

seen the local officials cede several blocks to a rag-tag band of demonstrators who call themselves the Capitol Hill Autonomous Zone. Fear of the far left has literally caused local officials to let a chunk of their own city devolve into a no-go zone for their own cops.

Naturally, left-leaning media outlets have been quick to shower praise on this legacy and slow to amplify reports of arson and other unchecked crimes. One story from the New York Times praised the “liberated streets”—liberated, as if spray-painting a boarded-up business were the equivalent of the Normandy landings.

Amid all this, our Democratic counterparts in the House of Representatives have mostly continued to keep their doors locked and their lights off. But here in the Senate, we came back in over a month ago. We have taken smart precautions, but we have not let the people’s business come to a halt.

Our committees have been overseeing the CARES Act and working on other essential business, like the National Defense Authorization Act.

Our colleagues are considering what else might help the country reopen, like strong legal protections for schools, colleges, employers, and healthcare workers.

Under the leadership of Senator TIM SCOTT, our conference is developing a serious proposal to reform law enforcement in smart ways without lashing out needlessly and counterproductively at the first responders who are a credit to their communities.

GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just this week, on the floor, we will complete a major piece of legislation that will benefit generations to come. Thanks to a number of our colleagues—particularly the junior Senators from Colorado and Montana—the Senate is poised to take historic action for the future of the Nation’s public lands.

I haven’t been the only one coming to the floor to highlight how my constituents prize our State’s national parks, wildlife refuge, and other managed areas—for recreation and for many livelihoods. We Kentuckians are proud that our Commonwealth is home to one of the National Park Service’s crowning jewels at Mammoth Cave. We are proud of our historic sites like Mill Springs Battlefield and our wildlife refuges at the Clarks and Green Rivers. And I am proud that the Senate this week will provide permanent, steady support to maintain these treasures for generations to come.

As we have heard, the same is true for Colorado, where entire regional economies are driven by outdoor recreation in alpine wonderlands; for Montana, where Federal and State management work hand in hand with local sportsmen and Native American Tribes to preserve millions of acres of pristine, Big Sky wilderness; for West Virginia, where 54 of 55 counties have ben-

efited from the Land and Water Conservation Fund investment; and for Ohio, where the Cuyahoga Valley puts parkland in the backyards of millions of people. The list goes on and on.

Public lands hold a unique place in the life of every State in America—from their natural beauty, to their use for recreation, to their pivotal roles in local economies. In the communities just outside of the gates, public lands drive over \$40 billion in economic activity every year, and they play a big part in the entire outdoor recreation industry that creates hundreds of billions of dollars in national prosperity every year.

Once again, I am grateful to our colleagues who have stewarded the Great American Outdoors Act thus far; to Senator GARDNER and Senator DAINES for their leadership; and to Senators ALEXANDER, PORTMAN, MANCHIN, and WARNER for their efforts as well to steer this strong, bipartisan product toward the finish line. I look forward to continuing to advance this legislation today and passing it this week.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019— Resumed

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

The 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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. 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.

BOSTOCK V. CLAYTON COUNTY, GEORGIA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning, the long march for equality for LGBTQ Americans took a step forward. The Supreme Court handed down a landmark decision that Federal employment discrimination protections do, in fact, extend to LGBTQ Americans. Believe it or not, before today, it was not a settled legal matter that you could sue your employer for firing you solely on the basis of sexual orientation or sexual identity.

In 2020, in America, it was still OK to discriminate against people because of their sexual orientation or identity. Is that unbelievable that in the 21st century it was still allowed? Well, now it isn’t because of the Supreme Court, and they deserve credit for that case.

One of the cases that formed the basis of today’s ruling originated in my home State of New York, where a sky-diving instructor was fired for admitting his sexual orientation. So, today, the Supreme Court did the right thing and ruled that workplace discrimination is just as unlawful as discrimination on the basis of gender, race, or religion.

Of course, the ruling in no way diminishes our efforts here in Congress to pass the Equality Act led by my colleagues, Senators MERKLEY, BALDWIN, and BOOKER, which would be a great leap forward on equality that we are all looking for. It passed the House over a year ago, but it has been gathering dust in Leader MCCONNELL’s legislative graveyard. Senate Republicans are still not in the 21st century. They must think it is OK to discriminate against people because of their orientation or identity. Unbelievable. But maybe now, the fact that even a few Justices appointed by Republican Presidents believe that it was against the law—maybe that will prick the hearts of our Republican colleagues and Leader MCCONNELL and they will allow a vote on the Equality Act here on the floor. Even without the Senate and its backward ways, it is clear that the country is moving in the right direction.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. President, these are not ordinary times in America. For 21 straight days, hundreds of thousands of Americans have taken to the streets to protest police violence and racial injustice. Clashes between police and peaceful protesters over the past few weeks, in which some police departments have responded with overly aggressive tactics, have only articulated further the need for bold and wide-reaching reform of police practices.

Being killed by police is now the sixth leading cause of death for young Black men in America. Let me repeat that. Being killed by police is now the sixth leading cause of death for young Black men in America, and that is why the House and Senate have drafted legislation, the Justice in Policing Act,

that will deliver comprehensive reform to police departments, including a ban on choke holds, a ban on no-knock warrants in Federal drug cases, a ban on racial profiling, and limits on the transfer of military equipment to police departments. Our bill would make it a lot easier to hold police accountable in court for misconduct and institute several reforms to prevent that misconduct in the first place.

Only a few months ago, the Justice in Policing Act might have seemed controversial, but in the wake of such obvious injustice recorded on iPhones throughout the country, there is now broad and deep support for the policies we Democrats are pushing in the Justice in Policing Act.

A recent Reuters poll reported—listen to this—82 percent of Americans, including 7 in 10 Republicans, want to ban police from using choke holds; 83 percent of Americans, including 7 in 10 Republicans, want to ban racial profiling; 92 percent of Americans, including 9 in 10 Republicans, want Federal police to wear body cameras; 91 percent of Americans, including 9 in 10 Republicans, support allowing independent investigations of police departments that show patterns of misconduct; and 75 percent of Americans, including 6 in 10 Republicans, support allowing victims of police misconduct to sue police departments for damages, also known as qualified immunity reform.

Now is the time to seek bold and broadscale change, not change around the margins. Now is the time for wholesale reform, not piecemeal reform. The Justice in Policing Act takes a comprehensive approach, but, at the moment, our Republican colleagues seem to be on a path toward taking a much, much narrower, less inclusive approach. That is wrong.

Some Senate Republicans have endorsed individual proposals in our bill, like qualified immunity reform and bans on choke holds, but it looks like these policies may not be included in the Republican bill. While our bill recognizes that a strong Federal response is necessary to bring change to every police department in America, the Republicans, it seems, are going to leave much of the task up to the States. If history has taught us anything, particularly when it comes to civil rights, it is that progress on civil rights has been stunted, slowed down, and sometimes stymied by letting the States take the lead.

Let me repeat to my Republican colleagues: We need comprehensive and bold reform, and we need a commitment from the Republican leader to consider broad, strong police reform—the Justice in Policing Act—on the floor of the Senate before July 4.

Again, I ask our Republican leader—I have asked before: Allow the Justice in Policing Act to be on the floor. We can debate it. We can amend it. Some of you may not vote for it, but the Nation is crying out for debate on a com-

prehensive and strong approach, not to cherry-pick one or two items and say “See, we have done our job” and go home.

This has been a pervasive and deep problem in America for decades and centuries. To now give it short shift and to try and get off the hook would be so wrong at the moment when Americans are calling for it. The vast majority of Republican voters are calling for it. Do we have any courage here or any strength to face the issue head-on at a time and at a moment when we can do it? I hope our Republican friends will summon that courage, that strength, and that desire to bring real, strong, and comprehensive reform. The time for waiting is over.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, meanwhile, a global pandemic continues to assail our country and our economy. The COVID-19 pandemic did not disappear while the Nation rightfully turned its attention to the issues of racial justice. In fact, just as the country was preparing for the early stages of reopening, the number of cases began to spike again in a number of States.

Arizona has activated emergency plans to deal with the surge of new patients. Over the weekend, Florida reported its highest single-day number of cases. Twenty-two States are reporting increases in the numbers of confirmed cases of coronavirus after those numbers had been declining. The experts tell us that it is not simply because there is more testing. There is also more coronavirus in many of these States.

A headline in Time magazine sums it up: “America Is Done With COVID-19. COVID-19 Isn’t Done With America.” It is our responsibility to deal with this problem. The trends are extremely concerning.

I have asked the White House to have members of the coronavirus task force, including Dr. Fauci and Dr. Birx, give Senate Democrats a briefing on these recent spikes. I have yet to hear back. The White House continues to muzzle the most knowledgeable people.

President Trump, haven’t you learned that when you don’t face the truth, it hurts the country and hurts you? You tried to deny that this coronavirus was real—it was a hoax; it will go away in a few days; there are very few cases—and, of course, it ravaged our country.

Now they are doing the same thing. President Trump is doing exactly the same thing—withholding the experts and withholding the truth in hopes that things will disappear. That is just not how science tells us things work.

President Trump now seems ready to dismiss these issues entirely. It is appalling. He is planning big campaign rallies, asking reporters, amazingly, to sign waivers not to sue if they contract COVID from attending. I guess he worries that they might get it, but he doesn’t care. He wants to have his rally. That is the superficiality of this President.

President Trump has also moved major parts of the Republican convention out of North Carolina in order to avoid having to respect the most basic precautions against the spread of coronavirus.

Today, amazingly enough, the FDA withdrew the emergency authorization of the use of hydroxychloroquine as a treatment against COVID. Remember how the President of the United States, only a few weeks ago, was promoting the use of hydroxychloroquine like a pharmaceutical salesman, going so far as to take the drug himself despite not having the disease? Now the FDA says that it is not reasonable to believe the drug is effective against COVID or that its benefit outweighs the “known and potential risks.” That is the President’s own department telling him to stop it—to stop telling Americans lies about the coronavirus and about what is good and bad to treat it. It is amazing. An agency like this one, which knows they are not supposed to buck the President or face his wrath, still felt the obligation to come forward and tell Americans the truth about hydroxychloroquine.

This should be a warning to all Americans. You can’t listen to President Trump when it comes to healthcare, whether it comes to hydroxychloroquine or anything about the coronavirus itself, because the experts in his own administration so often contradict his advice. It shouldn’t need saying that the President is not a doctor, yet he has been issuing off-the-cuff medical advice from the White House podium only to have the experts scrambling to backtrack weeks later. This is not how a leader handles a crisis. This is not even how a normal person handles a crisis.

Senate Republicans, meanwhile, have relegated the COVID issue to the back burner. As the expiration dates for several of the programs established under the CARES Act quickly approach, Leader McCONNELL has reportedly told his caucus not to expect another emergency relief bill until the end of July. The emergency unemployment insurance we passed in the CARES Act is soon going to run out. The ban on evictions is soon going to expire. State and local governments are preparing to slash public services and are in dire need of Federal support. Cliff after cliff after cliff faces us. Economic trouble after economic trouble after economic trouble is looming upon us very soon. Yet all of these problems and all of these deadlines seem to mean very little to the Republican Senate majority, which is taking its sweet time to respond to an urgent and multifaceted national crisis.

What are our Republican friends going to tell people whose unemployment insurance runs out? Tough luck? What are our Republican friends going to tell people evicted from their homes? Too bad? What are our Republican friends going to tell the many public servants fired because their

States are running out of money and we have refused to step up to the plate? What are they going to tell the Nation's parents when schools will not be able to open because we haven't given them adequate resources to do so?

We are going to tell them that the Republican majority is asleep at the switch during a major national crisis, but that will be of little solace. We would much rather work together and get things done.

Even on bedrock issues of democracy elections, the Republican majority has once again been absent. The COVID pandemic has made our elections a challenge, obviously. In Nevada, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and, most recently and most glaringly in Georgia, voters have had to overcome significant barriers to voting. Senators KLOBUCHAR, FEINSTEIN, and PETERS have been demanding that Republican chairs of their respective committees hold hearings on these election issues. That would be the bare minimum the Senate could do in response to widespread election issues.

Police reform, racial injustice, voting rights, a global pandemic, massive levels of unemployment—these are huge issues that demand the attention of the U.S. Senate, but Leader MCCONNELL and the Republican majority just can't seem to find the time. On issues like COVID, racial justice, the economy, voting, the Republican majority is sadly missing in action.

Instead, Leader MCCONNELL is pushing two rightwing judges onto the Nation's circuit courts: Justin Walker and Cory Wilson.

Mr. Walker is a man of limited judicial experience who has made it very clear he personally opposes our healthcare law. He called the Roberts decision to uphold the Affordable Care Act indefensible and catastrophic.

Mr. Wilson, by the same token, called our healthcare law illegitimate and perverse. That is right, folks. If you need healthcare and you are suffering because of COVID, well, our Republican friends are nominating judges who think the law is illegitimate and perverse. In the middle of a public health crisis, the Republican majority is planning to confirm rightwing judges who oppose our healthcare law.

Adding insult to injury, Mr. Wilson has been one of the leaders in opposing and undoing voting rights. Here, at a time when people are protesting for racial equality, the Republican majority has the temerity to put on the floor of the Senate someone who has spent his career trying to limit the rights of people, oftentimes minorities, to vote. Mr. Wilson has supported restrictive voter ID laws and expressed strong opposition to parts of the Voting Rights Act. That is right. In the middle of a national movement on issues related to racial justice, Senate Republicans are trying to put a judge on the bench with a hostile record on voting rights.

We all know that when you have the Senate majority, it is all about prior-

ities. We are all empowered here on the Senate to propose bills and amendments and to ask consent to speak for as long as we want, but only Leader MCCONNELL gets to decide which bills reach the floor, and for the past 2 months, as the economic pain from the coronavirus deepens, as the disease starts to come back, as the economy runs into trouble after trouble after trouble, as long-simmering issues of racial justice and police brutality propel peaceful protesting in our biggest cities and smallest towns, the Republican Senate majority has been out to lunch. This week, as Leader MCCONNELL asks us to consider more rightwing judges for the Federal bench, it could not be more apparent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, across America, people of all ages, races, and backgrounds have continued to show up on the streets to speak up and speak out against racial injustice. Of course, it is their right under the Constitution to do so.

Galvanized by the tragic death of George Floyd, they are marching in peaceful protests, signing petitions, and having frank discussions with their families. It is a moment characterized by heartbreak and anger over the injustices that many Black Americans feel are perpetrated on them every day, but it is also a time for hope for the future as the issue has come front and center. Frankly, we have to do something about it.

In city halls, State legislatures, and, of course, here in the U.S. Capitol, there is a newfound sense of energy and urgency behind the effort to pass meaningful reform. We have an opportunity to create profound change in an area that, for too long, has just been a can kicked down the road, and I am optimistic we will succeed.

I told the Floyd family when I talked to them before their son, their brother, was buried: My hope for you and my hope for all of us is that something positive will come out of this tragedy.

Here in the Senate, we are working on legislation to respond to these events, and the majority leader has tasked our friend and colleague from South Carolina, Senator TIM SCOTT, to lead the effort in our conference. I am proud to have been working with him closely—and several other colleagues—to draft legislation that I think will help us begin the first step down that path and support America's police forces.

As we work through potential policies, it is important to hear feedback from my constituents back home, and last Friday I had the chance to do just that. I reached out to my friend, Dallas Mayor Eric Johnson, whom I have gotten to know pretty well during his first year as mayor. Whether it be Dallas tornadoes or the COVID-19 virus or, now, discussions about the George

Floyd killing and racial injustice, we have found the opportunity to work together to support the people of Dallas through some incredibly difficult times.

I asked him if he would help me convene a group of leaders in Dallas to discuss these issues, and by Friday we were all socially distancing around a large table in city hall in Dallas, TX. The mayor and I were joined by Police Chief Renee Hall, Dallas County Sheriff Marian Brown, Dallas County District Attorney John Creuzot, as well as union, community, and faith leaders. We had a frank conversation about the challenges we are up against as we work to repair the broken trust between law enforcement and some of the communities they serve.

I was able to spend some time talking about the work we are doing here in the Senate and the ideas that could be included in any legislation. I talked about two specific proposals that I have recommended—one being the establishment of a National Criminal Justice Commission. This Commission would review the criminal justice system from top to bottom and provide recommendations to us, something that has not happened at the national level since 1965.

I also recommended taking steps to ensure more departments and agencies are providing deescalation training for their officers so, hopefully, officers will know how to use these tactics to prevent similar tragedies from occurring in the first place.

But mostly I was there to listen and to learn from the men and women with decades of experience in protecting, serving, and advocating for their communities.

Chief Hall talked about how policing strategies had created a wedge between law enforcement and some of the minority communities and the work it is going to take in order to repair that trust and eliminate that wedge. She noted that Dallas is home to some of the best officers in the country and that the vast majority of them show up for work every day with all of the right intentions and attitude, but for the small number of officers who don't, we need to be able to identify them quickly and remove them from our police forces.

Thinking about the officer who was directly responsible for George Floyd's death, according to published reports, he had at least 17 misconduct complaints already lodged against him. Now, that should be a red flag for anybody.

In any tragedy, you can't help but go through the what-ifs and wonder how things might have played out differently. What if his supervisors had taken action? What if he had been fired? What if he hadn't been available to respond to the incident involving George Floyd because he was assigned to some other duties?

Well, these are difficult questions to ask because the outcome likely would

have been different, but they are the types of questions we need to ask in order to prevent history from repeating itself.

The major theme of our conversation was trust: How do we restore communities' trust in law enforcement? Minister Sammie Barry from Dallas West Church of Christ made a great point about ensuring that police agencies reflect the diversity of the communities in which they serve.

Texas is about as diverse a State as they come. Our cities are a vibrant blend of backgrounds, cultures, and skin tones, and our police departments should reflect that.

That is one topic of discussion here in the Senate, one I hope we can act on in the coming weeks: How do we encourage police recruitment of the right people who can reflect the communities in which they serve?

As Dallas County Sheriff Marian Brown said, we all recognize and acknowledge that we have a long way to go, and unfortunately there is no magic pill to help get us there. Instead, we are going to have to roll up our sleeves and do the hard work of trying to build consensus and solve problems.

As always, the first step in the process is good communication. Honest and frank discussions between community leaders, law enforcement, and elected officials are a great start, but we are going to have to do a lot more than talk in order to create palpable change.

I will be the first to admit I don't have all the answers. I don't think anyone else does either, but these conversations are key to helping each of us get closer to finding them.

I want to thank Mayor Johnson and everyone who took time out of their busy schedules to participate in our discussion last Friday. These men and women have provided me with valuable insight and ideas about the changes that need to be made in order to restore public confidence in all of our law enforcement agencies.

I have come back to Washington with new ideas based on their feedback, and I am eager to continue to work with all of our colleagues to deliver real reforms for the American people and restore that trust which, unfortunately, has been strained, if not broken, in some communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The Senator from Washington.

BOSTOCK V. CLAYTON COUNTY, GEORGIA

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, before I speak about the legislation we are going to be voting on shortly, I wanted to mention today's significant Supreme Court decision to protect the LGBTQ community and Americans from discrimination in the workplace.

This is a very important step forward. Gay and transgender Americans should not face discrimination in the workplace or live in fear of losing their jobs simply because of who they are, and it is an important step forward but is also long overdue.

My home State of Washington has been a leader on this issue for decades, but—just think—until today, June 15, 2020, we had no nationwide rules against firing an employee or harassing someone at work for being gay, lesbian, bisexual, or trans. That is just wrong, and LGBTQ+ Americans still face discrimination in far too many areas of life: public accommodations, housing, education, and some federally funded programs.

We have proposed legislation that would be, I believe, comprehensive civil rights and anti-discrimination legislation to help protect this community. The House has passed this legislation, and I believe it is time that the Senate pass this legislation.

Leader MCCONNELL and the Republicans should take the Equality Act out of the legislative graveyard and get it onto the Senate floor. Today I join my colleagues Senators MERKLEY, BALDWIN, and others who are calling for Senate action on this important issue.

Again, I want to emphasize how important and fundamental I think this decision was and how challenging and disappointed I am that we have had legislation to protect this community that we could have passed decades ago.

H.R. 1957

Madam President, I also rise to talk about the several votes we are going to have on public lands coming up, and one of them is about a budget point of order.

In my mind, budget points of order are about cost. Well, we are here to talk about what a good investment public land is.

We have the Grand Canyon. We understand that. It is a good investment. Mt. Rainier, in my home State of Washington—a good investment—is an iconic mountain, maybe, to some, but we in the State of Washington also know that it brings in millions of dollars in revenue and millions of visitors.

That is just what our public lands do: They become icons. The preservation of the natural world is a good investment—in my mind, better than roads and bridges and buildings—because it actually lasts for centuries. Places like the Grand Tetons or Denali—which are in other States—literally are icons to all of us and help us from one generation to the next.

Besides being icons, they do pay for themselves. That is, the economic return of public lands is phenomenal. It does create, but it generates. It generates activity that generates income to county governments, to State governments, and to the Federal Government—and lots of private entities are involved.

So hundreds of billions of dollars are spent. In fact, \$877 billion was part of a report that was issued a few years ago. You might not think of that right off the top of your head because you are thinking about some aspect of the outdoors, and you might not think of it as generating dollars, but, OK, try a few

of the brand names on, whether it is REI or The North Face or Columbia Sportswear Company—or just your local fishing guide who does white-water rafting or fishing or other outdoor activities.

These lands are basically generating billions of dollars in revenue. So, in my mind, the fact that they are receiving oil and gas offshore leasing revenue, along with getting the benefit of the public lands—and generating all of that revenue—to me, is very sound fiscal policy and a great investment.

So, to me, the issue isn't the budget point of order as much as it is the question of why this program has been around for so long and the money wasn't used in the program. Probably somewhere around \$20 billion has been used for other things instead of the intended purpose of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Maybe it is because not everybody was on board with spending that amount of money for public lands, but I think we are here today to say there is a new coalition of people who are willing to say that, and they do see the economic return.

We are specifically passing a law that says that you are going to spend those dollars for that and that the other purposes Congress may have decided in the past are not the specific purpose but that public land is.

So I am very happy we are making this investment that, in my mind, is one of the smartest fiscal policies we could ever make; that is, to spend money not from the taxpayer but from these private entities on offshore drilling that goes into something for the benefit of the taxpayer and that generates economic return to all of us.

I can't ask for a better tax policy or fiscal policy than to use it to preserve open space and public land and generate revenue and help all of us enjoy the outdoors.

As I said, revenue raising from offshore leasing and investing in public land was exactly what Scoop Jackson had in mind when he authored the Land and Water Conservation Fund more than 50 years ago, and it is actually what we should be doing. I am glad my colleagues have realized this is the right fiscal policy. It is good for us, and it is good for America's future.

I know that Scoop Jackson would be very happy, and I know his son Peter, who just passed recently, would also be very happy that this correction is being made.

This will be the first time that the money is fully used for the intended purpose of what the money and revenue was put into the fund to do. I am glad we are making this milestone happen, and I encourage my colleagues to think about this fiscal policy. The fiscal policy that benefits the United States by having open space and public lands generates \$877 billion.

Yes, if you want another reminder, this is a view of downtown Seattle from a very famous park, Gas Works Park, in the north end of Lake Union.

That park probably wouldn't be there if we didn't have the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The idea was, as Scoop said, as America urbanized, we needed to preserve open space for the public to use it. Some of the most iconic open spaces across the United States have been created for the public to enjoy.

So let's reaffirm our commitment that was always there. Let's turn down the budget point of order and make sure that we are making the right investments and finish moving this legislation to its final passage.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, last week we had some great conversations on the floor of the Senate about the Great American Outdoors Act and the combination of two important pieces of legislation—the Land and Water Conservation Fund, first authorized 55 years ago, and the Restore Our Parks Act—both of which would be combined in the Great American Outdoors Act and the most significant piece of conservation legislation Congress has passed in nearly 50 years or more.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, of course, is funded by taking offshore oil and gas revenues, and that is how the Restore Our Parks Act would be funded as well. Both of them would take dollars generated from offshore oil and gas production. There are a few other ways that it is funded, like boat fuel excise tax revenues and others, but primarily that is the source of funding, and, after a series of formula distributions out of the Treasury, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is appropriated about \$1 billion, and eventually the Restore Our Parks Act, under this legislation, would be appropriated dollars as well.

Ninety-nine percent of the dollars used by the Land and Water Conservation Fund is used to purchase inholdings to complete national parks and to work on wildlife refuges and other types of important public land designations across the country.

We all know that our national parks are suffering from the amount of visitors that they receive. We are grateful for the visitors, but that is a tremendous strain on roads and trails and the visitor centers across the country. For instance, in Rocky Mountain National Park, the third most heavily visited park in the Nation, there is an about \$85 million backlog, including trail maintenance, visitor centers, the sewage systems, the campgrounds, and some other challenges that they could help fix with the use of these dollars.

Last week I also talked about some important letters we had received, letters of support for the Great American

Outdoors Act, including a letter from the outdoor recreation industry. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the outdoor recreation industry be submitted for the RECORD.

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

JUNE 8, 2020.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL AND LEADER SCHUMER: The outdoor recreation industry is extremely encouraged by recent announcements that the Senate plans to hold a vote on the Great American Outdoors Act (GAOA) in June. As outdoor recreation business leaders, we know investments in recreation access and infrastructure are vital to the outdoor recreation industry and economies across the country.

Prior to the COVID-19 outbreak, the outdoor recreation industry contributed \$778 billion in economic output, accounted for 2.2 percent of United States Gross Domestic Product, supported 5.2 million jobs and was growing faster than the economy as a whole in every indicator. Unfortunately, due to the COVID-19 pandemic and shutdowns necessary to slow its progression, America's outdoor recreation economy was hindered when we needed the outdoors more than ever. Outdoor Recreation Roundtable's April survey of the sector shows that 79 percent of outdoor businesses have had to lay off or furlough employees, and 89 percent are seeing decreased revenue. However, we know there is a bright future for outdoor recreation ahead, as several sectors of the industry are already experiencing rapidly increasing demand.

These outdoor businesses are the backbone of our industry and range from specialty retailers, apparel, gear and vehicle manufacturers, outfitters and guides to campground and marina operators. They are often foundational to a community's economy. With rising unemployment and Americans eager to experience the outdoors, investment in our industry's core infrastructure—public lands and waters—will allow our businesses to get back to what we do best: stimulate local economies, put people back to work, and allow Americans to benefit from time spent outside.

This is why we respectfully ask you to pass the Great American Outdoors Act as soon as possible.

GAOA will fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) at \$900 million annually, providing more recreation access for communities across the country and fueling more outdoor recreation economic activity. In a nutshell, if Congress invests the intended amount of \$900 million into LWCF recreation access projects on local, state and federal lands, it will create much-needed close-to-home recreation opportunities while revitalizing the outdoor recreation economy.

Additionally, GAOA dedicates up to \$9.5 billion over the next five years to maintenance backlog projects that have been devastating our public lands and waters. Investing in these projects will improve outdoor recreation-related facilities such as docks, restrooms, campgrounds, trails, roads and more that have deteriorated significantly from decades of underfunded maintenance. As business leaders, we understand the need to make sure customers have good experiences when they visit stores or facilities, it ensures they come back again. Funding the maintenance backlog will also ensure that adequate infrastructure for all types of recreation on our public lands and waters exists so more people who are seeking the benefits the outdoors has to offer can get outside safely and grow our industry sustainably.

Passing GAOA now would stimulate the outdoor recreation industry made up of

thousands of businesses that support communities in all 50 states, support rural economies, create jobs to carry out essential work, and provide opportunities for millions of Americans to recreate on our public lands and waters for generations to come. We know this vital legislation is slated for a vote in the coming weeks and we urge you to move as quickly as possible to get this legislation across the finish line. Your support of GAOA is a vote for American jobs and health, community resiliency and the outdoor recreation economy. Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

Airstream, Inc., Alta Planning + Design, Inc., Arc'teryx Equipment Inc., Arété Structures, LLC, Bass Pro Shops, Bell Helmets, Blackburn Design, Blue Springs Marine, Boat Owners Association of the United States, Boat Owners Warehouse, Boats Incorporated, Brunswick Corporation.

Cabela's, CamelBak, Camperland of Oklahoma, Chaparral Boats, Inc., CHM Government Services, Chris-Craft, Clark Marine, Cleveland Boat Center, Correct Craft, Creative Pultrusions, Crestview RV.

Dee Zee, Inc., Delaware North Parks and Resorts, Eagle Claw Fishing Tackle, FERA, Forest River, Inc., Forever Resorts, Formula Boats, Fort Sumter Tours, Freedom Boat Club.

Galati Yacht Sales, Giro Sport Design, Glacier Guides & Montana Raft, Grand Design RV, Guest Services, Inc., Hagadone Marine Group, Handout Gloves, Head USA, Hellwig Products Company Inc., Hemlock Hill RV Sales, Hipcamp, Hornblower Cruises and Events.

Indian Lake Marina, Inc., Indmar Products, K2 Sports, Kamgrounds of America, Inc., Kawasaki Motors Corp., U.S.A., Lakeview Marine, Inc., LKQ Corporation, Magic Tilt Trailers, Malibu Boats, Inc., Marina Holdings, Marine Center of Indiana, Maverick Boat Group, Inc., Mount Dora Boating Center.

N3 Boatworks, Nantahala Outdoor Center, National Outdoor Leadership School, Newmar Corporation, Patagonia, Petzl America, Plano Synergy, Polaris, Inc., Port Harbor Marine, Priority RV Network, Pure Fishing.

Quality Bicycle Products, Rapala USA, Reed's Marine, Inc., Regulator Marine, Inc., REI, Rendezvous River Sports, Rhino Marking & Protection Systems.

Santa Barbara Adventure Company, Seirus Innovative Accessories, Inc., Shimano North America Fishing, Simms Fishing, Skyjacker Suspensions, Smoker Craft.

Spiritline Cruises, SRAM LLC, St. Croix Rods, Sun RV Resorts, Suzuki Motor of America, Inc., The North Face, Tiara Yachts & Tiara Sport, Trek Bikes, Turn 14 Distribution Inc.

VF Corporation, Vista Outdoor, Volvo Penta of the Americas, WARN Industries, Westrec Marinas, WET River Trips, Wildwater River Guides, Winnebago Industries, Xanterra Travel Collection, Yamaha Rightwaters, Yogi Bear's Jellystone Parks, Zebco Brands.

This letter is written by a number of some of the most notable names in the outdoors that people around the country would recognize: Polaris, Patagonia, and Colorado's own VF, headquartered now in Colorado.

In a State like Colorado, the outdoor economy is a huge driver of our State's economy, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of

economic activity. This letter from the outdoor recreation industry says they are extremely encouraged by the Great American Outdoors Act, and they note that this is an incredible opportunity to invest in recreation access and infrastructure, both of which are vital to the outdoor recreation industry and economies around the country.

Earlier today, we received another very important letter—a letter that I think a lot of people will find very important. This letter, dated June 15, 2020, begins with this paragraph:

From east to west, America is home to incredible lands, waters, and cultural treasures. Now, more than ever, we are relying on our public lands to get outdoors, to connect with the world, to support jobs, and to strengthen our communities. In this time of uncertainty, we have been given a once in a lifetime opportunity to protect our public lands and waters for all generations to come.

This letter was written by Theodore Roosevelt IV. This letter in support for the Great American Outdoors Act comes from the great-grandson of President Teddy Roosevelt.

Passing the Great American Outdoors Act would be taking a page from President Theodore Roosevelt's book: protecting the quintessence of who we are as Americans in the stewardship of our natural places, great and small. President Roosevelt set conservation as a priority—a duty—for a great and far-sighted nation in recognition that our national bounty is the foundation for all else. Without it, we cannot prosper.

I am glad to see strong bipartisan support for the GAOA in the House, Senate, and from the President. We are counting on you to protect and preserve our public lands. And we need your continued leadership to secure this monumental legislation.

Sincerely, Theodore Roosevelt IV.

I have talked often about the legacy President Roosevelt left our country when it comes to our lands and conservation. In fact, the genesis of the Great American Outdoors Act comes from a meeting Senator DAINES and I had, along with the majority leader, Senator McCONNELL, talking to the President in the Roosevelt Room at the White House about these two programs, which people like MARK WARNER, RICHARD BURR, ANGUS KING, JOE MANCHIN, MARTIN HEINRICH, MARIA CANTWELL, ROB PORTMAN, and LAMAR ALEXANDER worked so diligently on. We talked about the legacy Theodore Roosevelt has, and now we have this letter from his great-grandson securing that legacy for this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter from Theodore Roosevelt IV printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 15, 2020.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER McCONNELL, SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: From east to west, America is home to incredible lands, waters, and cultural treasures. Now, more than ever, we are relying on our public lands to get outdoors, to connect with the world, to support jobs, and to strength our communities. In this time of uncertainty, we have been given a once in a lifetime opportunity

to protect our public lands and waters for all generations to come.

I write to you today to urge swift passage and enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act (GAOA)—legislation that will provide much needed support to the outdoor places we all depend on. This bill will fully and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), our nation's most important conservation program, to ensure protection and increased access to public lands in every state and county in America. Additionally, GAOA will fund priority repairs in our National Parks and on other public lands to address an ever-growing backlog of maintenance needs.

This outstanding bipartisan legislation will ensure every American has access to the outdoors, no matter where they live. It will also help our communities and nation recover by creating jobs and economic growth across the country—in both cities and rural areas. Nationally, outdoor recreation contributes roughly \$778 billion in consumer spending and supports 5.2 million jobs. Moreover, economic analysis shows that every \$1 million invested in LWCF could support between 16 and 30 jobs, while national park funding in GAOA could support 100,000 jobs, \$17.5 billion in economic output, and contribute \$9.6 billion to the US GDP. At a time when small businesses are struggling, GAOA would provide much needed stimulus to get Americans outdoors and back to work.

Passing the Great American Outdoors Act would be taking a page from President Theodore Roosevelt's book: protecting the quintessence of who we are as Americans in the stewardship of our natural places, great and small. President Roosevelt set conservation as a priority—a duty—for a great and far-sighted nation in recognition that our natural bounty is the foundation for all else. Without it, we cannot prosper.

I am glad to see strong bipartisan support for GAOA in the House, Senate, and from the President. We are counting on you to protect and preserve our public lands. And we need your continued leadership to secure this monumental legislation.

Sincerely,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT IV.

Mr. GARDNER. I know tonight we will have continued conversations about the legislation and the cost of the legislation. There are some who will say that this bill isn't paid for or perhaps that the revenues aren't accounted for properly. I would like to speak to the contrary. Again, I will be speaking about this later this evening.

If you look at how this bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, is funded, it doesn't cost the taxpayer money. It comes from offshore oil and gas revenue. That is revenue generated from oil and gas production on Federal land in fiscal year 2019, which totaled \$11.6 billion. This is just an example of one of the years of funding.

In 2019, the revenue generated from oil and gas was about \$11.6 billion; \$11.6 billion went into the Treasury.

Right off the top of that, \$2.4 billion went to the States. We don't change that. The \$2.4 billion goes to the States. This bill does not change that.

Another \$1 billion of that \$11.6 billion from back in 2019—the same formula would apply every year—another \$1 billion went to Tribal entities right off the top.

So \$2.4 billion went to States, and another \$1 billion went to Tribal entities.

After that, \$1.7 billion of this amount of money went to the Reclamation Fund. To get this straight, there is funding that goes out to the States, funding that goes out to Tribal entities, and funding that goes to the Reclamation Fund.

Then fourth in line for this, \$1 billion went to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

A curious thing happened on the way to the forum, as they say. Only \$495 million got appropriated to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. So \$1 billion gets taken out of the money in 2019, the \$11.6 billion, with \$1 billion to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but only \$495 million gets appropriated. That is because even though it was authorized to get more, that money has been syphoned off and spent on other things.

And \$150 million went to the Historic Preservation Fund.

That is a total of \$5.25 billion from 2019. That is what we accounted for so far out of that revenue: money to the States, money to Tribal entities, money to the Reclamation Fund, \$1 billion to the LWCF fund even though only \$495 million got appropriated, and \$150 million to the Historic Preservation Fund. That left \$5.35 billion that went directly into Treasury. That is the money that would be used—at least a portion of it—for the Restore Our Parks Act.

You can see this is paid for. Congress just has bad habits that need to be corrected around here. We will have additional time to have that conversation this evening and obviously others about the merits of this legislation and what it means.

There has been more and more talk around the country about how this isn't just about national parks and it isn't just about national forests; it is about our urban parks and urban centers. Some of our colleagues made passionate, eloquent statements about the need for access in all of our communities, to make sure we have more access for communities across the country—our urban settings, our rural settings, whether it is a ballpark or some other kind of recreation activity at a park.

This is the opportunity for us to get to work, with no cost to the taxpayer, to do something we can all be proud of. I am grateful that Mr. Roosevelt would send a letter highlighting the work this Congress is doing that can stand, generations later, the test of Teddy Roosevelt's leadership and the opportunity for us to build on the leadership of President Roosevelt.

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

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am here on the floor today to talk about the legislation that is before the Senate, which is a great opportunity to help our national parks.

The bill does a number of things that people have heard about to help with regard to our public lands, with regard to fishing access, and with regard to community parks. Yet one thing it does that is absolutely essential is it included the Restore Our Parks Act. That is legislation which is necessary right now to fix our national parks.

I say fix our national parks—they are our treasure. When people are asked about the national parks, they usually use that word. It is a treasure. It is a great asset of the United States. I think Ken Burns said it is “America’s best idea.” He did a great documentary on the parks, by the way.

The point is, our national parks are spectacular. They are majestic. They tell the history of our country. There are so many good things about them. The problem is that right now, our parks are under a huge backlog of maintenance projects—\$12.5 billion. That is way more than the parks’ budget. They just can’t get out from under it. It has been happening for years and years.

Think about people going back to our parks this summer after the coronavirus hopefully gets better and people are able to go to these reopened parks. We will probably have huge attendance. When they get there, they will find out that a trail is closed because of erosion, or the bathroom doesn’t work because the bathroom has deteriorated, or they can’t go to the visitors center because the ceiling has been leaking, which caused mold on the walls, which caused the floors to buckle, or the highways and bridges are crumbling. This is what is happening in our national parks.

As Members of Congress, we asked them to give us a full list over the last few years of this because we keep hearing about this, and they have. They have talked about \$6.5 million of high-priority projects and about \$6 billion of priority projects, and the list continues to grow.

By the way, the costs continue to compound. In other words, they get worse and worse every year. Just think about your own home. If you don’t fix the leaky roof I have talked about, you will have all these other problems. If you can get to it and fix it when it happens, you will have much lower costs. All of us as taxpayers should want to fix this maintenance backlog and be able to say that not only are these parks a treasure, but these parks are open, everything is open, and we can do a better job in stewardship. This legislation does that.

Not a penny of the funding, by the way, can go toward expansion of the parks. I have heard that from some of my colleagues—well, you all keep putting money into expanding the parks. No, that is not what this is about. This

is about stewardship. This is about ensuring that we take better care of what we have. I can’t think of a more fiscally conservative idea than that. I think it is important for us to realize that this legislation before us is not about expanding anything; it is about taking better care of what we have.

The annual appropriations from Congress to the parks funds the rangers, the nature programs, and the basics to continue to operate the parks. They do not fund these maintenance backlog problems or these big projects. We have been ignoring them for decades, by the way. This is not new. It has built up and is getting worse and worse as the costs compound.

Let me give an example. Cuyahoga Valley National Park is in Ohio. We love Cuyahoga Valley. It is the 13th most visited national park in the country. You may never have heard of it, but if you are in the Akron-Cleveland area, I hope you go. It is spectacular. Guess what. They have a maintenance backlog of just over \$50 million. Their annual budget from the Park Service is \$11 million. That covers everything. That operates the entire park—the 13th most visited park in America. It is a beautiful park that extends basically from Cleveland to Akron. It is beautiful along the Cuyahoga River. It is beautiful. It has a tourism train that goes through it, a single-track, narrow-gauge train. It is just a great place. The train tracks are falling apart. That is a huge expense that can’t come out of this annual budget because you have to replace the ties and so on.

There is a bridge that I saw that is crumbling. It is not going to be able to be used soon by bicyclists or hikers to go over the river because it is falling apart. That bridge is a capital expense. It takes a lot of funding to do that and to do it right. So the legislation before us says: Let’s take this on. Let’s get started on getting this backlog behind us so that we can focus on having the most majestic and the most beautiful parks in the world here that we can continue to be proud of.

The way we do it is really interesting. We say, OK, we are going to continue to have the annual appropriations, and we are going to properly fund the parks that way, but for these backlog problems, we are going to take funding from offshore and onshore oil and gas and other energy projects that are currently going directly into the government, and we are going to take no more than half of that funding that is unobligated—in other words, not obligated to any other purpose—and we are going to say: Let’s use that funding, up to a cap every year, to reduce about half the backlog over the next 5 years. It is the priority projects I talked about, the \$6.5 billion.

To me, this makes all the sense in the world. Again, it is going to save us money over time—assuming we want our parks to be working, we want the trails to be open, we want the business centers to be open, which of course we

do and we must. Our parks are more visited than ever, and it is important that we have parks that are ready, particularly when people start to go back to the parks this summer.

Some of my colleagues have come to the floor and said: Well, isn’t there another way to do this? I mean, I wish there were, but this is a pretty good funding source.

For those who say it is not paid for, well, I am telling you what the funding source is. Is it the royalties that come off of these energy projects.

By the way, this is for a good conservation cause and a good fiscally conservative cause—to get these long-term maintenance problems under control so that they don’t continue to grow and grow and grow.

I first started on the project over 13 years ago, which is why it is kind of exciting for me that is finally coming, I hope, to fruition here in the Senate, at least.

I was the OMB Director for George W. Bush—the Office of Management and Budget—and in our budget in 2007, we put in place a centennial project for the parks. The Park Service celebrated its 100th anniversary in 2016, and building up to that, we wanted to deal with this long-term maintenance backlog and provide some more funding for the parks.

I worked with the Secretary of the Interior at the time—this was, again, the George W. Bush administration, a Republican administration. I worked with Democrats here on the Hill. We worked with all the outside groups concerned about the parks and came up with a creative way to get public-private partnership money in it to provide more funding for this long-term maintenance problem. We were not successful in getting Congress to take it up and to appropriate those funds at the time, but I continued working on this.

A couple years later when I was asked to serve on the centennial commission on the parks—I was not in office at that time. I had left politics—thinking forever—but now I am back here in the Senate. But on the centennial commission, we analyzed what was going on in the parks in connection with the centennial coming up, in 2016, and what was the No. 1 issue? Of course it was this long-term maintenance backlog and how do you deal with it and the great frustration people felt because we just couldn’t get on top of it. So I have been at this for some time.

Again, I see that some of my colleagues are saying there must be other ways to fund this, and some have suggested, well, let’s raise some fees.

Well, I am the author of the Centennial Act, which was passed about 3 years ago—on the last day, practically, of session in 2016. That legislation actually took the senior fee, which is the lifetime senior pass, and increased it, actually quadrupled it, to provide more funding for this very purpose and other purposes at the parks.

That was not without controversy. I can show you some of the letters and emails that I got and some of the phone calls that we received with regard to increasing the senior pass. But we did it for the right reasons—because we thought the senior pass was a relatively good deal—which it still is, by the way. It is a tremendous deal for our seniors. But we decided we were going to take some heat on this in order to provide more revenue for the park because we were so frustrated because we couldn't find other sources.

I am also the author of the Centennial Challenge as part of that legislation, which allows for the private sector to provide funding to our parks. Again, we did this because we were very interested in finding more funding. The Centennial Challenge Fund is a public-private partnership. It requires that every Federal dollar that goes into the parks be matched at least one-to-one with a private sector dollar. And I have been involved with that. I have been involved in selling that program and encouraging the private sector to do more.

Since we passed that in 2008—fiscal year 2008—Congress has provided \$129 million in appropriations, which has been leveraged by an additional \$167 million in non-Federal funding. In other words, it has been more than one-to-one. There has been more than 1 dollar of private sector funding that has matched the 1 dollar of Federal funding, so that has worked. But, folks, it has its limits. We are talking about \$12.5 billion in the backlog, and the numbers I just gave you—we were able to raise \$167 million in non-Federal funding.

So I would just say to my colleagues who say “Gosh, why can't you raise fees and so on?”—that has been done.

I will say also with regard to fees into some of our parks, it is not very practical. At the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, as an example, there are literally dozens of entrances to the park. I mean, the park is in a suburban area through Akron and Cleveland, that area, and you can get to the park through all sorts of different roads and avenues, and there is no grand entrance to the park. There is a great visitors center, which people are encouraged to go to as they enter the park, but there are bike trails through it, and there is a railroad through it, as I talked about, and there are lots of roads that come into it. So it is not like you are driving into Yellowstone Park and you have to go through a designated entrance.

So is there more we can do in some of these areas to provide additional payoffs to the parks? I am sure there are, and I will continue to work on that, and I will continue to look at ways to do it. But \$12.5 billion? It is not going to happen without a lot of controversy. So this is about being sure we are doing what is right for our parks.

It is also, though, helpful in terms of jobs, as you can imagine, because these

projects are infrastructure. We talk a lot about that around here and, typically we don't even think about paying for it. We just say we are going to do an infrastructure stimulus project, as an example, as was done back in 2008 and 2009.

In this case, these are shovel-ready and vetted projects. Again, we have required, as Congress, for the Park Service to tell us what the projects are. So I can give you a list for your State. I have done that with my colleagues—given them the list of what the top priorities are for their States, how much money it is, what the project is, how you do it. You don't have to go and get the permits that you might have to get on non-Federal land because these are on national park property, and they just keep building up, higher and higher, but they are ready. They are ready to go. They are also vetted. They also don't have to go through the same process that some would if they were on non-private land.

They create a lot of jobs. We just had a report that has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget that came out of the Park Service showing that the number of jobs that are direct jobs related to this national park restoration act we are voting on today is over 40,000 jobs when you do direct and indirect, including suppliers to these projects.

So you have the person who is fixing the bridge I talked about or the railroad tracks, but who provides the material to put in the new railroad ties? It is over 100,000 jobs. So over 100,000 jobs are created just from this legislation.

So it is the right thing to do no matter what, but it also happens to be a really opportune time for us to put in place some funding that goes directly into good-paying, high-quality jobs—average pay, \$65,000 to \$70,000 a year—to be able to help with regard to the post-coronavirus economic downturn we have seen and will see for some time.

So this is good legislation for all these reasons.

There has also been an analysis done recently about what happens if you don't fix these parks and the parks aren't able to open.

There is a \$41 billion economic benefit for communities around the parks. That is \$41 billion a year. Think about that. It supports more than 340,000 jobs. These are not jobs in the parks themselves but surrounding. So these are the restaurants and the hotels and the outfitters and so on.

Our national parks are not only a great way for us to help create more jobs with regard to the infrastructure needs that are overwhelming, with good stewardship—not expanding one acre but just taking better care of what we have—but it is also an opportunity for us to help our economy, to help ensure that we are putting people back to work in good-paying jobs, and help ensure that taxpayers aren't going

to foot an even higher bill by not taking care of that leaky roof that then causes the mold on the wall that then causes the floor to couple.

We are going to get this started. Will there be need for more funding? Absolutely. Again, some of the ideas I have talked to my colleagues about on how to find additional funding, I am all ears. Again, I have done it. I have raised the fees in legislation. I have looked at the private sector, and we brought in over \$150 million of private sector money. But this \$6.5 billion, which is the amount in this legislation, to deal with the highest priority infrastructure projects and problems at our parks is absolutely essential.

Let's not wait any longer. Let's get this done now and ensure we can continue to enjoy not just the beauty and the history of our national parks but also those economic benefits I talked about and do so for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, it seems clear this body is prepared to pass the Great American Outdoors Act. It will be doing so without the bipartisan language to strengthen coastal resiliency around the country, sending a final message to the American people that the Senate cares more about parks than it does about people.

Let me just say a couple things first. My colleague has just said that this is paid for. I almost burst out laughing. It is paid for by taking dollars currently obligated to go to the U.S. Treasury and shuffling them over. That is paid for like I am going to take money that is going for groceries and instead I am going to pay for the movie theater. We are going to take money that is spent on essentials and spend it on something that is wonderful, but no one would say it is essential.

And I say that one only needs to follow the money—to follow the money—to see that the Senate cares more about parks than it does about people.

The Great American Outdoors Act will spend billions on deferred maintenance—broken toilets, leaky roofs, et cetera—in national parks, but, in fact, 60 percent of this money is going to seven States.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund spending shows the disparity clearly, spending \$17.66 per capita on inland States, while just \$7.53 on coastal States, and is spoken of as an economic development tool, raising \$40-something billion for the communities in which the investment is made, which tells you why the Senators from these seven States are the cosponsors of the bill. Who wouldn't want \$40 billion in economic activity at the expense of everybody else?

But who is it at the expense of? Forty-two percent of Americans live in parishes or counties in coastal United States; 85 percent of Americans live in those coastal States; and zero percent

of this money is going to address coastal resiliency—areas increasingly threatened by rising sea levels and flooding, lives being lost, communities being upended by catastrophic flood events such as hurricanes can cause. I have seen it in my State of Louisiana. We have seen it on the news. We should be painfully aware at this point of the devastation hurricanes and other flooding disasters can cause in our society.

So the Great American Outdoors Act spends billions on where people vacation but absolutely nothing on where people live.

I have been vocal in my opposition to the bill in its current form, and the reasons for that opposition have been misconstrued, so let me please now clarify.

I heard one Senator say that I only wanted money for Gulf States. Yes, I do want money for Gulf States. Louisiana has been the hardest hit by coastal erosion.

By the way, 90 percent of the funding for the Great American Outdoors Act comes from energy production off the gulf coast. But I want funding for all coastal States.

Louisiana's wetlands are eroding into the gulf at the rate of one football field per hour, but we are not alone. Go to barrier islands on the eastern coast. Go to Alaska and see the communities that are dissolving into the ocean. Miami property values are falling as the Atlantic Ocean rises, threatening with greater flooding, causing rising insurance rates, and causing lower property values. That is Miami Beach, Sea Island, GA; Cape Fear, NC; Rhode Island; Maine; you name it—each has water coming higher than it ever has.

Wouldn't it have been great if, as these bills passed out of the committee together, a coastal resiliency piece of legislation had been added to the Great American Outdoors Act? But now the 42 percent of Americans who live on the beach, live in a coastal parish or county, and the 85 percent who live in a coastal State are waiting for some help to come later.

Now, that said, some have said I am against giving any money to the national parks. Nothing could be further from the truth. I have stated before from this very desk in speeches on this issue that I believe that national parks are a vital part of the American experience. Just as one of my colleagues said, they provide opportunities for Americans to experience a natural environment and learn about our Nation's history.

I would vote happily for the Great American Outdoors Act, giving it billions, if only we would spend at least a little bit—maybe a dime—on coastal resiliency for where people live. I am not against parks; I am just against parks over people.

As people misstated my opposition, they correctly stated the reason they do not wish to include my language to provide protection—coastal resiliency—for the parishes and counties

where people live. This is the one true thing: Folks are afraid that if the coastal resiliency legislation is included, the bill would not pass. For some, it would be perceived as encouraging offshore drilling, that it would raise issues of climate change, and, again, that it would not pass.

Well, there are several responses. First, if you don't try, you fail. Henry Ford said: Whether you say that you can or you say you cannot, you are correct. Such is the case with this bill.

If people say that we cannot include legislation for coastal resiliency to protect parishes and counties where 42 percent of Americans live, we can't do so because it would not be included in the first place.

Secondly, it was said that the Great American Outdoors Act is based on revenue from offshore drilling, and therefore folks would not vote for it—again, one of those things you have to almost laugh at because if people really think that, it is either the epitome of hypocrisy, or it just shows gross ignorance. The Great American Outdoors Act is funded with revenue from offshore oil and gas production. So for someone to say that, no, folks won't vote for a coastal resiliency bill because it relies upon offshore oil and gas revenue, but they are to support the Great American Outdoors Act, which relies on offshore oil and gas revenue to pay for it—again, you just have to laugh. It is either hypocrisy, or it is gross ignorance. I actually think it is just not true; that the real reason the coastal resiliency bill is not included is that folks are afraid that if it is included, it would not pass.

One of my colleagues who agrees with me on this issue said that it is kind of like being in a lifeboat and you say: We are in; pull up the ladder. Once we got this legislation in a form that would pass, the folks who wanted it to pass, whose States disproportionately benefit from this, that they will recognize and realize the economic development, they said: Let's pull up the ladder. We don't care about coastal resiliency enough that we are going to actually include legislation that would support it financially. So they had their money. They achieved their objective. The heck with those at risk from rising sea levels. The heck with those 85 percent of people who live in coastal States, the 42 percent who live in a coastal parish or county. We will get our bathrooms fixed, the potholes done. Come visit us. You will absolutely need to because, in the meantime, you will be flooding.

So the idea of getting your funding and your bill in place—you are on the life raft, and then pulling up the ladder brought to mind this image.

Here you see folks being pulled up a ladder. Hurricane Katrina. The wetlands south of New Orleans had eroded into the ocean. When Katrina hit, it was almost a straight shot to those levees, and such a straight shot, eventually they collapsed. Because they

collapsed, we had flooding in New Orleans.

There you see a truck almost completely submerged.

There you see somebody who broke through their roof so that they could get on top of their roof so they could be rescued. They are being pulled up because the people who wrote this bill said, No, if we include the coastal resiliency, our bill will not pass; therefore, we aren't going to try. Because they said, By golly, we are in the life raft and being pulled up a ladder, there will be many more Americans who will be pulled up a ladder, but they will be pulled up a ladder by the Coast Guard, which will rescue them from a rooftop because of rising sea levels—and, therefore, flooding and hurricanes—in their hometowns. I would like to say that this would be a rare event. We have seen it increasingly, though. Again, since more and more Americans live in coastal parishes and counties, this will become a bigger and bigger issue. So this photo seems appropriate.

Folks didn't want to try. They feared that caring for Americans and helping to prevent an incident such as this would imperil the fixing of potholes in national parks located disproportionately in seven States. Again, because of that, we will have more scenes like this—more deaths, more devastation, more lives in turmoil, and billions upon billions that will be spent on disaster relief because this body will have refused to have invested in coastal resiliency. If there were ever a case of a stitch in time could save nine, it would be this.

Again, folks, ask: Well, what could you do with coastal resiliency?

I will just speak of Terrebonne Parish in South Louisiana, which borders the Gulf of Mexico. They recently put in a flood wall. There was a high water event, and of the 10,000 homes that would have been flooded—maybe with \$1 billion or \$2 billion in disaster relief—no flooding occurred because of an investment in coastal resiliency.

Now, we can do it if we try, but if we say we are not going to, then we are in the life raft that is being pulled up the ladder, and we have our money, and potholes will be fixed in our home States. In the meantime, if you are in a parish or a State or a county, we will be there afterward to give you money through FEMA, but we will not be there beforehand to keep you from flooding in the first place. This is what happens when you put parks over people. Perhaps this Senate should reverse this and put people over parks.

At the outset, I said that the Great American Outdoors Act is going to pass. I see it. They have done their work, and it is going to pass. I will just go home tonight, frustrated, thinking of this picture and how many more we have. Yet, if the sponsors of this bill who have been all about "we will be with you next time" are truly, truly wanting to prevent another incident like this, then maybe they will join my

bipartisan coalition that advocates for either a coastal amendment or some legislation in the future. They will show that they are as willing to fight as hard to save the lives of those who live on our coastline as they are to secure the funding to fix broken toilets and potholes and leaky roofs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, we have a series of votes today on the Great American Outdoors Act, including one to adopt the substitute amendment. There are 60 of my Senate colleagues who cosponsored this bill, and 20 more joined us last week, resulting in strong, bipartisan votes to begin consideration of the bill. These votes today will put us within 1 vote of passing this important bipartisan legislation.

Over the last week, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have taken to the floor to talk about how the Great American Outdoors Act will benefit the entire country, and they have shared examples of how their home States have been positively impacted already by the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is a testament to the importance of this historic conservation legislation that has brought so many of us together during such a toxic atmosphere. Yet that is the beauty of our Nation's great outdoors. It brings us all together—all walks and shapes and political preferences. It makes no difference. We all love the outdoors, and it is available for everyone to enjoy in any number of ways, whether that be through hunting, hiking, fishing, biking, or just simply by soaking in nature.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been responsible for helping to acquire many of our Nation's most iconic and scenic lands and to provide wonderful outdoor recreational opportunities, but it is important to remember that it is also used in many ways that provide an economic boost to our States and counties, whether that be through an LWCF grant that allows community spaces to be built, like the 47 community pools the LWCF supported across my beautiful State of West Virginia, or a baseball field in Colorado.

It is also a job creator. A recent analysis from Boston University shows that, at the full funding of \$900 million annually, the LWCF could support approximately 15,000 to 28,000 jobs at a time when our country needs them most.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a major contributor to the rapidly growing outdoor recreation economy. According to the most recent information provided by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the U.S. outdoor recreation economy accounts for 2.2 percent, or \$427 billion, of our Nation's gross domestic product. Likewise, the Outdoor Industry Association has cal-

culated that the outdoor recreation economy generates almost \$890 million in annual consumer spending and supports over 7.6 million jobs.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been able to do wonderful things with the funds that have been appropriated to date even though those appropriations, in recent years, have averaged only about half of the authorized funding level. In previous years, they were even less than that. Just imagine what we can achieve for our country with the full LWCF funding of \$900 million per year as the Great American Outdoors Act would provide.

We need to secure this funding because, since the Land and Water Conservation Fund was established 55 years ago and despite the fact that every State, every territory, and almost every county in this country has benefited from the LWCF, it has only been fully funded twice. I say it has only been fully funded twice in 55 years. The passing of the permanent LWCF authorization last year was an important step, but securing a permanent, dedicated funding source for the multiple conservation programs funded by the LWCF is the ultimate goal.

I would be remiss not to acknowledge the many Democratic Senators and Members of the House, both retired and here today, who have been champions for LWCF. They have helped to pave the way of where we are today—within striking distance of realizing the goal of permanent, mandatory funding.

I am incredibly proud, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, as the sponsor of the LWCF Permanent Funding Act, and as the lead Democrat on this bill, to be in good company of 43 of my Democratic colleagues who have signed onto this legislation.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations as well, I have heard the concerns that this bill sidesteps the ability of the committee to oversee LWCF expenditures, so I want to take a moment to clarify that this isn't the case. The Great American Outdoors Act retains congressional oversight and involvement in determining how the mandatory funding is allocated.

To quote from the bill: "Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available, including allocations by account, program, and project." There is similar language for deferred maintenance spending.

The Great American Outdoors Act is necessary, however, to ensure that the full \$900 million each year that is authorized for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is spent so that we don't end up with what has happened over the past 50 years, wherein over \$21 billion has been deposited into the Land and Water Conservation Fund but has not been used for LWCF purposes. It never will be. We will never see that. It is in the Treasury. Similarly, the Great American Outdoors Act takes the necessary step of putting \$9.5 bil-

lion toward deferred maintenance projects on Federal lands, with 70 percent of that amount dedicated for our national parks. This legislation will be the most significant reduction ever in eliminating a major portion of deferred maintenance backlog on our national parks and public lands.

The impact of failing to fund maintenance for so long is clear to see for the hundreds of millions of visitors to our public lands each year. This includes the deterioration of historic buildings at Independence Hall; the failing water treatment facilities at Yosemite and the Grand Canyon; the public access roads at our national parks and our forests that are in disrepair; and outdated and unsafe employee housing. We need to do better in taking care of these very, very special places.

The infrastructure projects that will be funded through this bill are critical to protecting many of our national treasures, and like the LWCF funding, it will provide a significant benefit to the outdoor recreation economy. The Great American Outdoors Act will help us to be good stewards of our public lands while, at the same time, it will create thousands of new jobs. It is a bipartisan win-win.

At the end of the day, this is an opportunity for us to pass down a legacy to our kids, to our grandkids, and to generations to come. I believe this will be the most impactful nationwide conservation legislation since the Land and Water Conservation Fund was first created over 50 years ago, and 50 years from now, I know that this body will be remembered for getting this bill across the finish line. We have broad, bipartisan support with 60 Senators signing on, which is representative of how important these bills are to every State. We have support from the administration and unwavering support from over 900 conservation and sportsmen's groups throughout the Nation.

I know that not all of my colleagues can support this bill and that others would have liked to have seen their priorities added. I also want to mention that I know it has been portrayed by some that we are doing one instead of the other. We are taking care of recreation and outdoors. There might be coastal deterioration, and we are very concerned about that. Yet I want you to know that, since there has been offshore drilling, a tremendous amount of those resources have gone to the four coastal States of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas. Louisiana is the only State that has used all of its funds for coastal restoration, and I applaud it for that. I know how costly that has been and how costly it will be, and we will help in any way we possibly can.

It is not an either-or. It is not that we are getting this and that they are being punished for something else. That is not the case whatsoever. We are finally getting the funds that were basically dedicated 55 years ago that never did go to the LWCF, the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We have

over \$9 billion in our park system that needs to be for repairs, and we are using these funds in the most prudent possible way we can. We would hope that everyone would look at it in the most positive way and pass something that we could all look back on and be very, very proud of.

I know that my commitment, as the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, is to work with Senators on their priorities. It always has been, and it always will be no matter what one's party affiliation—Democrat or Republican. When you are in a position of being a ranking member or of being chairman of that committee, you work with all of the committee members, which helps to ensure the consideration of those committee bills on the Senate floor.

What we saw last week and that I anticipate we will see again today is a shining example of Democrats and Republicans coming together to put politics aside to do what is best for conserving the natural resources of this great Nation. So I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting yes on each of the three votes tonight. They are all very, very important. They will get us closer to the final passage of the Great American Outdoors Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Great American Outdoors Act and on the fact that this legislation will add over \$17 billion to our deficit over the next 10 years.

When I first rose to speak on this bill and on my amendment to it, I closed by saying that if we could not pay for even a portion of this bill, then we were in worse trouble than I had thought. Sadly, I rise today, knowing that we, apparently, want such trouble.

During this fiscal year, we have already run up a deficit of \$1.9 trillion—more than twice the size of the deficit we ran at the same time last year. We also just added \$2.4 trillion to our debt as the Nation necessarily responded to the coronavirus pandemic.

For the past 2 years, I have been working on and consistently suggesting a way to responsibly pay for deferred maintenance at our national parks. I love our national parks and have fond memories of visiting our first national park, Yellowstone, and many other parks when I was younger and still today. That is why I offered my amendment that would have created a paid-for legacy restoration fund that would have ensured permanently dedicated revenue for our parks and their maintenance needs.

For the longest time, I was told that my spending concerns would be addressed when the bill moved out of committee. When the bill moved to the floor, I asked that my amendment be included in the substitute or that it receive a vote. It was not included, and we did not receive a vote.

While my amendment did not address it, I would also mention that many of my colleagues regularly express concern about how we increasingly have moved discretionary spending to mandatory spending. This bill does just that with the Land and Water Conservation provisions.

Mandatory spending is always renewed and never voted on or evaluated again. When the Land and Water Conservation Fund was permanently authorized at the start of this Congress, we were told that its spending would remain subject to appropriations and the oversight that goes with that. Instead, we are taking away that protection and increasing mandatory spending even more without increasing revenue. That means more additional national debt each year without a single vote.

So here we are today, asking future generations to pay for what we are not even willing to consider paying for when we could have responsibly funded the maintenance provisions. We won't even consider my amendment that would have a modest charge to foreign visitors as part of their visa fees to help to address this issue, and that is revenue that will be lost forever from the tourists because we can only collect the fees when they buy visas. The revenues cannot be collected retroactively. If we won't pay for even a part of the bill, what will we pay for?

Congress must stop with gimmick spending, wherein we attempt to spend the same money twice. That is what this bill does. If we keep adding new mandatory spending without adding new revenue, Congress will be forced at some point to eliminate mandatory spending or to get new funding streams that survive well into the future. Mandatory spending is the portion of our bill that will be covered by this that we will not vote on. We will not take a look at it again. They say, yes, there will be oversight—not on whether we spend it, not on where the money comes from. There will not be another opportunity on that. Therefore, I oppose this legislation and oppose adding to the already massive debt burden being placed on future generations and the increase in mandatory spending when the solution to charge foreigners is available.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, the pending amendment, No. 1617, would violate the Senate pay-go rule by increasing the on-budget deficit. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this measure pursuant to section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

MOTION TO WAIVE A POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable

sections of that Act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of amendment No. 1617, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, just to talk a little about bit how this bill is funded, again, the legislation relies on the use of the oil and gas revenues from both onshore for part of the bill and offshore for other parts of the bill, and that has been the tradition of the legislation since its passage in 1965 until 5 years ago, since we have had the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Of course, the new Historic Preservation Act provisions rely on these revenues as well.

To give you kind of a run-through or an example of how this would have proceeded in 2019—and thanks to my colleague Senator ALEXANDER for really pointing this out and highlighting how this funding works—it would have been the total revenues generated from offshore production and the revenues that the Federal Government would have received from that. This gives us, I think, a good example of how this works.

The revenue generated from oil and gas production on Federal land in fiscal year 2019 totaled about \$11.6 billion. Of that \$11.6 billion, \$2.4 billion went to the States. First out of the gate was the \$2.4 billion. Now, this may change from year to year, but the formula distribution is the same. So \$2.4 billion of that went to the States. Another \$1 billion went to Tribal entities. Then another \$1.7 billion went to the reclamation funds.

First, the money comes into the Treasury. It goes out to the States. Then it goes out to the Tribal entities. Then it goes out to the reclamation fund. Then \$1 billion goes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In this last year, Congress appropriated, though, to the Land and Water Conservation Fund \$495 million, and the rest of the money got siphoned off and went somewhere else. Then \$150 million went to the Historic Preservation Fund, which was a total of \$5.25 billion in 2019 for this distribution. That left about \$5.35 billion to go directly to the Treasury.

These dollars that we are using help to fund the Restore Our Parks Act to catch up with deferred maintenance. I think our colleague Senator PORTMAN has done an outstanding job of explaining that this deferred maintenance is also considered debt. So we are actually using these dollars that have been collected from oil and gas revenues that have gone to the Treasury and have been distributed out to go to the debt and the deferred maintenance projects at national parks across the country: Colorado National; \$85 million for Rocky Mountain National Park, \$75

million for Mesa Verde; \$8 million for the Great Sand Dunes; \$7 million for Black Canyon National Park; and the list goes on and on. That is not even including the Forest Service, the BLM lands, and other efforts by the Bureau of Indian Education. That is how this revenue would work.

I also wanted to point this out again to my colleagues, some of whom may have heard this before and some may not have. Today, June 15, 2020, we received a letter that was written to Senator MCCONNELL, Senator SCHUMER, Speaker PELOSI, and Leader MCCARTHY from Teddy Roosevelt IV. This is the great-grandson of President Teddy Roosevelt. I will read it here:

From east to west, America is home to incredible lands, waters, and cultural treasures. Now, more than ever, we are relying on our public lands to get outdoors, to connect with the world, to support jobs, and strengthen our communities. In this time of uncertainty, we have been given a once in a lifetime opportunity to protect our public lands and waters for all generations to come.

I write to you today to urge swift passage and enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act (GAOA)—legislation that will provide much needed support to the outdoor places we all depend on. This bill will fully and permanently help fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), our nation's most important conservation program, to ensure protection and increased access to public lands in every state and county in America. Additionally, GAOA will fund priority repairs in our National Parks and on other public lands to address an ever-growing backlog of maintenance needs.

The letter goes on and talks about the principles of President Roosevelt and the public lands protections that this Congress continues to build upon, standing on the shoulders of those generations past so that we can preserve and protect our generations to come.

I know it has been said by some of the opposition to the legislation that there are no people who live in the areas where the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Restore Our Parks Act helps, that this goes to protect States that apparently don't have enough people to merit it.

Look, every State in the Union has benefited from legislation covered by the Great American Outdoors Act. Every county—nearly every county—across the country has benefitted from programs within the Great American Outdoors Act. It is not just national parks. My town in Colorado, in the Eastern Plains, is 40 miles away from the Kansas-Nebraska border. We don't have a national park in our county. It is several hours to get to Rocky Mountain National Park. But even that little town that I live in, in that little tiny county in the Eastern Plains of Colorado, has benefited from the Land and Water Conservation Fund—whether it was decades ago, the purchase of water rights that went along with the reservoir, called Bonny Reservoir in the Eastern Plains, to help protect those water rights or recreation opportunity for youth. This is a farming community. We live in the High Plains.

There are no mountains around us. There are no ski areas around us. Yet this has helped us too. It helps all Americans. It helps corner to corner across this great Nation.

Tonight, we are going to be given a choice and a chance to vote on three different efforts. I hope my colleagues will join me in waiving the budget point of order, as I have laid out in my objection and in my request for a waiver. I hope my colleagues will join me in the next votes following that—one of which will require a simple majority and one of which will require, yet again, a 60-vote threshold.

This is an opportunity for us to work together on a bipartisan basis—the House and the Senate, Republicans and Democrats coming together, and with the White House. They have announced their support. The President announced his support for this legislation several months ago. We come together to do something that we can build upon for this country—the greatest ideas this country has ever put forward—our public lands, our public places, and most special spaces in America.

In Colorado, Wyoming, Louisiana, California, New Mexico, and in every State, we see dollars coming in and jobs being created because of this legislation—the land that this legislation represents and the policies that this legislation will cover.

It is estimated that this legislation will create 100,000 jobs—over 100,000 jobs, quite frankly—just in the national parks section alone. And the way the economy is right now, every one of those jobs matters. For every \$1 million that is spent in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it supports nearly 16 to 30 jobs. For every \$1 million, it supports another 16 to 30 jobs.

I think one of the most important factors in the jobs analysis is where we are at in the country with the economic crisis we face. When the coronavirus came into Colorado—that first wave, the initial step—it hit our Western Slope communities the hardest. You had a lot of international visitors coming to ski the best skiing areas in the country. You had a lot of travelers from the Front Range coming up to enjoy the weekend, and it created some big challenges from COVID-19 in those communities as a result. Some of those towns have 20 percent, 22 percent, 23 percent unemployment in the immediate aftermath of the pandemic and the shutdowns of restaurants and hotels, and the ski areas shut down a couple of months earlier than they normally would have.

Of course, it didn't just impact the winter ski season and the winter recreation season. It impacted the summer recreation season. Outfitters who had their trips canceled, who had their reservations yanked because you couldn't travel or you couldn't go out, decided it wouldn't be right to stay at a hotel or maybe the hotel was closed. If you were out camping, the parks were closed as well. I think that became one

of the reasons why this legislation is so important too. It is not just about the resources. It is not just about protecting the public lands. It is about the jobs that can be created in these public land communities that were hit hardest and first by that initial wave of coronavirus.

That is all the more reason I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to waive the budget point of order, as well as the procedural votes that we will have this evening and the eventual passage of the legislation itself, the Great American Outdoors Act, which most likely will occur sometime Wednesday morning, maybe around noon or so.

I am grateful for the support of people like Teddy Roosevelt, great-grandson of President Roosevelt. I am grateful for the support of my colleagues and the work of Senators HEINRICH, MANCHIN, CANTWELL, KING, and WARNER, who have been so diligent across the past several months as this legislation moves its way to passage, and of RICHARD BURR, who has been an incredible stalwart champion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I thank Senator ALEXANDER for his work.

It goes to show you this didn't happen alone. It didn't happen in a vacuum. It didn't happen because one person or one party decided to get behind it. It happened because of a group effort of people in both Chambers and at the White House to support it.

Today, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce reiterated their support of this legislation. The American Petroleum Institute supports this legislation. Countless environmental and conservation organizations support this legislation. Some 850-plus groups support this legislation.

We have an opportunity to do something good for our country, to do something good for future generations.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the budget act.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Brown	Collins
Baldwin	Burr	Coons
Bennet	Cantwell	Cornyn
Blumenthal	Capito	Cortez Masto
Blunt	Cardin	Cotton
Booker	Carper	Cramer
Boozman	Casey	Daines

Duckworth	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Manchin	Shaheen
Feinstein	McConnell	Sinema
Gardner	McSally	Smith
Gillibrand	Menendez	Stabenow
Graham	Merkley	Tester
Harris	Murphy	Tillis
Hassan	Murray	Udall
Heinrich	Peters	Van Hollen
Hirono	Portman	Warner
Hoeven	Reed	Warren
Hyde-Smith	Roberts	Whitehouse
Jones	Rosen	Wicker
Kaine	Rubio	Wyden
King	Sanders	Young
Klobuchar	Schatz	

NAYS—30

Barrasso	Inhofe	Risch
Blackburn	Johnson	Romney
Braun	Kennedy	Rounds
Cassidy	Lankford	Sasse
Crapo	Lee	Scott (FL)
Enzi	Loeffler	Scott (SC)
Ernst	Moran	Shelby
Fischer	Murkowski	Sullivan
Grassley	Paul	Thune
Hawley	Perdue	Toomey

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz	Markey
------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 30.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to, and the point of order falls.

The majority leader is recognized.

MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 1628

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 1628.

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

MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 1626

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 1626.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1617

The question occurs on agreeing to the substitute amendment No. 1617.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Alexander	Casey	Gillibrand
Baldwin	Collins	Graham
Bennet	Cooms	Grassley
Blumenthal	Cornyn	Harris
Blunt	Cortez Masto	Hassan
Booker	Cotton	Heinrich
Boozman	Cramer	Hirono
Brown	Daines	Hoeven
Burr	Duckworth	Jones
Cantwell	Durbin	Kaine
Capito	Ernst	King
Cardin	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Carper	Gardner	Leahy

Loeffler	Reed	Tester
Manchin	Roberts	Thune
McConnell	Rosen	Tillis
McSally	Rubio	Udall
Menendez	Sanders	Van Hollen
Merkley	Schatz	Warner
Murkowski	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murphy	Scott (SC)	Wicker
Murray	Shaheen	Wyden
Perdue	Sinema	Young
Peters	Smith	
Portman	Stabenow	

NAYS—24

Barrasso	Hawley	Paul
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Braun	Inhofe	Romney
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Crapo	Kennedy	Sasse
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Enzi	Lee	Sullivan
Fischer	Moran	Toomey

NOT VOTING—3

Markey	Shelby	Warren
--------	--------	--------

The amendment (No. 1617) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1957, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

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

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 75, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 120 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Cantwell	Daines
Baldwin	Capito	Duckworth
Bennet	Cardin	Durbin
Blumenthal	Carper	Ernst
Blunt	Casey	Feinstein
Booker	Collins	Gardner
Boozman	Cooms	Gillibrand
Braun	Cornyn	Graham
Brown	Cortez Masto	Grassley
Burr	Cotton	Harris
	Cramer	Hassan

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

NAYS—23

Barrasso	Inhofe	Romney
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Crapo	Kennedy	Sasse
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Enzi	Lee	Shelby
Fischer	Moran	Sullivan
Hawley	Paul	Toomey
Hyde-Smith	Risch	

NOT VOTING—2

Markey	Warren
--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Colorado.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. JIM ROLLINS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Springdale Public School District superintendent Dr. Jim Rollins who will step down from his position at the end of June after decades of dedication to students, staff, and the community.

He has spent his career improving education and scholastic opportunities for students for more than 39 years as superintendent. His dedication and passion for education grew in his years as a science teacher in North Little Rock. At the same time, he continued to pursue advanced degrees in education at the University of Arkansas. He knew he wanted to help better the lives of students.

During his tenure as superintendent in Springdale, he oversaw tremendous growth in the district. Enrollment has increased from 5,000 students in 1980 to more than 23,000 students today. He rose to meet the challenges of the flourishing student population by supporting the construction of 22 schools and implementing innovative measures to provide the diverse student population tools to succeed.

Dr. Rollins has always made students a priority and emphasized this to teachers and staff with his motto "We Teach Them All."

He has distinguished himself as a key voice in education at the local, State,