

“(4) ESTIMATED COST SAVINGS.—For each active lease agreement under this section, the estimated cost savings to the Administration resulting from reduced maintenance, operating, and associated costs in the previous fiscal year.

“(5) OTHER QUANTIFIABLE BENEFITS.—Other quantifiable benefits, including additional cost savings not included under paragraph (4), to the Administration resulting from the use of leases under this section.”.

(c) REPORT ON REQUIREMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by adding after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) REPORT ON ENHANCED-USE LEASING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2022, the Administrator shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on existing requirements for applicants seeking a lease under this section, including—

“(1) any requirement related to the involvement of foreign entities, foreign entity ownership, and foreign entity investment; and

“(2) at the discretion of the Administrator, any other requirement related to the protection and security of Administration missions and facilities.”.

DIVISION C—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS TO ADDRESS THREATS TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$10,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for expenses necessary to address threats to the Supreme Court of the United States.

TITLE II

THE JUDICIARY SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$9,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for expenses necessary to address threats to the Supreme Court of the United States.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 301. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 304. Each amount provided by this Act is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res.

14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

This division may be cited as the “Supreme Court Security Funding Act of 2022”.

SA 5136. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5135 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4346, making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 5137. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4346, making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 2 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 5138. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5137 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4346, making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike “2” and insert “3”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have eight 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 19, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

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, July 19, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 19, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

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, July 19, 2022, 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, July 19, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 19, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 19, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 19, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kiana Kekoa, a Coast Guard fellow in my office, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the 117th Congress.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 20; that following the prayer and the 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; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Williams nomination; further, that the cloture motions filed during yesterday’s session ripen at 11:30 a.m., and that if cloture is invoked on the Williams nomination, all postcloture time be expired at 2:30 p.m.; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday’s session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. For the information of the Senate, there will be one rollcall vote at 11:30 a.m., two rollcall votes at 2:30 p.m., and additional rollcall votes later in the day.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMERICAN INNOVATION AND CHOICE ONLINE ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today, as I will many times, to address my colleagues on the topic of competition policy, especially in our digital markets where we have a situation where a few Big Tech titans have grown into the largest corporations our country has ever seen.

Just today, there is new reporting that shows that Google and Amazon have used their gatekeeper power to eliminate their competition for years. I don't think we are surprised by this, but this is new information that I think is important, as we learn new things all the time, that my colleagues know.

According to a 2014 memo first obtained by the House Judiciary Committee, a Google executive described—this is what the memo says—“grave concerns” about a new service from a rival “competing with their core search experience.” The documents also included an email from 2009 in which Amazon executives discussed ways to stop a company—that would be Diapers.com, a company it later bought—from advertising on their own platform.

This gets to the core of what we are talking about here and why we must take action. This email that was made public today reads:

We are under no obligation to allow them to advertise on our site. . . . I'd argue we should block them from buying product ads immediately, or at minimum price those ads so they truly reflect the opportunity costs.

What does that mean? Well, Amazon could charge their rival whatever they wanted for advertisements and try and keep consumers in the dark about lower prices. That is only two from the dozens of documents newly released today by the House Judiciary Committee.

I come to the floor today because the evidence is clear and continues to mount. These dominant tech platforms have abused their power for years, and now we are at a crossroads. Will America continue to be a place where entrepreneurs lead our economy forward or will we become a country where a handful of monopolists get to dictate who gets a chance to succeed?

Remember when they all started—whether they were in garages or whatever—they started with this idea that they were platforms for sharing this information. I don't think anyone ever conceived they would also own things

on the platform and then preference those things over other competitors. That is what is going on now. This is where consumers go to make their decisions about what they are going to buy.

When you have situations where Google has 90 percent of the search market, that is a monopoly, clear as can be. The decisions we make and the actions we take today will set the trajectory for American innovation, for ingenuity, and prosperity for the next generation. I say we must meet the moment.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have had the opportunity to serve as chair of the committee's Subcommittee on Competition Policy, Antitrust, and Consumer Rights. From my vantage point, I can tell you it has become painfully obvious, as many of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—have seen, that we have a serious competition problem throughout our economy, especially in Big Tech but not only in Big Tech. This issue impacts all Americans every single day.

Why are there only two dominant smartphone operating systems? Why do social media companies face so few consequences for playing fast and loose with our personal data? Why does Amazon keep raising prices that consumers and small businesses pay? The answer is simple: They are monopolies. That is what monopolies do. They are the big guys on the block, and there is a lack of competition.

Despite the volume of evidence that supports taking action, Congress has yet to pass a single bill on online platform competition since the dawn of the internet. That is right. At the beginning, we were told we don't want to squelch these new products and competition. That made sense back then, but it doesn't make sense now.

This evening, I am going to talk about the problems consumers and small businesses are experiencing in the online marketplace and the cost of inaction. It is really easy around this place not to act, to say things are too hard to deal with, whether it is climate change, whether it is immigration reform, whether it is tech policy from competition to privacy. But at some point, you have to stop blaming other people and do something about it.

I am going to review how other countries are attacking this problem and actually taking it on. I will discuss the many examples throughout history when Congress and enforcers have stepped up to confront monopoly power. This has long been a problem in our country.

You go way back to the Founding Fathers. So many people actually came to America because they wanted to be entrepreneurs. They don't want to have to buy all their tea from the East India tea company. You think about the Senators from the past taking on monopolies. Whether it is the railroad trust, whether it is the sugar trust, they took on monopolies.

There are old cartoons in this very Chamber, our Old Senate Chamber, showing these big, bloated monopoly trusts looking down on the Senators because they controlled them. We don't want that to happen in our modern day because we know many times from the past, the Senate did stand up and do something. That is the case I am going to make today for why my bipartisan bill with Senator GRASSLEY, the American Innovation and Choice Online Act, is necessary to level the playing field in our digital economy.

First, let me say a word about what we are up against. That is what everyone sees. I am trying to measure my audience today on C-SPAN versus what we believe is well around \$100 million that the Big Tech companies have purchased for ads, especially in States where Senators are up for reelection where they have purchased ads all over the country. But people do listen. There are a few people here right now, and if I give this speech in different ways a number of times, I can win.

Let's talk about what we are up against. When I talk about the dominant digital platforms, I am talking about some of the most powerful companies in the world with armies of lobbyists and lawyers—thousands and thousands of lawyers and lobbyists. I have two. They are sitting right here in the Chamber.

We do have kind of a David and Goliath situation, but the lawyers for Big Tech are everywhere, in every corner in this town, at every cocktail party, and all over this building. I tell my colleagues they don't even know sometimes when someone is trying to influence them because they may think they are just talking to a friend or someone who worked on their campaign a while ago. But once they talk about antitrust and Big Tech, they should ask the person if they are being paid by a tech company or if they are on the board of a tech company or if they have some affiliation with one of the Big Tech companies because, time and time again, they have been surprised to find the answer is yes.

But these Big Tech companies aren't just lobbying my colleagues; they are also lobbying the American people with astroturf campaigning and other dishonest PR tactics.

At the same time that I have been working with my colleagues in good faith on commonsense solutions to online competition problems, these companies have been telling anyone who will listen that acting to protect competition in our digital markets will sometimes or somehow cede our national security or it will outlaw Amazon Prime—claims that were disputed by the Department of Justice and Amazon's own lobbyists in the press. That is just two examples. We deal with this all the time. They will say anything and everything. Senator GRASSLEY and I came down here together to the Senate floor to refute this a few months ago.