S. 1315

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1315, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items under the Medicare program.

S. 1325

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1325, a bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion are informed of the medical risks associated with the abortion procedure and the major developmental characteristics of the unborn child, before giving their informed consent to receive an abortion.

S. 1334

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, a bill to amend the Toxic Substance Control Act to codify a Federal cause of action and a type of remedy available for individuals significantly exposed to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, to encourage research and accountability for irresponsible discharge of those substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1338

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1338, a bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and provide for the discoverability and admissibility of gun trace information in civil proceedings.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to require United States educational institutions to include information regarding financial transactions with the Government of the People's Republic of China or its affiliates in any petition for certification or recertification with the Student and Exchange Visitor Program.

S. 1373

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1373, a bill to reduce, from 21 years of age to 18 years of age, the minimum age at which a person may obtain a handgun from a Federal firearms license.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1385, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to establish additional requirements for dealers, and for other purposes.

S. 1417

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1417, a bill to establish a Venezuela Reconstruction Fund, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders''.

S. RES. 149

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 149, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should continue to support the A–10 Thunderbolt II attack aircraft program, also known as the Warthog and A–10C or OA–10C.

S. RES. 167

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 167, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month'' and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction.

S. RES. 185

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 185, a resolution requesting that the President transmit to the Senate not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President relating to the Administration's discussions and plans to assess, mitigate, and prevent growing inflation.

S. RES. 188

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 188, a resolution expressing appreciation and recognition for the Trump Administration for the creation of Operation Warp Speed and the historic development of a COVID–19 vaccine.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit treatment of student loan payments as elective deferrals for purposes of employer matching contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, today I have introduced the Retirement Parity for Student Loans Act. This legislation would permit employers to make matching contributions to workers under 401(k) and similar types of retirement plans as if a worker's student loan payments were salary reduction contributions to the retirement plan. This legislation will help workers who cannot afford to both save for retirement and pay off their student loan debt by providing them with employer contributions to build their retirement savings. This legislation is a common sense fix to the rules that govern employer-sponsored retirement plans and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1443

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Retirement Parity for Student Loans Act''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS AS ELECTIVE DEFERRALS FOR PURPOSES OF MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 401(m)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) subject to the requirements of paragraph (13), any employer contribution made to a defined contribution plan on behalf of an employee on account of a qualified student loan payment.''.

(b) QUALIFIED STUDENT LOAN PAYMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 401(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) QUALIFIED STUDENT LOAN PAYMENT.—The term 'qualified student loan payment' means a payment made by an employee in repayment of a qualified education loan (as defined in section 221(d)(1)) incurred by the employee to pay qualified higher education expenses, but only—

''(i) to the extent such payments in the aggregate for the year do not exceed an amount equal to—

''(I) the limitation applicable under section 402(g) for the year (or, if lesser, the employee's compensation (as defined in section 415(c)(3)) for the year), reduced by

''(II) the elective deferrals made by the employee for such year, and

''(ii) if the employee certifies to the employer making the matching contribution under this paragraph that such payment has been made on such loan.

For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'qualified higher education expenses' means the cost of attendance (as defined in section 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997) at an eligible educational institution (as defined in section 221(d)(2)).''.

(c) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR QUALIFIED STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS.—Subsection

(m) of section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14), and by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

''(13) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR QUALIFIED STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (4)(A)(iii), an employer contribution made to a defined contribution plan on account of a qualified student loan payment shall be treated as a matching contribution for purposes of this title if—

''(i) the plan provides matching contributions on account of elective deferrals at the same rate as contributions on account of qualified student loan payments,

''(ii) the plan provides matching contributions on account of qualified student loan payments only on behalf of employees otherwise eligible to receive matching contributions on account of elective deferrals,

''(iii) under the plan, all employees eligible to receive matching contributions on account of elective deferrals are eligible to receive matching contributions on account of qualified student loan payments, and

''(iv) the plan provides that matching contributions on account of qualified student loan payments vest in the same manner as matching contributions on account of elective deferrals.

''(B) TREATMENT FOR PURPOSES OF NONDISCRIMINATION RULES, ETC.—

''(i) NONDISCRIMINATION RULES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), subsection (a)(4), and section 410(b), matching contributions described in paragraph (4)(A)(iii) shall not fail to be treated as available to an employee solely because such employee does not have debt incurred under a qualified education loan (as defined in section 221(d)(1)).

''(ii) STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS NOT TREATED AS PLAN CONTRIBUTION.—Except as provided in clause (iii), a qualified student loan payment shall not be treated as a contribution to a plan under this title.

''(iii) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION RULES.—Solely for purposes of meeting the requirements of paragraph (11)(B) or (12) of this subsection, or paragraph (11)(B)(i)(II), (12)(B), or (13)(D) of subsection (k), a plan may treat a qualified student loan payment as an elective deferral or an elective contribution, whichever is applicable.

''(iv) ACTUAL DEFERRAL PERCENTAGE TESTING.—In determining whether a plan meets the requirements of subsection (k)(3)(A)(ii) for a plan year, the plan may apply the requirements of such subsection separately with respect to all employees who receive matching contributions described in paragraph (4)(A)(iii) for the plan year.

''(C) EMPLOYER MAY RELY ON EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATION.—The employer may rely on an employee certification of payment under paragraph (4)(D)(ii).''.

(d) SIMPLE RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 408(p) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR QUALIFIED STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the rules of clause (iii), an arrangement shall not fail to be treated as meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A)(iii) solely because under the arrangement, solely for purposes of such subparagraph, qualified student loan payments are treated as amounts elected by the employee under subparagraph (A)(i)(I) to the extent such payments do not exceed—

''(I) the applicable dollar amount under subparagraph (E) (after application of section 414(v)) for the year (or, if lesser, the employee's compensation (as defined in section 415(c)(3)) for the year), reduced by

''(II) any other amounts elected by the employee under subparagraph (A)(i)(I) for the year.

''(ii) QUALIFIED STUDENT LOAN PAYMENT.—For purposes of this subparagraph—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified student loan payment' means a payment made by an employee in repayment of a qualified education loan (as defined in section 221(d)(1)) incurred to pay qualified higher education expenses, but only if the employee certifies to the employer making the matching contribution that such payment has been made on such a loan.

''(II) QUALIFIED HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES.—The term 'qualified higher education expenses' has the same meaning as when used in section 401(m)(4)(D).

''(iii) APPLICABLE RULES.—Clause (i) shall apply to an arrangement only if, under the arrangement—

''(I) matching contributions on account of qualified student loan payments are provided only on behalf of employees otherwise eligible to elect contributions under subparagraph (A)(i)(I), and

''(II) all employees otherwise eligible to participate in the arrangement are eligible to receive matching contributions on account of qualified student loan payments.''.

(e) 403(b) PLANS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 403(b)(12) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The fact that the employer offers matching contributions on account of qualified student loan payments as described in section 401(m)(13) shall not be taken into account in determining whether the arrangement satisfies the requirements of clause (ii) (and any regulation thereunder).''.

(f) 457(b) PLANS.—Subsection (b) of section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following: ''A plan which is established and maintained by an employer which is described in subsection (e)(1)(A) shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of this subsection solely because the plan, or another plan maintained by the employer which meets the requirements of section 401(a), provides for matching contributions on account of qualified student loan payments as described in section 401(m)(13).''.

(g) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or such Secretary's delegate) shall prescribe regulations for purposes of implementing the amendments made by this section, including regulations—

(1) permitting a plan to make matching contributions for qualified student loan payments, as defined in sections 401(m)(4)(D) and 408(p)(2)(F) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section, at a different frequency than matching contributions are otherwise made under the plan, provided that the frequency is not less than annually;

(2) permitting employers to establish reasonable procedures to claim matching contributions for such qualified student loan payments under the plan, including an annual deadline (not earlier than 3 months after the close of each plan year) by which a claim must be made; and

(3) promulgating model amendments which plans may adopt to implement matching contributions on such qualified student loan payments for purposes of sections 401(m), 408(p), 403(b), and 457(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made for years beginning after December 31, 2021.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1451. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I am pleased to be joined by my friend and colleague from Delaware, Senator CHRIS COONS, to reintroduce the Reach Every Mother and Child Act of 2021. Our legislation would make it the policy of the United States to lead an effort to end preventable deaths of mothers, newborns, and young children in the developing world by 2030.

For years Sen. COONS and I have led efforts to ensure robust funding for the U.S. Agency for International Development's maternal and child health programing, which have formed the backbone of the U.S. commitment to help end preventable child and maternal deaths globally.

Due in part to American leadership and generosity, many lives have already been saved. Nevertheless, far too many mothers, newborns, and young children under the age of five continue to succumb to disease and malnutrition that could easily be prevented. The impacts of COVID–19 are exacerbating these gaps and disproportionately affecting the world's most vulnerable, undermining decades of progress.

Nearly 300,000 women die annually from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. In addition, a significant proportion of deaths of children under the age of five occur in the first 28 days after birth, with newborns accounting for nearly 50 percent of all under-five deaths. In 2019, 5.2 million children under the age of five died from mainly preventable and treatable diseases.

Our bill aims to reach these mothers and children with simple, proven, cost-effective interventions that we know will help them survive. A concentrated effort could end preventable maternal and child deaths worldwide by the year 2030, but continued U.S. leadership and support from the international community are critical to success.

To achieve this ambitious goal, our bill would require the implementation of a strategy focused on bringing to scale the highest impact, evidence-based interventions, with a focus on country and community ownership. These interventions would be specific to each country's needs and include support for the most vulnerable populations. We do not have to guess at what interventions will work—the reality is that thousands of children die each day of conditions we know today how to treat.

These life-saving interventions include clean birthing practices, vaccines, nutritional supplements, handwashing with soap, and other basic needs that remain elusive for far too many women and children in developing countries. This must change.

In addition, our bill proposes the establishment a Maternal and Child Survival Coordinator at USAID who would focus on implementing the five-year strategy and verifying that the most

effective interventions are being scaled up in target countries. The bill would improve government efficiency across several agencies that would collaborate with the Coordinator to identify and promote the most effective interventions to end preventable maternal and child deaths globally.

To promote transparency and greater accountability, our bill also would also require detailed public reporting on progress toward implementing the strategy.

Other bipartisan initiatives, such as the successful President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR, which was started by President George W. Bush, demonstrate that results driven interventions can turn the tide for global health challenges. Applying lessons learned from past initiatives, our bill would provide the focus and the tools necessary to accelerate progress toward ending preventable maternal and child deaths.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator COONS and me in supporting this legislation that will save the lives of mothers and children around the world.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1459. A bill to provide for the protection of and investment in certain Federal land in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the ''Protecting Unique and Beautiful Landscapes by Investing in California (PUBLIC) Lands Act.'' This measure would increase protections for over 1 million acres of Federal public lands throughout northwest California, the Central Coast, and Los Angeles, including nearly 600,000 acres of new wilderness, more than 583 miles of new wild and scenic rivers, and the expansion of an existing national monument by more than 100,000 acres.

This legislation would preserve our public lands for the benefit of current and future generations and help protect California's communities from the impacts of the climate crisis.

The ''PUBLIC Lands Act'' is grounded in the best conservation principles: it expands access to the outdoors for all, addresses disparities in access to nature, supports locally led efforts, and is based on science.

In Northwest California, this bill would designate new wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, recreation and conservation areas, and forest and watershed restoration areas. Importantly, it would increase wildfire resiliency in Northwest California, where the impacts of the climate crisis have resulted in more frequent and severe wildfires.

Along the Central Coast, the bill would designate nearly 250,000 acres of public land in the Los Padres National Forest and Carrizo Plain National Monument as wilderness, and establish a 400-mile long Condor National Recreation trail, stretching from Los Angeles to Monterey County. The designations in the bill would protect the Central Valley's abundant biodiversity, including threatened and endangered species.

In Southern California, the bill would expand the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument and establish a new National Recreation Area along the foothills and San Gabriel River corridor. Los Angeles County is one of the most park-poor, densely populated, and polluted regions in the Nation—this legislation would begin to rectify that by providing increased outdoor opportunities for all Angelenos, ensuring that disadvantaged communities can more easily benefit from our public lands.

I want to highlight that this legislation protects existing water rights, property rights, and land-use authorities. The bill does not create any new public lands—rather, it protects existing public lands through the high-value designation as wilderness in order to keep these lands as untouched and wild as possible.

The science is becoming increasingly clear that we must conserve 30 percent of our lands and waters by 2030 in our efforts to solve the climate crisis, protect nature, and save America's wildlife. This legislation would provide a down payment on that goal, helping California and the Biden Administration meet our 30x30 goals and reverse the worst effects of climate change.

The bill would also provide outdoor recreation opportunities to park-poor communities. It is imperative that as we conserve our public lands, we do so in a way that also reverses racial and economic disparities in access to nature and parks.

This bill enjoys the support of hundreds of local municipalities and elected officials, community groups, and businesses and local outfitters. It is the product of significant public engagement in the legislative process over decades.

I would like to thank my colleagues and conservation champions, Representatives JARED HUFFMAN, SALUD CARBAJAL, and JUDY CHU, for championing these bills in the House.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the ''PUBLIC Lands Act'' as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1458. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to encourage the planting of cover crops following prevented planting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1458

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Cover Crop Flexibility Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. COVER CROPS PLANTED DUE TO PREVENTED PLANTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 508A of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)—

(i) by striking ''collect an indemnity'' and inserting the following: ''collect—

''(I) an indemnity'';

(ii) in subclause (I) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(II) an indemnity payment that is equal to the prevented planting guarantee for the acreage for the first crop, if the second crop—

''(aa) is an approved cover crop that—

''(AA) will be planted for use as animal feed or bedding that is hayed, grazed (rotationally, adaptively, or at equal to or less than the carrying capacity), or chopped outside of the primary nesting season; or

''(BB) will not be harvested, such as a crop with an intended use of being left standing or cover; and

''(bb) cannot be harvested for grain or other uses unrelated to livestock forage or conservation, as determined by the Corporation.''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting ''a second crop described in item (aa) or (bb) of paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), or'' before ''double cropping''; and

(ii) by striking ''make an election under paragraph (1)(B)'' and inserting ''makes an election under paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I)''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following:

''(f) PREVENTED PLANTING COVERAGE FACTORS.—For producers that plant cover crops following prevented planting, the Corporation may provide separate prevented planting coverage factors that include preplanting costs and the cost of cover crop seed.''.

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) COVER CROPS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, regarding a policy to insure crops on fields that regularly utilize cover crops.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Research and development under subparagraph (A) shall include—

''(i) a review of prevented planting coverage factors described in section 508A(f) and an evaluation of whether to include cover crop seed costs and costs related to grazing in the calculation of a factor;

''(ii) the extent to which cover crops reduce the risk of subsequent prevented planting;

''(iii) the extent to which cover crops make crops more resilient to or otherwise reduce the risk of loss resulting from natural disasters such as drought;

''(iv) the extent to which increased regularity of using cover crops or interactions with other practices such as tillage or rotation affects risk reduction;

''(v) whether rotational, adaptive, or other prescribed grazing of cover crops can maintain or improve risk reduction; and

''(vi) how best to account for any reduced risk and provide a benefit to producers using

cover crops through a separate plan or policy of insurance.

''(C) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall make available on the website of the Corporation, and submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that—

''(i) describes the results of the research and development carried out under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) includes any recommendations with respect to those results.''.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, along with my livestock producer protection bill, I am also introducing legislation today to eliminate the November 1 haying and grazing date for cover crops.

Cover crops provide a lot of environmental benefits. They improve soil health, reduce erosion and nutrient runoff, improve water quality, and sequester carbon. They also benefit farmers, since their animals can graze these crops, or the cover crops can be harvested to provide forage for livestock. Currently, the haying and grazing date—the date on which farmers can start harvesting or grazing cover groups on prevent plant acres—is set for November 1, which is too late in the year for farmers in more northern States like South Dakota. Early winter weather in these States can cause cover crops to freeze before they can be used for hay and grazing.

The legislation I am introducing today with my colleague Senator STABENOW would fix this problem by letting farmers harvest and graze cover crops outside of the primary nesting season, which ends August 1 in South Dakota, allowing for both farmers and our environment to benefit from these crops.

Protecting our planet is imperative, and government certainly has a role to play in promoting clean energy and sound environmental policy, but putting the government in charge of our economy—in fact, putting the government in charge of pretty much every aspect of American life, as the Green New Deal would do—is not the answer. Innovation, not government, is the key to addressing environmental challenges.

Unfortunately, President Biden is embracing a whole host of Green New Deal-like policies. Take his so-called 30-by-30 directive directing the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other Agencies to provide recommendations to conserve 30 percent of U.S. lands and waters by 2030.

I have already heard from ranchers and landowners in South Dakota who are concerned about the measures the administration could pursue to meet this goal, including Federal land acquisitions and burdensome regulations on private landowners, many of whom are already doing everything they can to promote the health of their land.

There is also serious reason to doubt the government's ability to manage a vast new amount of land. The Federal Government already frequently fails to properly manage the land it already has. Yet some believe that we can give the Federal Government huge new swaths of land, and somehow the government will manage it properly.

Yet that is the problem with a lot of these socialist fantasies. They assume that the government will achieve levels of efficiency and productiveness that the government has simply never demonstrated. It is the triumph of fantasy over experience. Surely, the people espousing socialist fantasies have sat in long lines at the DMV or remember how the Obama administration had more than 3 years to prepare for the opening of the ObamaCare exchange yet couldn't even come up with a working website in that time period. Yet the Green New Deal's proponents are advocating that we put the government in charge of pretty much every aspect of American life.

Socialists and the Democrats parroting their ideology don't want to believe it, but the truth is that private individuals are often a lot more efficient, effective, and innovative than government, and we should be focusing our energies on supporting that efficiency and effectiveness and innovation instead of attempting to solve our environmental problems by giving the government more than it can handle.

I will continue working here in Congress to advance policies that promote clean energy and improve our environment without placing heavy burdens on American workers or American families. I will continue to advocate for policies that encourage and harness the ingenuity of the American people in facing our environmental challenges, and I will continue to oppose legislation that prioritizes supposed environmental gains over the well-being of the American people.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1469. A bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to meet the needs of homeless children, youth, and families, and honor the assessments and priorities of local communities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce bipartisan legislation that would better align the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) homeless assistance programs with other federal agencies' homelessness programs and provide greater flexibility to local communities to address youth homelessness.

According to the latest estimate from HUD, there are over 580,466 homeless individuals in the United States. This number includes an estimated 161,548 individuals in California, including children and youth.

However, if you compare that with data from other federal agencies, a different story is told.

For example, the Department of Education identified 1.3 million students experiencing homelessness during the 2018–2019 school year. This includes an estimated 271,528 public school students in California, almost double the total number of homeless individuals (including adults) identified by HUD in California.

The disparity between the homeless numbers reported by HUD and the Department of Education are not just mere statistical differences; they have real consequences.

For instance, only those children and families considered ''homeless'' under HUD's definition are eligible for vital homeless assistance programs. Those children and families who do not meet HUD's definition will therefore continue to fall through the cracks.

Our bill would allow HUD homeless assistance programs to serve extremely vulnerable children and families, specifically those staying in motels or in doubled-up situations because they simply have nowhere else to go.

These children are especially susceptible to abuse and trafficking because they are often not served by a case manager, and therefore remain hidden from potential social service providers.

Communities that receive Federal funding through HUD's competitive application process are also unable to prioritize or direct resources to help children and families who don't meet the current definition of ''homelessness.''

In addition to fixing the issue with competing federal definitions of homelessness, our bill would provide communities with new flexibility to use Federal funds the way they see fit to address local needs. Our bill requires HUD to assess the extent to which Continuums of Care use separate, specific, age-appropriate criteria for determining the safety and needs of children and unaccompanied youth and divert people to safe, stable, age-appropriate accommodations.

Finally, our bill would improve transparency and give a better sense of the homeless crisis facing our country by requiring HUD to include data on all categories of homelessness in its Point in Time count and Annual Homeless Assessment Report.

Mr. President, we must do more to meet the needs of homeless children and youth and stop the vicious cycle of poverty and chronic homelessness. As the ongoing coronavirus pandemic threatens to push more children, youth, and families into homelessness and continues to pose potentially lethal health risks, it is imperative that we do not impose more barriers for these children and families to access services. I believe this bill is a commonsense solution that will ensure that homeless families and children can receive the help they need.

I would like to thank Senator ROB PORTMAN for his support on this critical issue and for joining me in introducing this bill, and I implore our colleagues to support the ''Homeless Children and Youth Act.''

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1474. A bill to reaffirm the importance of workers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Today, I am joined by Senators WARREN, BROWN, VAN HOLLEN, and GILLIBRAND to introduce legislation to ensure that at least one Federal Reserve Governor has demonstrated primary experience in supporting or protecting the rights of workers.

Our legislation is not the first to require a member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors to have a particular area of expertise. Indeed, as part of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act, which passed the Senate by a vote of 93–4 and was signed into law on January 12, 2015, Congress amended the Federal Reserve Act to require at least one of the seven Federal Reserve Governors to be an individual ''with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks.'' Our legislation would ensure that workers get the very same representation that community bankers already have on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

As we all are aware, the Federal Reserve has a dual mandate of stable prices and maximum employment. Our bill is designed to better ensure that future Boards of Governors continue the current Board's focus on its full employment mandate as evidenced by its explicit acknowledgement last August in its revised Statement on Longer-Run Goals and Monetary Policy Strategy that ''maximum employment is a broad-based and inclusive goal.'' This reflects the Fed's ''appreciation for the benefits of a strong labor market, particularly for many in low-and moderate-income communities,'' with policy decisions to be informed by the Board's ''assessments of the shortfalls of employment from its maximum level'' rather than by ''deviations from its maximum level'' as in its previous statement. While this may not seem like a huge difference, it is reflective of the Board's ''view that a robust job market can be sustained without causing an outbreak of inflation.''

To put it more simply, this current Federal Reserve ''will remain highly focused on fostering as strong a labor market as possible for the benefit of all Americans,'' and our legislation seeks to ensure that future Federal Reserve Boards will continue to do the same.

COVID–19 has shown us just how essential workers are to our economy and our physical well-being. We all know grocery store workers, nurses, firefighters, delivery workers, and other workers in both the public and private sectors who, despite the risk to their own health, have been literally holding together the fabric of our society and economy so that we can make it safely to the other side of this public health emergency. As such, they too deserve at least one member of the Board of Governors with demonstrated primary experience in supporting or protecting the rights of workers. I thank the AFL–CIO, Columbia University Professor and Nobel Laureate Joseph Stiglitz, MIT Professor and Former International Monetary Fund Chief Economist Simon Johnson, and Georgetown Law Professor Adam Levitin for their support. and urge our colleagues to join in pushing to enact this legislation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1475. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the issuance of permits under title V of that Act for certain emissions from agricultural production; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1475

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Livestock Regulatory Protection Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON PERMITTING CERTAIN EMISSIONS FROM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION.

Section 502(f) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7661a(f)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) in the undesignated matter following clause (iii) (as so redesignated), by striking ''Approval of'' and inserting the following:

''(B) NO RELIEF OF OBLIGATION.—Approval of'';

(3) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through ''No partial'' in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

''(f) PROHIBITIONS.—

''(1) PARTIAL PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No partial''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CERTAIN EMISSIONS FROM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION.—No permit shall be issued under a permit program under this title for any carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions resulting from biological processes associated with livestock production.''.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week, the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the Congresswoman from the 14th District of New York reintroduced their Green New Deal resolution. I think most Americans remember this socialist fantasy from when these Members introduced it 2 years ago. It would be hard to forget a proposal with that pricetag. There was one think tank that analyzed the initial proposal and released a first estimate that found that the Green New Deal would cost between $51 trillion and $93 trillion over 10 years. Let me just repeat that—between $51 trillion and $93 trillion over 10 years.

To put that number in perspective, our entire Federal budget in 2019—our entire Federal budget—was well under $5 trillion. It would be interesting to learn where we are going to get that kind of money. A massive tax hike on the rich wouldn't get us close to paying for this, but I don't think I am the only one who isn't sure where we would get the money for this. I don't think the plan's authors have a very clear idea of that either. In fact, the entire Green New Deal resolution is notable for its complete lack of specificity.

It proposes outlandish, impossible goals, like upgrading every single building in the United States—every single building—in the next 10 years for maximum energy and water efficiency, as well as comfort, but it offers zero—zero—specifics for how we might actually accomplish them. I am not surprised, because there is no way to come close to accomplishing everything the Green New Deal's authors want to accomplish over the next decade without enormous economic pain.

So often, when hearing the policies of the far left, environmental and otherwise, I am struck by how they leave people out of the equation. Now, of course, the individuals proposing these plans don't think they are leaving people out of the equation. The Green New Deal's authors are clearly under the impression that they are creating a paradise for American families—if paradise includes the government supervision and administration of just about every aspect of American life. Yet the reality is that, like so many utopian plans, most of the environmental left's sweeping ideas for remaking our society would have nightmarish effects in practice: higher energy costs, reduced economic growth, sharp increases in the cost of essential commodities like groceries, huge tax hikes, and job losses.

Today, I want to talk about just one example of the damaging potential of environmental extremism, which has relevance for a bill I am introducing today.

There has been an increasing tendency on the part of the environmental left to demonize the consumption of beef, and this tendency is creeping into the mainstream. Earlier this week, food website Epicurious—a site a lot of Americans turn to when they are wondering what to cook for dinner—announced that it will no longer add new recipes featuring beef. The website said its move is not anti-beef but pro-planet. It is pretty much wrong on both counts.

First of all, the move to demonize beef could have real consequences for a lot of ranchers, like those I represent in South Dakota. If the demand for beef drops, some of these ranchers may be out of a job. Of course, the Green New Deal's authors would probably suggest a government program to help

them out, but I can't think of many ranchers I know who would like to abandon their way of life for their dependence on a government program, and there is no reason they should have to.

Contrary to the story being pushed by the environmental left, beef production is directly responsible for only a tiny fraction of U.S. emissions, and beef cattle actually plays an important role in managing pasturelands that sequester vast amounts of carbon. On top of that, it has become clear that, with certain feed additives, it is possible to significantly reduce cattle emissions, making the demonization of beef even more wrong-headed.

Today, I am introducing the Livestock Regulatory Protection Act with my colleague Senator SINEMA. I actually introduced this bill years ago with the Democratic leader, before it became dangerous for Members of the Democratic leadership to support anything that might anger the environmental left. The Livestock Regulatory Protection Act is simple. It would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from imposing emissions regulations relating to the biological processes of livestock.

We really shouldn't need this bill, but it is becoming increasingly clear that we do. This legislation was included in annual funding bills on a bipartisan basis for a number of years after the Democratic leader and I first introduced it, but the House has omitted it from its recent bills, and the Senate has had to secure its inclusion in the final bills. Passing this legislation would give livestock producers long-term certainty that their livelihoods will not be compromised by overzealous environmental crusaders.

I believe very strongly in protecting our environment. I have been an outdoorsman all my life. In many ways, outdoors men and women are the original environmentalists. If you value spending time in the outdoors—whether you are hunting or hiking, fishing or swimming—it is likely you are going to care a lot about keeping our air and water clean, preserving native species, and safeguarding our natural resources.

I have been interested in clean energy issues for a long time and have been introducing legislation to support clean energy development for more than a decade. In February, I introduced two bipartisan bills to support the increased use of biofuels and to emphasize their clean energy potential. Currently, the EPA's modeling does not fully recognize the tremendous emissions-reducing potential of ethanol and other biofuels.

The Adopt GREET Act, which I introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR, would fix this problem and pave the way for increased biofuel use both here and abroad by requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to update its greenhouse gas modeling for ethanol and biodiesel using the U.S. Department of Energy's GREET model.

I also introduced a bill to advance long-stalled biofuel registrations at the EPA. Regulatory inaction has stifled the advancement of promising technologies, like ethanol derived from corn kernel fiber, even though some of these fuels are already being safely used in States like California.

My bill would speed up the approval process for these innovative biofuels. This would allow biofuel producers to capitalize on the research and facility investments they have made and improve their operating margins while further lowering emissions and helping our Nation's corn and soybean producers by reinforcing this essential market.

Just last week, I joined colleagues from both parties to cosponsor the Growing Climate Solutions Act, which is legislation to make it easier for agriculture producers and foresters to participate in carbon markets. This bill is a great example of the kind of bipartisan process we should be following when it comes to climate legislation.

So, as I said, I strongly believe in protecting our environment, but I believe that we need to protect our environment in a way that takes account of people, too. That means promoting legislation that is good for our environment and for our economy, that is good for our environment and good for agriculture producers, and that is good for our environment and good for American families.

That is why I have introduced proposals like the Soil Health and Income Protection Program, or SHIPP. This program, a short-term version of the Conservation Reserve Program, is a win for both our environment and for farmers and ranchers. SHIPP, which became law as part of the 2018 farm bill, provides an incentive for farmers to take their lowest performing cropland out of production for 3 to 5 years. Like the Conservation Reserve Program, it protects our environment by improving soil health and water quality while improving the bottom line for farmers.

(The remarks of Mr. THUNE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1458 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1495. A bill to promote international press freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. A vibrant and independent media and public access to accurate information are critical to the functioning of any democracy. A free press is so important that our Founding Fathers explicitly guaranteed that right in the First Amendment of our Constitution, and the United Nations defined press freedom as a fundamental human right in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But today—as democracies worldwide are facing growing challenges from authoritarian leaders, censorship, and disinformation campaigns—foreign journalists are facing unprecedented dangers that put their profession, and their lives, at risk.

The nature of threats against journalists is shifting. While the number of journalists killed in war zones continues to drop, the number of journalists killed or targeted in countries at peace continues at historically high levels. Fifty journalists were killed because of their work in 2020, and 68% of these deaths occurred outside of conflict zones. Most of those who perpetrate attacks are never held accountable. Worldwide, there was complete impunity in 86% of cases of murdered journalists occurring between September 2019 and August 2020. In addition, the number of journalists imprisoned remains at historically high levels, with nearly 400 behind bars as of December 2020. And authoritarian governments are using the COVID–19 pandemic as a pretext for censorship, restricting reporters' freedom of movement, and harassing them.

The legislation I am introducing today with Senator GRAHAM marks World Press Freedom Day by honoring journalists not only with words but with action. It builds on the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act, signed into law in 2009, to take concrete steps to ensure the wellbeing of journalism as a profession, and of individual journalists themselves. This legislation creates a new fund for programs to help keep foreign journalists safe, whether they are operating in dangerous environments or need to be re-located for their safety, and authorizes $30 million for this purpose. It uses existing funding to help nations prevent, investigate, and prosecute crimes against journalists overseas. It creates a new non-immigrant visa category to allow journalists in danger to come to the United States. And it creates a Coordinator for International Press Freedom at the State Department to serve as a focal point for advancing the right to freedom of the press and freedom of expression abroad.

I am proud to join Senator GRAHAM in this effort to ensure that the free press that we value so highly in the United States is protected and promoted around the world, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this legislation is swiftly considered by the Senate.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1496. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to fund demonstration projects to improve recruitment and retention of child welfare workers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. As we work to support American families, stimulate the economy, bolster small

businesses, protect health care workers, and sustain our industries, investing in child welfare is imperative to supporting these efforts. The coronavirus pandemic has further highlighted that the development of a robust, well-trained, and stable child welfare workforce is central to improving outcomes for children and families across the United States. The existence of such a workforce is essential to a child welfare agency's ability to carry out the responsibilities with which they have been entrusted. Child welfare work has been shown to be physically and emotionally challenging, as demonstrated by recent studies into the impact of secondary traumatic stress (STS) on child welfare professionals. The multitude of challenges inherent in child welfare work, combined with relatively low compensation and work benefits, make these careers difficult to sustain, resulting in high rates of turnover and professionals who are more susceptible to burnout and compassion fatigue.

For the past 15 years, child welfare turnover rates have been estimated between 20 percent and 40 percent. In 2017, Virginia reported a turnover rate of 30%, while Washington State reported a turnover rate of 20% and Georgia reported a turnover rate of 32%. These high rates of turnover detract from the quality of services delivered to children and families and result in an estimated cost of $54,000 per worker leaving an agency.

More needs to be done to ensure that individuals pursuing careers in child welfare receive appropriate training and support to improve the sustainability of their important, yet demanding work. Maintaining a high-performing, engaged, and committed workforce is vital to providing families with the quality supports they need to stabilize, reunify, and thrive. Research suggests that positive child welfare outcomes depend largely on the capacity and competence of the child welfare workforce.

This is why I am pleased to introduce today the Child Welfare Workforce Support Act with my colleague Senator BALDWIN. This bill directs the Secretary to conduct a five-year demonstration program for child welfare service providers to implement targeted interventions to recruit, select, and retain child welfare workers. This demonstration program will focus on building an evidence base of best practices for reducing barriers to the recruitment, development, and retention of individuals providing direct services to children and families. Funds will also be used to provide ongoing professional development to assist child welfare workers in meeting the diverse needs of families with infants and children with the goal of improving both the quality of services provided and the sustainability of such careers. Investing resources in determining what practices have the greatest impact on the successful recruitment and retention of child welfare workers will assist in developing an evidence-base for future federal investment in this space.

I hope that as the Senate considers reauthorizing the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act that we consider the Child Welfare Workforce Support Act and recognize the vital role that child welfare workers play to improve outcomes and protect our most vulnerable infants and children.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1497. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to ensure protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth and their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. According to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth are at an increased risk for experiencing maltreatment compared to non-LGBTQ youth. Because of limited exposure to mandated reporters as a result of the COVID–19 pandemic, the unfortunate truth is that the maltreatment that some youth experience have experienced has gone unrecognized and underreported. Research prior to the pandemic demonstrated that LGBTQ youth were more likely to experience physical abuse by a parent or guardian when compared to their heterosexual peers. Risk for harm of vulnerable youth also extends far beyond physical safety. LGBTQ youth are at a disproportionately high risk for depression, suicidal ideation and suicide, and self-harming behaviors, with rates of attempted suicide of around 2 to 10 times those of peers.

These risks for maltreatment often times result in LGBTQ youth entering the child welfare system. Studies have found that, ''LGBT young people are overrepresented in child welfare systems, despite the fact that they are likely to be underreported because they risk harassment and abuse if their LGBT identity is disclosed.'' This overrepresentation of LGBTQ youth in the foster care system raises concerns about issues in the child abuse and prevention space. Additional research is needed to understand the risk of abuse among LGBTQ youth, particularly those identifying as transgender. This information will yield invaluable information to be used in developing targeted prevention strategies to reduce the rates of adverse childhood experiences of LGBTQ individuals.

This is why I am pleased to introduce the Protecting LGBTQ Youth Act with my colleague Senator BALDWIN. Our bill amends the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and calls for HHS and other federal agencies to carry out an interdisciplinary research program to protect LGBTQ youth from child abuse and neglect and improve the well-being of victims of child abuse or neglect. This legislation also expands current practices around demographic information collection and reporting on incidences and prevalence of child maltreatment to include sexual orientation and gender identity.

Additionally, the bill opens existing grant funding opportunities to invest in the training of personnel in best practices to meet the unique needs of LGBTQ youth and calls for the inclusion of individuals experienced in working with LGBTQ youth and families in state task forces. Improving data collection and disaggregation will provide greater insight into the circumstances LGBTQ youth face in the home that, when left unaddressed, lead to entry into the child welfare system. This improved data-driven understanding can then be used to develop appropriate and effective primary prevention practices to decrease the risks faced by LGTBQ youth, and will be pivotal in our understanding of abuse and neglect following the pandemic.

I hope that as the Senate moves to reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act we consider the Protecting LGBTQ Youth Act to better inform our collective understanding of the risks faced by LGBTQ youth and the best ways to protect them.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1500. A bill to permit Amtrak to bring civil actions in Federal district court to enforce the right set forth in section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, which gives intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1500

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rail Passenger Fairness Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(1) Congress created Amtrak under the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–158).

(2) Amtrak began serving customers on May 1, 1971, taking over the operation of most intercity passenger trains that private, freight railroads were previously required to operate. In exchange for assuming these passenger rail operations, Amtrak was given access to the national rail network.

(3) In return for relief from the obligation to provide intercity passenger service, railroads over which Amtrak operated (referred to in this section as ''host railroads'') were expected to give Amtrak passenger trains preference over freight trains when using the national rail network.

(4) In 1973, Congress passed the Amtrak Improvement Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–146), which gives intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation preference over freight

transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing. This right, which is now codified as section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, states, ''Except in an emergency, intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation provided by or for Amtrak has preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing unless the Board orders otherwise under this subsection. A rail carrier affected by this subsection may apply to the Board for relief. If the Board, after an opportunity for a hearing under section 553 of title 5, decides that preference for intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation materially will lessen the quality of freight transportation provided to shippers, the Board shall establish the rights of the carrier and Amtrak on reasonable terms.''.

(5) Many host railroads have ignored the law referred to in paragraph (4) by refusing to give passenger rail the priority to which it is statutorily entitled and giving freight transportation the higher priority. As a result, Amtrak's on time performance on most host railroads is poor, has declined between 2014 through 2019, and continues to decline.

(6) According to Amtrak, 6,500,000 customers on State-supported and long-distance trains arrived at their destination late during fiscal year 2019. Nearly 70 percent of these delays were caused by host railroads, amounting to a total of 3,200,000 minutes. The largest cause of these delays was freight train interference, which accounted for more than 1,000,000 minutes of delay for Amtrak passengers, or approximately 2 years, because host railroads chose to give freight trains priority.

(7) Poor on-time performance wastes taxpayer dollars. According to a 2019 report by Amtrak's Office of Inspector General, a 5 percent improvement of on-time performance on all Amtrak routes would result in $12,100,000 in cost savings to Amtrak in the first year. If on-time performance on long-distance routes reached 75 percent for a year, Amtrak would realize an estimated $41,900,000 in operating cost savings, with a one-time savings of $336,000,000 due to a reduction in equipment replacement needs.

(8) Historical data suggests that on-time performance on host railroads is driven by the existence of an effective means to enforce Amtrak's preference rights:

(A) Two months after the date of the enactment of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–432), which included provisions for the enforcement of these preference rights, was enacted, the on-time performance of long-distance trains improved from 56 percent to 77 percent and Class I freight train interference delays across all routes declined by 40 percent.

(B) One year after such date of enactment, freight train interference delays had declined by 54 percent and the on-time performance of long-distance trains reached 85 percent.

(C) In 2014, after some of the provisions in the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 related to enforcement of preference were ruled unconstitutional by a D.C. Circuit Court, long-distance train on-time performance declined from 72 percent to 50 percent, and freight train interference delays increased 59 percent.

(D) The last time long-distance trains achieved an on-time rate of more than 80 percent in a given month was February 2012.

(9) As a result of violations of Amtrak's right to preference, Amtrak has been consistently unable on host railroad networks to meet its congressionally mandated mission and goals, which are codified in section 24101 of title 49, United States Code (relating to providing on-time and trip-time competitive service to its passengers).

(10) Amtrak does not have an effective mechanism to enforce its statutory preference right in order to fulfill its mission and goals. Only the Attorney General can bring a civil action for equitable relief in a district court of the United States to enforce Amtrak's preference rights.

(11) In Amtrak's entire history, the only enforcement action initiated by the Attorney General was against the Southern Pacific Transportation Company in 1979.

(12) Congress supports continued authority for the Attorney General to initiate an action, but Amtrak should also be entitled to bring a civil action before a Federal district court to enforce its statutory preference rights.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZE AMTRAK TO BRING A CIVIL ACTION TO ENFORCE IT PREFERENCE RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended, by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding sections 24103(a) and 24308(f), Amtrak shall have the right to bring an action for equitable or other relief in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to enforce the preference rights granted under this subsection.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 24103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and section 24308(c)'' before '', only the Attorney General''.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1501

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Stop Corporate Inversions Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, either—

''(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

''(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on January 18, 2017, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

''(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

''(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

''(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

''(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

''(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before May 8, 2014,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B);

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'';

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)''; and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after May 8, 2014.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1507. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate certain limitations with respect to pre-production plastic pellet pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1507

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited the ''Plastic Pellet Free Waters Act''.

SEC. 2. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS FOR WASTEWATER, SPILLS, AND RUNOFF FROM PLASTIC POLYMER PRODUCTION FACILITIES, PLASTIC MOLDING AND FORMING FACILITIES, AND OTHER POINT SOURCES ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSPORT AND PACKAGING OF PLASTIC PELLETS OR OTHER PRE-PRODUCTION PLASTIC MATERIALS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'') shall promulgate a final rule to ensure that—

(1) the discharge of plastic pellets or other pre-production plastic materials (including discharge into wastewater and other runoff) from facilities regulated under part 414 or 463 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), is prohibited;

(2) the discharge of plastic pellets or other pre-production plastic materials (including discharge into wastewater and other runoff) from a point source (as defined in section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362)) that makes, uses, packages, or transports those plastic pellets and other pre-production plastic materials is prohibited; and

(3) the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) are reflected in—

(A) all wastewater, stormwater, and other permits issued by the Administrator and State-delegated programs under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) to facilities and other point sources (as defined in section 502 of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1362)) that make, use, package, or transport plastic pellets or other pre-production plastic materials, as determined by the Administrator, in addition to other applicable limits and standards; and

(B) all standards of performance promulgated under section 312(p) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1322(p)) that are applicable to point sources (as defined in section 502 of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1362)) that make, use, package, or transport plastic pellets or other pre-production plastic materials, as determined by the Administrator.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1521. A bill to require certain civil penalties to be transferred to a fund through which amounts are made available for the Gabriella Miller Kids First Pediatric Research Program at the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. While cancer is the leading cause of death by disease among children past infancy, childhood cancer and other rare pediatric diseases remain poorly understood. According to the National Cancer Institute, an estimated 15,590 children and adolescents under the age of 19 will be diagnosed with cancer, and 1,780 will die of the disease in the United States in 2021.

This is why I am pleased to be introducing the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act 2.0 with Senators JERRY MORAN, MARK R. WARNER, and BILL CASSIDY. The legislation provides a new source of funding for the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) Gabriella Miller Kids First Pediatric Research Program (Kids First) by redirecting penalties collected from pharmaceutical, cosmetic, supplement, and medical device companies that break the law to pediatric and childhood cancer research. The bill is named in honor of Gabriella Miller, a Leesburg, Virginia resident who died from a rare form of brain cancer at the age of 10. Gabriella was an activist and worked to raise support for research into childhood diseases like cancer until her death in October of 2013.

The Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Program has supported critical research into pediatric cancer and structural birth defects and has focused on building a pediatric data resource combining genetic sequencing data with clinical data from multiple pediatric cohorts. The Gabriella Miller Kids First Data Resource Center is helping to advance scientific understanding and discoveries around pediatric cancer and structural birth defects and has sequenced nearly 20,000 samples thus far. While Congress has appropriated $12.6 million for the Kids First program annually since Fiscal Year (FY) 2015, this legislation would make additional funding streams available to appropriators to further support pediatric and childhood cancer research.

Gabriella Miller was a passionate activist and fighter. In 2014, I was a strong champion of the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act, which established the Ten-Year Pediatric Research Initiative at the NIH and authorized $12.6 million per fiscal year through FY23. We honor Gabriella's memory by continuing her work in making sure pediatric disease research is a priority. This bipartisan legislation would provide a critical source of funding to improve research in pediatric cancer and diseases, and I urge my colleagues to support it.'

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 189—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY'S WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2020 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 189

Whereas, on April 24, 2021, in Omaha, Nebraska, the women's volleyball team of the University of Kentucky won its first National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Volleyball Championship by defeating the University of Texas in a 4-set victory;

Whereas the players, coaches, and staff of the University of Kentucky displayed hard work and dedication in a challenging pandemic season concluding the year with 24 wins, only 1 loss, and their 4th consecutive Southeastern Conference title;

Whereas Madison Lilley, Alli Stumler, and Avery Skinner were selected for the all-tournament team;

Whereas Madison Lilley was also named the tournament's Most Outstanding Player and the National Player of the Year;

Whereas head coach Craig Skinner was named Coach of the Year and has earned a NCAA Tournament berth every year during his 16 years with the program;

Whereas all of the coaching and support staff of the University of Kentucky Wildcats deserve congratulations, including Craig Skinner, Anders Nelson, Carly Cramer, Kristen Sanford, Katy Poole, Jake Romano, Nathan Matthews, Dr. Kimberly Kaiser, Dr. Scott D. Mair, Dr. Kyle Smoot, Dr. Rob Hosey, Kathrin Eiserman, John Spurlock, Damian Black, Chris Shoals, Zach Ball, Faith Wise, and Bryce Penick;