by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFF THE COAST OF CALIFORNIA, OREGON, AND WASHINGTON.

Section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other law, the Secretary shall not issue a lease for the exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas in any area of the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of the State of California, Oregon, or Washington.''.

SA 1621. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

SA 1622. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

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

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have 12 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 5:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provision of rule XXII, the postcloture time with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 1957 expire at 12:15 tomorrow.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, June 10; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1957, under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator LEE.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, to most Americans, the so-called Great American Outdoors Act is a mistake. It is expensive, shortsighted, and it is wrong; but to those of us who live in the American West, it is a disaster. Despite its rosy claims, this legislation combines two bills that will only tighten the Federal stranglehold on our lands and drive us deeper into debt, to the detriment of our economy, our environment, and the livelihoods and the freedom of the American people.

So just how, you might ask, does it do that? Well, let me explain. The first title containing an expanded version of the Restore Our Parks Act attempts to address the roughly $19.3 billion maintenance backlog on our Federal lands, concentrated primarily within national parks projects, which approach a $12 billion maintenance backlog just on their own, but it seeks to do so by spending $9.5 billion of Federal offshore energy revenues over 5 years, without any means whatsoever of offsetting those extra funds.

Now, that, to be clear, is money that is currently going to the U.S. Treasury to pay for a number of other costs, a

number of other expenditures—from aircraft carriers to Federal courts and everything in between—and will only add to our already ballooning national debt.

It is, we have to remember, Congress's job to set priorities for the funds in the Treasury. If we prioritize something—if we prioritize one thing—we must either proportionately decrease the funding for something else or find another way to generate new revenue.

This bill does neither. Furthermore, without any measures to prevent it, it guarantees that a similar backlog will only reemerge in the future. There are better ways to address this problem. For example, there are much better ways in a proposal that has been introduced by Senator ENZI in a bill called the REAL Act. The REAL Act would modestly increase park visitor fees by $5, businesses and tourist visa fees by $25, and a visa waiver program fee by $16—estimated to bring an additional $5.5 billion in revenue over the next 10 years.

This, the REAL Act, introduced by Senator ENZI is a reasonable, practical solution to sustainably address the maintenance backlog on our National Parks, which is a problem. It is a problem that needs to be dealt with, and the REAL Act does it in a very responsible, sustainable fashion. What is more, the REAL Act would create a permanent and independent way of supplementing the funding for our National Parks and do so without adding to the national debt.

The second title of this bill—of the Great American Outdoors Act—creates almost $1 billion of mandatory spending every single year on new Federal land acquisition through the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In other words, it adds a new entitlement, adding to our already unaffordable system of entitlements. It puts it on a level playing field with things like Social Security and Medicare, other entitlement programs, the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Now, why would we do this when we are already on a collision course with our ability to fund Federal programs, including and especially those programs that America's seniors have paid for, for years, and come to rely on? Why would we do that for this program? Why make it mandatory spending and thus convert it into yet another unaffordable entitlement program?

Let's talk a little bit about the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or LWCF, as it is known. This was originally put in place pursuant to a law passed in 1964, and the LWCF, as it was created and enacted into law back in 1964, was put in place in order to promote and preserve access to recreational opportunities on Federal public lands—on public lands generally, in fact. So the fund was set up to be the principal source of money for Federal land acquisition and to assist States in developing recreational opportunities on their own.

Originally, it directed 60 percent of its funds to be appropriated for State purposes and 40 percent for Federal purposes. Unfortunately, the program has since drifted far from its original moorings and far from its original intent, and it has been rife with abuse. In 1976, the law was amended to remove the 60-percent State provision, stating simply that not less than 40 percent of the funds must be used for Federal purposes, while remaining silent on whether a State would receive a penny.

Now, just over the last year or so, not less than 40 percent of the funds are dedicated to State purposes, so that still means that up to 60 percent of the funds can still be used for Federal land acquisition. The result? Well, it hasn't been good. It has been used more for Federal land acquisition than for improving access to or care of the vast Federal lands that we already own and manage—or in many cases, fail to manage.

Sixty-one percent of the funds have historically been used for acquisition, compared to the 25 percent that have been allocated to State grants, spending close to $12 billion to purchase new Federal lands.

So despite people's images of charming ribbon cuttings at local parks and scenic wildlife, the LWCF has functioned as the Federal Government's primary vehicle for Federal land grabs, resulting in a massive, restrictive, and neglected Federal estate.

The Federal Government now owns 640 million acres of land—more than 640 million acres—within the United States. To put this in perspective, this amount—the more than 640 million acres of land currently owned by the Federal Government within the United States—is a total larger than the entireties of France, Spain, Germany, Poland, Italy, the United Kingdom, Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands combined.

Now, I am not talking about the government-owned lands or the parklands within those countries. I am talking about the entirety of the countries themselves. The Federal Government owns more land than that. That is 28 percent of the total acreage within the United States, and more than 50 percent of the land in the West. This has proven to be far more land than the Federal Government is capable of managing responsibly. The condition of the vast Federal estate ranges from fair to poor to dismal. These lands face problems with rampant wildfires, soil erosion, mismanagement, and littering—with a staggering combined maintenance backlog of nearly $20 billion.

Resources are only being spread thinner as they are being stretched to serve more and more lands—more and more lands that are now going to be bought with the new entitlement spending that we are putting in place with this bill should we enact this ill-conceived legislative proposal.

On top of that, many of the LWCF funds have been diverted to a vague ''other purposes'' category that has, in many instances, little to do with access to outdoor recreation at all. In fact, many of the programs it has funded have, instead, aimed to pull land from public use, regardless of how the land in question is classified. So rather than increasing opportunities for hunting and fishing, snowmobiling, hiking, camping, mountain biking, or kayaking, the land policies in place have slowly been squeezing out recreational opportunities, and this has been going on for decades.

And so, too, have these policies imposed severe economic restrictions. As the Federal estate has grown since the time the LWCF was established in 1964, natural resource production—including mining, energy, timber, and livestock raising—have sharply declined, depriving rural communities and their economies of crucial jobs and economic activity.

Timber production, for example, has been cut by about 90 percent since the 1980s. So instead of providing sustainable, renewable, economically productive logging in the Northwest, these forests are now managed by catastrophic wildfire under the supervision—or I should say the failed supervision—of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

If you don't believe me, ask anyone who lives in the Western United States. Ask anyone who lives in the communities of Utah who have seen the environmental and economic devastation brought about as a result of failed land management policies.

Now, some claim, rather audaciously, that the outdoor recreation economy is a major boon to these very same communities that are being impoverished by it. But usually, nearly always, people who say that aren't people who live in those communities.

Seasonal tourism is not a sustainable core industry for most communities. Much of the money spent on outdoor recreation ends up going to apparel, equipment, and gear from large out-of-state companies. Rural public lands counties don't see a penny of it. This is especially true in those counties where the Federal Government owns not just 67 percent of the land mass, as is the case throughout Utah as a whole, but 90, 95 percent plus of the land in some counties.

To make matters worse, Federal lands also mean a loss of property taxes and, as a result, a loss of huge sources of revenue and opportunities for States and for local communities. It is no coincidence that the poorest rural counties in the West are the very same communities, the very same counties where they have the most Federal land. The poorest counties are the counties with the most Federal land.

Why is that? Well, there are a number of reasons, but one of the things that has to be taken into account is

the fact that, without property taxes, schools are underfunded, local governments are crippled, fire departments are, ironically, depleted and, therefore, unable to properly take care of the lands they are charged to protect in the first place. This, by the way, says nothing of the loss of economic activity as a whole. I am just talking here about the lack of property tax revenue.

Now, there is a Federal program for this, the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program, also known as the PILT Program, as the abbreviation refers. This is a program that was intended to address this disparity by compensating counties and local communities for their loss of property taxes—that is the loss from property taxes that comes about as a result of significant Federal land ownership and the Federal Government's declaration, by law, that its lands may not be taxed. But PILT payments have provided only a pittance of what would be due to local governments were Federal lands not exempt from property taxes.

In 2018, the Utah Legislature commissioned a state-of-the-art evaluation of 32 million acres of Federal land in Utah, excluding roughly 3 million acres of National Parks and Wilderness Areas. Now, this May, that same commission found that appraising these BLM and Forest Service lands according to their lowest use value would result in an annual property tax bill of $534 million. And this, by the way, in addition to excluding National Parks and Wilderness Areas from that equation, was a study that involved only those Federal lands extending to within 1 mile of any municipal boundary or of any city or town in Utah. So this fraction would produce $534 million annually in property tax revenue, even if it were taxed at its lowest value.

In 2019, the PILT payments to Utah statewide totaled just $41 million, just 7.7 percent of the potential revenue from property taxes. Again, we are not talking about the National Parks or their National Wilderness Areas, nor are we talking about the lands outside of 1 mile beyond any municipal boundary.

And while States and localities are the ones carrying the unfair economic burden, Washington only pours salt in these wounds by neglecting its oversight responsibilities. In May 2019, a GAO report found that BLM fails to maintain centralized data on lands acquired and that an increasing element of LWCF funds across agencies are being spent on acquisition projects that occur without and, in some cases, contrary to congressional approval.

Not only that, but a December 2019 GAO report found that numerous agencies have blatantly disregarded LWCF requirements in order to illegally purchase more land. Yes. They are buying land, in many cases, contrary to their statutory authorization and limitations imposed by law. Under the original LWCF Act, no more than 15 percent of the land added to the National Forest System is to be west of the 100th meridian, essentially everything west of Oklahoma. But the GAO found that between fiscal years 2014 and 2018, the Federal Government had acquired more than 450,000 acres of land in the United States, more than 80 percent of which were west of the 100th meridian. In another recent review of land acquisition policies across the agencies conducted by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, officials said that 40 percent of the land acquired with LWCF funds were not even requested by the agencies—not requested in the first place, yet they were purchased in some cases contrary to an explicit statutory command.

As it turns out, billions of LWCF dollars are being spent without the Congress and without the relevant agencies or the public being informed of where or why or pursuant to what authority they were made. Why, then, would it ever make sense to turn this into an entitlement program, to turn this into something that is self-perpetuating—into a self-licking ice cream cone—that needs no support or reauthorization year to year from Congress?

Last year, the Senate permanently reauthorized this broken, harmful, dangerous, unaccountable fund without reform and without any incentive to offer future reforms, but as if that weren't bad enough, the legislation before us now proposes to make that funding mandatory.

Before, Congress could at least appropriate varying amounts to be used from the fund. Now, this bill, if passed, would turn the LWCF into a true trust fund, automatically requiring that the full $900 million be spent primarily on Federal land acquisition each year in perpetuity without accountability and without oversight. The unofficial Congressional Budget Office score estimates that this bill, as a whole, will cost nearly $17.3 billion over the next 10 years, all for land projects that we cannot afford, let alone maintain.

This is not how Congress was tasked with exercising the power of the purse. This is not how it is supposed to work—not in this country and certainly not in this legislative body.

It is the tough business of Congress to set priorities and to decide which, among worthy causes, should receive our limited resources. These funds could be going to provide relief in the midst of the current pandemic or to our national defense or to shoring up benefits for veterans or to a myriad of other goals. Putting these funds into a direct deposit mechanism, however, means that we are not having those conversations and not actively evaluating how we can best spend those taxpayer dollars each year. No, no. Instead, we are going to put it on autopilot. That is what this bill wants to do rather shamefully.

This provision of the bill automatically puts more funds toward the harmful cause of growing the Federal estate, putting us on an even worse path than we have already taken. In fact, the first provision of the bill is only evidence to the fact that we have bitten off far more than we can chew.

We can do better. As it currently stands, we have nothing to gain from this legislation. The agenda of aggressively and endlessly growing our Federal estate has put us on a dangerous path with devastating effects for our lands and for the people who live, recreate, and survive off of them as my home State of Utah has already experienced far too well. If we do not change course, this path will only worsen for the rest of the Nation too.

I want to point out something—a common misperception that people often have about Federal land and what it is and what it does. In many cases, if you don't live in the western United States, you are not necessarily aware of the fact that the overwhelming majority—not just most but the overwhelming majority of Federal land is not a national park. National parks are some of the few things people consistently like about the Federal Government. They are frequently the favorite thing about the Federal Government. We all love national parks. They are beautiful. They are fun, and they are something that the Federal Government does that everyone still enjoys and loves. But most Federal land is not a national park. The overwhelming majority isn't anything like a national park, and the way these lands are divided out really isn't fair.

In every State east of Colorado, the Federal Government owns less than 15 percent of the land. In every State to the west of Colorado and including Colorado, the Federal Government owns at least 15 percent and, in many cases, many multiples of that. In my State it happens to be about 67 percent. A tiny segment of that land consists of national park land. Most of it is just land that you can't use for anything else. The local governments can't tax them, and people can't access them for economic or recreational purposes without a ''Mother, may I?'' from the Federal Government. That is what it is. Most of this land isn't even a national park or a national recreation area or a wilderness area or anything remotely worthy of that. This is just about Federal control, and most of it is not managed very well.

The National Park System has been underfunded. They, in many ways, do the best job they can with what they have, but they have been chronically underfunded, and the national parks are quite well run compared to the vast majority of Federal public land we have, which is chronically neglected, environmentally mismanaged, often to the economic and environmental detriment of those States where there is a lot of Federal land.

Take San Juan County, UT. The Federal Government owns somewhere along the order of 95 percent of the land in San Juan County. It also happens to be Utah's poorest county.

These two issues are not a coincidence. The fact that they appear in the same land mass is not coincidental; it is causal. The Federal Government is the cause for the impoverishment of this county and other communities in Utah and throughout the United States. Why? Because people can't own the land, can't develop the land, can't tax the land to fund their schools, their search and rescue services, or any other government priority. Nor can they access it for most economic purposes.

Finally, all of my other observations about this legislation notwithstanding, this is the Senate, and just like church is for sinners, the Senate floor isn't for perfect, hermetically sealed, finished bills. We are supposed to bring imperfect bills to the floor to debate and deliberate and amend and discuss and, ultimately, find consensus. That is why I and many of my colleagues have been trying to do exactly that in this very situation with this very bill.

I have a number of amendments. Many western State Senators do as well. Several Gulf State Senators have their own concerns about this bill in its current form. The way the process is supposed to work is that we bring this and other bills like it to the floor, and we offer up changes and see where the Senate is, see where the process goes, using reason, gentle persuasion, and awkward improvements to each piece of legislation as our guide. That is how it is supposed to work.

There are a number of Senators from western States, from Gulf States, and from States that really aren't in the West or the gulf that don't really have that much to do with Federal public land, but they can see the procedural and substantive defects of this bill. That is why many of us who really would like to make improvements to this bill have come together from different parts of the country.

The process of actually legislating has gone out of fashion in Washington and, quite regrettably, out of this Chamber in recent years, but it is something that I think the whole Senate would like to get back to—and I mean the whole Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike. This is an issue that is neither Republican or Democratic; it is not liberal or conservative; it is not Libertarian. It is not an ideological viewpoint. I know people within this Chamber on virtually every point along the ideological political continuum who would very much like to see the Senate working as an actual legislative body rather than as a rubberstamp for whatever small handful of people happen to write out behind closed doors and decide must be the finished, perfect, hermetically sealed object of our vote. This is wrong. It is an insult, not just to the 100 Senators who are here. It is that to be sure, but nobody cares about that. It is more about those we represent, those who elected us. Those election certificates don't belong to us. They belong to the voters of our various States who expect us to represent them. Regardless of how we might vote on any particular piece of legislation, they expect us to have read it; they expect us to do our job by showing up and by offering to make it better where we see flaws and we see defects. There is no perfect bill, but we can still make legislation a lot less bad. We can make it better. We bring about actual consensus. Consensus is not found by ramming something through without an opportunity for amendment, debate, or discussion.

This is wrong. It has gone on for far too long. I have seen it under the leadership of Democrats and Republicans alike in this Chamber, and it has to end. It will end. The question is, How long is it going to take us and how much misery will the American people have to endure while most of their Senators are effectively locked out of meaningful legislative debate, discussion, and amendment? This is wrong, and it has to end.

The debate on this bill has now been extended by a whole extra day. There is no earthly reason why we can't use that extra day to work through a handful of 15-minute votes on a handful of amendments. It is just not that hard. In the amount of time that I have been speaking tonight, we could have processed a couple of amendments. In the amount of time that will be devoted only to hand-wringing and dismissal of legitimate concerns with this legislation, we could process any amendment that anyone wants to introduce, and this legislation could still be passed weeks before the House of Representatives is even poised to return. So why are we not doing this? There is no persuasive answer here.

We have to start doing our job. I look forward to working with our colleagues to get an agreement on some amendments so that we can give this legislation the due consideration and the careful deliberation that it deserves, that we deserve, that those who elected us deserve, and then move on to the important nominations pending before the Senate and to the National Defense Authorization Act that are next in line. In the meantime, I hope Democrats and Republicans alike can unite behind the fact that we can't skate forever under the mantra that the Senate is the world's greatest deliberative body when it does not deliberate. The good news is, it is entirely within our power to reclaim use of that title justifiably and with dignity.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:32 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 10 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*JOHN CHASE JOHNSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 9, 2020:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 9033:

To be general

GEN. CHARLES Q. BROWN, JR.