 200401. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) ASSET.—The term ‘asset’ means any real property, including any physical structure or grouping of structures, landscape, trail, or other tangible property, that—

“(A) has a specific service or function; and

“(B) is tracked and managed as a distinct, identifiable entity by the applicable covered agency.

“(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means—

“(A) the Service;

“(B) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(C) the Forest Service;

“(D) the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(E) the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(3) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).

“(4) PROJECT.—The term ‘project’ means any activity to reduce or eliminate deferred maintenance of an asset, which may include resolving directly related infrastructure deficiencies of the asset that would not by itself be classified as deferred maintenance.

“§ 200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund’.

“(b) DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be deposited in the Fund—

“(A) beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this section—

“(i) from fees collected under section 803(e) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(e)), \$5 per entrance fee (as defined in section 802 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6801)), adjusted annually for inflation; and

“(ii) from fees for the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass collected under subsection (a) of section 805 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804) (excluding any fees for a discounted pass collected under subsection (b) of that section), \$20 per each nondiscounted America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass; and

“(B) during the period beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2030—

“(i) from fees collected under subparagraph (B)(i)(III) of section 217(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)) for use of the electronic system for travel authorization established under subparagraph (A) of that section, \$29 per travel authorization, adjusted annually for inflation; and

“(ii) from fees collected under section 22.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, for visa applications submitted by non-immigrants seeking temporary admission to the United States for businesses or pleasure under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigra-

tion and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(B)) (commonly referred to as B-1 and B-2 visas), \$50 per application, adjusted annually for inflation.

“(2) INCREASE IN PARK ENTRANCE FEES AND THE AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—THE NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS.—

“(A) INCREASE IN PARK ENTRANCE FEES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall increase each entrance fee (as defined in section 802 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6801)) established for a System unit under section 803(e) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(e)) by \$5.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—The Secretary shall annually adjust the increase in the amount of each entrance fee required under clause (i) for inflation.

“(B) INCREASE IN AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—THE NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting jointly (referred to in this subparagraph as the ‘Secretaries’), shall increase the fee for the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass (as established under section 805(a)(5) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(a)(5))) (excluding any fee for a discounted pass made available under subsection (b) of that section) by \$20.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—The Secretaries shall annually adjust the increase in the amount of the fee required under clause (i) for inflation.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

“(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

“(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

“(3) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be used for priority deferred maintenance projects in the System, in the National Wildlife Refuge System, on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, and in the National Forest System, as follows:

“(A) 70 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Service.

“(B) 15 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Forest Service.

“(C) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(D) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management.

“(E) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

“(B) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—The amounts remaining in the Fund after the allocations required under subparagraph (A) may be allocated for transportation projects of the covered agencies, including paved and unpaved roads, bridges, tunnels, and paved parking areas.

“(C) PLAN.—Any priority deferred maintenance project funded under this section shall be consistent with an applicable transportation, deferred maintenance, or capital improvement plan developed by the applicable covered agency.

“(f) PROHIBITED USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts in the Fund shall be used—

“(1) for land acquisition;

“(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

“(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

“(g) SUBMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a list of projects to be funded for fiscal year 2021 that—

“(1) are identified by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture as priority deferred maintenance projects; and

“(2) as of the date of the submission of the list, are ready to be implemented.

“(h) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—The President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of projects to be funded from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year.

“(i) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under this section, consistent with the allocations to covered agencies under subsection (e)(1).

“(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (c) shall be allocated by the President.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(j) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public cash or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

“(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

“(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

“(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) credited to, and form a part of, the Fund; and

“(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

“(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

“(k) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.”.

(2) CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

“2004. National Parks and Public

Land Legacy Restoration Fund ...200401”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 805(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(b)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “(excluding the portion of the cost of the America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass that is attributable to the increase under section 200402(b)(2)(B)(i) of title 54, United States Code)”.

(b) INCREASE IN CERTAIN VISA APPLICATION FEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall amend section 22.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, to increase, for the period beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2030, the application fee for visa applications submitted by nonimmigrants seeking temporary admission to the United States for businesses or pleasure under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(B)) (commonly referred to as B-1 and B-2 visas) by \$50 per application, which amount shall be adjusted annually for inflation.

(c) INCREASE IN FEES FOR USE OF THE ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 217(h)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), in the second sentence, by striking “The initial fee shall be the sum of—” and inserting the following: “Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act, the fee collected under this subparagraph shall be an amount that is equal to the sum of—”;

(ii) by striking subclause (I) and inserting the following:

“(I) an amount not to exceed \$17, as determined by the Secretary, which shall be for disposition in accordance with clause (ii)(I);”;

(iii) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) \$29 per travel authorization, adjusted annually for inflation, for disposition in accordance with section 200402(b)(1)(B)(i) of title 54, United States Code.”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(I) TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND.—Amounts”; and

(ii) in subclause (I) (as so designated), in the second sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(II) FEES FOR THE SYSTEM.—Amounts”.

(2) REPEAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective on September 30, 2030, paragraph (1) and the amendments made by that paragraph are repealed.

(B) APPLICATION.—Effective on the date described in subparagraph (A), section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187) shall be applied and administered as if paragraph (1) and the amendments made by that paragraph had not been enacted.

(d) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including whether this section and the amendments made by this section have effectively reduced the priority deferred maintenance backlog of the covered agencies (as that term is defined in section 200401 of title 54, United States Code); and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SA 1664. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____ . CONVERSION OF CERTAIN LAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED LAND.—The term “covered land” means land that is—

(A) acquired using a payment to a State under section 200305 of title 54, United States Code; and

(B) located adjacent to a health care facility.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

(b) CONVERSION.—Notwithstanding section 200305(f)(3) of title 54, United States Code,

the Secretary shall approve the conversion of covered land to other than public outdoor recreation use, if the conversion of the covered land would, as determined by the Secretary, improve the viability of existing local health care facilities in the vicinity of the covered land.

SA 1665. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 8, strike line 19 and all that follows through the matter following line 18 on page 14 and insert the following:

“(h) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States—

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

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

“(A) the total amount of expenditures expended for the projects listed as of the date on which the list is submitted; and

“(B) the total amount of expenditures estimated to be required to complete the projects listed.

“(i) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under this section, consistent with the allocations to covered agencies under subsection (e)(1).

“(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (c) shall be allocated by the President.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are

less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(j) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public cash or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

“(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

“(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

“(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations allocated under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) credited to, and form a part of, the Fund; and

“(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

“(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

“(k) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

“2004. National Parks and Public

Land Legacy Restoration Fund ...200401”.

(c) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including whether this section and the amendments made by this section have effectively reduced the priority deferred maintenance backlog of the covered agencies (as that term is defined in section 200401 of title 54, United States Code); and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. PERMANENT FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200303 of title 54, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 200303. Availability of funds

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts deposited in the Fund under section 200302 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter shall be made available for expenditure for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation, to carry out the purposes of the Fund (including accounts and programs made available from the Fund pursuant to the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-94; 133 Stat. 2534)).

“(b) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be in addition to amounts made available to the Fund under section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) or otherwise appropriated from the Fund.

“(c) ALLOCATION AUTHORITY.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—The President shall submit to Congress detailed account, program, and project allocations of the full amount made available under subsection (a)—

“(A) for fiscal year 2021, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act; and

“(B) for each fiscal year thereafter, as part of the annual budget submission of the President.

“(2) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under subsection (a), including allocations by account, program, and project.

“(B) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(i) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be allocated by the President.

“(ii) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (a) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(3) RECREATIONAL PUBLIC ACCESS.—Amounts expended from the Fund under this section shall be consistent with the requirements for recreational public access for hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, or other outdoor recreational purposes under section 200306(c).

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall submit to Congress an annual report that describes the final allocation by account, program, and project of amounts made available under subsection (a), including a description of the status of obligations and expenditures.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 200302(c) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) Section 200306(a)(2)(B) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking clause (iii).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 200303 and inserting the following:

“200303. Availability of funds.”.

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 1666. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted an amendment SA 1617 to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr.

TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, lines 2 through 5, strike “(including accounts and programs made available from the Fund pursuant to the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-94; 133 Stat 2534))”.

On page 12, lines 10 and 11, strike “or otherwise appropriated from the Fund”.

On page 14, strike lines 10 through 14 and insert the following:

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

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

SEC. 4. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FROM THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

Section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Facility rehabilitation and maintenance.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(4), in the second sentence, by striking “, or development” and inserting “, development, or facility rehabilitation and maintenance”;

(3) in subsection (c), in the first sentence, by striking “, or development” and inserting “, development, or facility rehabilitation and maintenance”;

(4) in subsection (f)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “, or development” and inserting “, development, or facility rehabilitation and maintenance”;

(5) in subsection (j), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “, and development” and inserting “, development, and facility rehabilitation and maintenance”.

SEC. 5. ALLOCATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AMOUNTS FOR OTHER RELATED PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 200307 through 2003010 as sections 200308 through 2003011, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 200306 the following:

“§ 200307. Allocation of Fund amounts for other related purposes

“Amounts deposited in the Fund under section 200302 may be allotted by the President for any of the following other related purposes:

“(1) The Forest Legacy Program established under section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c).

“(2) Cooperative endangered species grants authorized under section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1535).

“(3) The American Battlefield Protection Program established under chapter 3081.

“(4) The uses authorized under section 31(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356a(d)).

“(5) The provision of grants from the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund authorized under section 904(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503(a)).

“(6) The uses authorized for the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account under section 3(c) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b(c)).

“(7) The program for the Highlands region established under the Highlands Conservation Act (Public Law 108-421; 118 Stat. 2375).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 200302(b)(2) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking “200310” and inserting “200311”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 200307 through 200310 and inserting the following:

- “200307. Allocation of Fund amounts for other related purposes.
- “200308. Availability of Fund amounts for publicity purposes.
- “200309. Contracts for acquisition of land and water.
- “200310. Contracts for options to acquire land and water in System.
- “200311. Transfers to and from Fund.”.

SA 1667. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. BOUNDARIES OF THE GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL MONUMENT AND THE BASIN AND RANGE NATIONAL MONUMENT, NEVADA.

The Secretary of the Interior shall not modify or revoke—

(1) the boundaries of the Gold Butte National Monument, as established in the State of Nevada by Presidential Proclamation 9559, as issued on December 28, 2016 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note); or

(2) the boundaries of the Basin and Range National Monument, as established in the

State of Nevada by Presidential Proclamation 9297, as issued on July 10, 2015 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note).

SA 1668. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. . REAUTHORIZATION OF OHIO & ERIE NATIONAL HERITAGE CANALWAY.

Division II of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333; 110 Stat. 4274; 122 Stat. 824; 122 Stat. 826; 127 Stat. 3801; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314; 133 Stat. 778) is amended—

(1) in section 809, by striking “2021” and inserting “2036”; and

(2) in section 810(a), by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$30,000,000”.

SA 1669. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. . ENERGY EFFICIENCY MATERIALS PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICANT.—The term “applicant” means a nonprofit organization that applies for a grant under this section.

(2) ENERGY-EFFICIENCY MATERIAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “energy-efficiency material” means a material (including a product, equipment, or system) the installation of which results in a reduction in use by a nonprofit organization of energy or fuel.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “energy-efficiency material” includes—

(i) a roof or lighting system or component of the system;

(ii) a window;

(iii) a door, including a security door;

(iv) a heating, ventilation, or air conditioning system or component of the system (including insulation and wiring and plumbing improvements needed to serve a more efficient system); and

(v) a renewable energy generation or heating system, including a solar, photovoltaic, wind, geothermal, or biomass (including wood pellet) system or component of the system.

(3) NONPROFIT BUILDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “nonprofit building” means a building operated and owned by an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “nonprofit building” includes a building described in subparagraph (A) that is—

(i) a hospital;

(ii) a youth center;

(iii) a school;

(iv) a social-welfare program facility;

(v) a faith-based organization; or

(vi) any other nonresidential and non-commercial structure.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program to award grants for the purpose of providing nonprofit buildings with energy-efficiency materials.

(c) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants under the program established under subsection (b).

(2) APPLICATION.—The Secretary may award a grant under paragraph (1) if an applicant submits to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may prescribe.

(3) CRITERIA FOR GRANT.—In determining whether to award a grant under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall apply performance-based criteria, which shall give priority to applicants based on—

(A) the energy savings achieved;

(B) the cost-effectiveness of the use of energy-efficiency materials;

(C) an effective plan for evaluation, measurement, and verification of energy savings; and

(D) the financial need of the applicant.

(4) LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL GRANT AMOUNT.—Each grant awarded under this section shall not exceed \$200,000.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2025, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program established under subsection (b) that describes—

(1) the net reduction in energy use and energy costs under the pilot program; and

(2) for each recipient of a grant under the pilot program—

(A) the geographic location of the recipient; and

(B) the size of the organization of the recipient.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, to remain available until expended.

SA 1670. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____ . LIFETIME NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS FOR DISABLED VETERANS.

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

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

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

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

SA 1671. Mrs. LOEFFLER 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. SAND-

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

On page 12, line 16, insert “and a list of any Federal land previously acquired using amounts from the Fund that, based on the significant administrative burden to the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, of restoring or maintaining the Federal land, is identified by the President as appropriate for transfer to the State in which the Federal land is located, subject to the approval of the State” after “subsection (a)”.

SA 1672. Mrs. LOEFFLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____ . APPROVAL REQUIRED PRIOR TO THE ACQUISITION OF LAND, WATER, OR AN INTEREST IN LAND OR WATER.

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

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

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Appropriations”;

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

“(2) **PREACQUISITION.**—Appropriations”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **APPROVAL REQUIRED.**—Appropriations from the Fund under this section may not be used for the acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water, unless, prior to the acquisition, the Secretary or the Secretary

of Agriculture, as applicable, has received from the Governor of the State in which the land, water, or interest in land or water proposed to be acquired is located a written certification that—

“(A)(i) the Governor of the State approves the proposed acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water; and

“(ii) the unit of local government in which the land, water, or interest in land or water proposed to be acquired is located has not passed a resolution objecting to the proposed acquisition; or

“(B)(i) the Governor of the State disapproves the proposed acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water; but

“(ii) the unit of local government in which the land, water, or interest in land or water proposed to be acquired is located has passed a resolution expressing support for the proposed acquisition.”

SA 1673. Mrs. LOEFFLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 8, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 9, line 2, and insert the following:

“(h) **SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.**—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress a list of projects to be funded from the Fund that includes—

“(1) a detailed description of each project;

“(2) the expected timeline for the completion of each project;

“(3) the estimated expenditures from the Fund for each projects for the applicable year; and

“(4) any estimated funding shortfall for the completion of each project.

SA 1674. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr.

BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.

Section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other law, the Secretary shall not issue a lease or any other authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, natural gas, or any other mineral in—

- “(1) the Mid-Atlantic planning area;
- “(2) the South Atlantic planning area;
- “(3) the North Atlantic planning area; or
- “(4) the Straits of Florida planning area.”.

SA 1675. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AUTHORITY TO POSSESS FIREARMS.

(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL LAND.—In this section, the term “Federal land” means Federal land that is open to, and accessible by, the public.

(b) AUTHORITY TO POSSESS FIREARMS.—An individual may possess a firearm on Federal land, on the condition that such possession is consistent with the law of the State in which the Federal land is located.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I have requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 11, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 11, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 2020

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12:01 a.m., Friday, June 12; 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 morning business be closed; finally, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1957.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12:01 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9 p.m., adjourned until Friday, June 12, 2020, at 12:01 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ANTHONY J. TATA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY, VICE JOHN C. ROOD, RESIGNED.