



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017

No. 102

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Holy God, in whose presence dark nights of challenges are dispelled by the dawn of Your love, You know our needs before we express them. Thank You for daily providing our lawmakers with guidance and strength.

Lord, we pause to thank You for the courage and sacrificial service of our Capitol Police. Forgive us when we take their daily courageous service for granted. Lord, forgive us, also, when we seem to forget that words matter and can become seeds that will bring a bitter harvest.

Bring speedy healing to all those injured in yesterday's shooting and solace for all of us affected by this tragedy.

Today, use our Senators as instruments of Your peace, bringing unity from division, light from darkness, joy from sadness, and hope from despair.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 722) to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Corker (for Graham) amendment No. 240, to reaffirm the strategic importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty to the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its contribution to maintaining stability throughout the world.

Gardner modified amendment No. 250, to provide an exception for activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning, the Senate continues to send its prayers to all the victims of yesterday's horrific shooting. We know our House colleagues are all thinking about their colleague, Majority Whip SCALISE. It has been an immensely difficult 24 hours for all the victims, including Matt Mika, who remains in ICU, Zach Barth, and, of course, Capitol Police Officers Crystal Griner and David Bailey. Those officers didn't back down when faced with this threat. Instead, as the Capitol Police always do, they put themselves in harm's way to help protect others. Without them, we know so many more would have been injured.

So we want to continue to express our gratitude to all those who gra-

ciously put their lives on the line to keep the Capitol community safe. In doing so, we are also reminded of the bravery of our colleagues on the field yesterday—those who stepped in to help friends who had been injured as they waited for first responders to arrive. I think it says something about the character of those people as well.

The events of yesterday were devastating, and we know it will take time to heal. But for now, the members of the congressional baseball team have made the decision to go forward with tonight's game, which will be played for charity. I know we will be thinking about each of them as they take the field tonight.

Mr. President, the Senate today will take a final vote on the bipartisan first step to hold Iran and Russia accountable. This follows overwhelmingly bipartisan action yesterday to approve the Russia sanctions amendment, an effort that would not have been possible without the good work of our Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Senator CORKER, and our Banking chair, Senator CRAPO, and their ranking members.

After 8 years of failed foreign policy under the Obama administration, 8 years of following the Obama administration's preferred strategy of drawing down both our forces and our commitments, we must take a stronger stance in deterring Iran and holding its regime accountable for its actions and addressing Russia's years-long pattern of provocations.

These sanctions, which are just one of our foreign policy tools, will only work as part of a broader effort to rebuild our military force structure and combat readiness in order to send a strong signal to friend and foe alike. The United States should no longer stand by and allow threats like these to go unaddressed.

When the administration completes its series of strategic reviews, I will

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3505

look forward to hearing from the President and his advisers their recommendations for countering Iran's malign conduct across the Middle East and their recommendations for countering Russia's persistent efforts to undermine NATO.

As I said earlier this week, this Iran and Russia sanctions agreement reflects good bipartisan work. I want to thank Senators on both sides of the aisle for coming together to codify and strengthen existing sanctions. Let's come together again now and pass these sanctions later this morning.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, have you announced the business for the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have laid down the business.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the fifth anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. DACA provides temporary legal status to immigrant students who arrived in the United States as children and infants, if they register with the government, pay a fee, and pass a criminal background check.

The program is based on the DREAM Act, a piece of legislation I introduced 16 years ago in 2001. That legislation gave undocumented students who grew up in this country a chance to earn a path to legal status and citizenship. These young people have come to be known as DREAMers. What used to be a word reserved for rock-and-roll groups is now a word that has become part of our common language to describe an immigration challenge and opportunity.

These DREAMers came to the United States as children. They are American in every way except for their legal immigration status. We have already invested a lot of money in these kids. We educated them. We made them part of this country, and it makes no sense to squander their talents by deporting them at this moment in their lives.

In April 2010, I sent a letter to President Obama. Dick Lugar, the Republican Senator from Indiana, joined me. On a bipartisan basis, we said to President Obama: Stop deporting these young kids. They did nothing wrong. Their parents made the decision to come here. Give them a chance. The President responded. It is now clear the DACA Program he created by Executive order has been a great success.

More than 780,000 DREAMers have come forward and received DACA protection and status that has allowed them to contribute more fully to this country as students, as teachers, as nurses, as engineers, as entrepreneurs.

A recent study by the Center for American Progress found that ending DACA—saying to these 780,000 young people they are no longer part of America—would cost us. It would cost our economy over \$400 billion in gross domestic product over the next 10 years. These are productive citizens doing good things for America. I should take that back. They are not citizens yet. They are productive people doing good things for America whom I want to make citizens if the DREAM Act becomes law.

I have many differences with President Trump on immigration. For example, the President's January 25 Executive order makes up to 8 million immigrants priorities for deportation, and seeks to create a deportation force by tripling the number of immigration agents. This ignores the reality that the vast majority of undocumented immigrants are law-abiding individuals who make important economic contributions to this country, and have deep roots in the United States.

I am grateful, and I say that publicly. I have said it before. I am grateful President Trump has decided to keep the DACA Program in place. Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service Director nominee, Francis Cissna, have promised me personally and publicly that they will maintain the existing guidelines for the DACA Program. I appreciate this commitment. I intend to hold them to it.

Congress also has an obligation to do its job. We ought to do something we rarely do in the U.S. Senate—pass legislation, fix our broken immigration system. Think about this: On June 27, 2013—4 years ago—the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, passed comprehensive immigration reform by a vote of 68 to 32, better than 2 to 1. I was glad to be part of the Gang of 8 Democratic and Republican Senators who worked for months on the bill that passed by this margin. It strengthened border security, protected American workers, and it established a tough but fair path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented people in this country.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority of the House of Representatives would not debate it, would not consider it, would not bring it for a vote, and it died in the U.S. House of Representatives. If they had done their job, their work, it would have passed with a bipartisan majority. President Obama would have signed it into law. I might not be standing here today talking about this issue.

Over the years, I have come to the floor of the Senate to tell story after story about DREAMers, the young immigrant students who grew up in this

country. These stories put a human face on the DACA Program and the DREAM legislation. They show that immigration makes our country stronger.

Today, I want to say a word about Gissel Escobedo. This is Gissel. She came to the United States at the age of 3. Her family emigrated from Mexico. She grew up in my home State of Illinois, in the town of Cicero. She was an honors student in high school. She attended their gifted program. She had a big responsibility personally. From a young age, she was one of the primary caregivers for her brother who suffers from severe autism. During the little spare time she had, Gissel was a volunteer in her community, helping organizations provide care for children with autism.

As an undocumented student though, Gissel was not eligible for any Federal assistance to go to college, but as a result of her academic achievements in high school, she received a private scholarship to attend the University of Illinois at Chicago. As a college student, Gissel was a writing tutor and a leader in student organizations for future teachers. In 2010, she graduated from the University of Illinois Chicago and the College of Education with a degree in elementary education. After the graduation ceremony, Gissel received a Dean's Merit Award. She delivered the graduation speech for her class.

She wanted to start using her degree as an elementary school teacher, but because she was undocumented, that wasn't possible. Instead, she continued her education and earned a master's degree at the University of Illinois. She was accepted into a disability leadership program as a family advocate.

Then, in 2012, the world changed for the better for Gissel. President Obama established the DACA Program. She immediately applied for DACA. Then, in 2013, she completed her master's degree and became an elementary school teacher. For the last 4 years, Gissel has been a teacher in the Berwyn South School District. Last year, she was awarded a certificate of achievement for her leadership as one of two teachers to implement the first-ever dual-language program in the district.

Gissel sent me a letter. I would like to read part of it as part of the RECORD. Here is what she said:

DACA has enabled me to become a meaningful member of society by opening doors that would have otherwise not been accessible. DACA recipients, like myself, are more than just a policy. My hope is that when people listen to our stories, they will notice the kind of individuals that we are and the kind of contributions we make—not only to the economy, but to our society.

I reflect on that paragraph to think about this young woman, the challenges she has faced within her family, and challenges imposed by the fact that she was undocumented. She has never lost sight of her commitment to her family, to her disabled sibling, and to many others in her community.

Now she wants to be a teacher. Wouldn't you be proud and honored to have your child in a classroom with someone with Gissel's master's degree and values? I certainly would. Gissel and other DREAMers have so much to give to the United States, but without DACA and without the DREAM Act, Gissel would be deported back to Mexico—a country she hasn't lived in since she was 3 years old.

Will America be a stronger country if we send away people like Gissel, if we deport them and say we don't need them in our future? Of course not. The answer is clear. Gissel will make America a better place. Today we celebrate the DACA Program, which has given Gissel and hundreds of thousands of other DREAMers the chance to finally come out of the shadows, but we also recognize DACA as a temporary solution.

Ultimately, Congress—and especially the Senate—must step up and show leadership here; make certain that we address the failings and weaknesses of our broken immigration system; say to the 780,000 protected by DACA that you stepped forward, paid your fee, submitted yourself to a background check, and have been given a temporary opportunity to be part of America. Now it is our job to translate that into a permanent opportunity for these young people to make America a better place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING SENATOR DURBIN

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my friend and colleague for his outstanding words on DACA. No one has fought more for the DACA kids than he has, not just in the last year but over the last decade. The fact that so many of them are here is, in good part, due to his great work and effort. Thank you.

THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, we are still all a bit shaken by the horrors of yesterday's shooting. It was a senseless act of violence, made even more chilling by the circumstances at a baseball practice for a bipartisan charity event. I understand that Representative SCALISE is still in critical condition following surgery last night. When we hear the word "critical" attached to his condition, it sends shivers down our spines. We hope and pray for a quick and full recovery. I know that all of his House colleagues are wishing him well right now, and I want him to know his friends in the Senate do as well.

The same goes for the other four who were injured in the attack, including two members of our Capitol Police Force. Our thoughts and prayers go with them as well. We remain grateful for their service and bravery and for the service and bravery of all of our Capitol police officers. Their presence at the field yesterday—the presence of those two Capitol police officers at the

field yesterday prevented a bad situation from getting worse and undoubtedly saved lives. Had the two brave police officers not acted or if they had not been there, it might well have been a massacre.

We would all be wise to reflect on the importance of civility in our Nation's politics this morning. We disagree vehemently at times in Congress and folks out in the country do, too, but the level of nastiness, vitriol, and hate that has seeped into our politics must be excised. Let us all strive at all times—whatever our disagreements—to respect those who disagree with us, to seek a greater understanding of them, to walk in their moccasins—as Native Americans have always said. Let us strive always to conduct our politics with civility.

I was heartened to hear that the congressional baseball game will still be played this evening. Let it be a symbol that hate and violence do not cast too long or too great a shadow, that we can and will come together this evening, and the game will go on. I will be going to the game with the three congressional leaders as a show of solidarity.

Mr. President, last evening, the Senate showed it can come together. Last night, we voted, in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, to strengthen a package of sanctions against Russia. It was the product of diligent weeks of bipartisan negotiations. I saw the Senator from Maryland behind me a few minutes ago. He deserves lots of credit, as do the Senators from Ohio, Tennessee, and Idaho. The final result is a very good one for our country because yesterday the U.S. Senate said to Mr. Putin, in no uncertain terms, that when he violates international norms and interferes with our election, he will not escape reproach.

Not only did we pass a new round of tough sanctions for Russia's meddling in our election, we codified existing sanctions into law, making them harder to lift, and we moved to make the Congress—not the President—the final arbiter of sanctions relief when necessary. Any ideas of the President that he can lift sanctions on his own, for any reason, are dashed by this legislation.

The House of Representatives should take notice that 97 Senators voted in favor of this package. I hope Leader RYAN will move with the same haste to pass this package of sanctions through the House. I hope the President will sign it. The months-long effort to forge bipartisan consensus on Russia sanctions—an issue that gets to the vital interests of our country, the wellspring of our democracy—gives me hope that Democrats and Republicans can come together and work together on a number of big issues this year.

There are several issues coming before this body soon where we can come together: another budget—passing another budget; reauthorizing flood insurance and children's health insurance; raising the debt ceiling. Each of

those issues will, by definition, demand bipartisan effort.

A lesson that all of us have learned here in the Senate is that legislation is made better and much more likely to pass when both parties are involved in crafting it.

I have noticed the media has been questioning all morning why Congress isn't more bipartisan. We should be. But when the Russia sanctions agreement passes and the budget deal passes, both major bipartisan efforts, they are proof that we can get things done together. If those agreements were given a little more recognition by the media—the fact that we can at times, at least, work in a bipartisan way—that would help. For too many of us on both sides of the aisle, it seems as though when there is divisiveness, it gets far more attention in the media than when there is comity between the parties.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, finally, I would suggest to my colleagues that the most immediate place where we can translate the rhetoric calling for us to come together into reality is on healthcare. A goal many of us share on both sides of the aisle is to improve the law, bring costs down for consumers, stabilize the marketplace, and make it easier for older Americans to afford the ever-rising out-of-pocket costs of prescription drugs.

I would conclude by stating that we can make the rhetoric of bipartisanship not empty by both parties coming together and working together on healthcare. We have shown thus far in this Congress with the passage of the budget and Russia sanctions that significant legislation can best be served by bipartisanship. Opening up the process and having us all come together on healthcare would be a very good, concrete reaffirmation of bipartisanship and would translate the rhetoric—not bad at all—that we have heard here today into reality.

In conclusion, the rhetoric about bipartisanship can be strengthened. Hopefully healthcare is a place where we can strengthen it, by opening up the process, having hearings, and having open discussion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls on S. 722 be charged equally to both sides.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senator from

Alabama is presiding over this very important debate because one of the most important issues to both of our States, Colorado and Alabama, is the economy and the economic well-being of our great country. The amendment that I will be discussing today goes to the very heart of our opportunities in space, our opportunities in innovation, our opportunities to ensure that we have the most reliable information as it relates to weather and to weather events.

It is a great partnership that we have had with the Senator from Alabama, who has been absolutely critical and instrumental in ensuring a persistent, reliable space presence. I thank the Senator from Alabama, Mr. STRANGE, for his incredible leadership when it comes to making sure that we are able to reach space, that we are able to continue our space mission. Whether it is in the defense of this country or in understanding where the next tornado may strike, I thank the Senator from Alabama for the leadership that has been provided to ensure that constant presence and persistence.

Of course, I rise to speak in support of the bipartisan Gardner-Nelson-Warner et al. amendment, amendment No. 250. Yet, truly, to the Senate—to my colleagues here—I rise in support of America's role and leadership in space.

I rise on behalf of the hardworking men and women across this Nation who make our country's aerospace industry second to none, because, over the past 70 years, the United States has led the way in space exploration. From the Apollo missions to the space shuttle to the Orion program, we are the leaders in exploring the great frontier of space. That is who this country is. That is who we are—explorers, pioneers. We were the first to the Moon, and I hope we are the first to Mars, but we cannot give up that pioneering innovation that has led this country to greatness.

I will share with colleagues of the Senate a CNBC story from March that China is building a manned spacecraft that is capable of sending astronauts to the Moon as well as to near-Earth orbit flight.

Can you imagine the day when the stars and stripes on the lunar surface stands not alone but stands next to the stars of a flag of another nation—perhaps China's, perhaps somebody else's?

When it comes to our access to space, this debate is absolutely critical because without the passage of amendment No. 250, we lose a tremendous portion of our access to space. We lose it for commercial applications, and we lose it for civil applications.

In the past few months, this China activity has shown the importance of U.S. leadership. That is why this bipartisan amendment comes with a very simple point. It ensures that NASA and our commercial space industry will continue to be the country's leader in aerospace.

The ranking member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator MARK

WARNER, of Virginia, is coleading my amendment. The Senator has done a phenomenal job in leadership on the Intelligence Committee in leading this amendment.

I see that my colleague from Florida, Senator NELSON, has joined this debate. He has done a phenomenal job in leading this effort. As the ranking member of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, with jurisdiction over NASA, Senator BILL NELSON is the leading co-sponsor of this effort.

They understand how important it is to address this issue for NASA and other space missions.

I stand here in support of the greater goals of the underlying bill that we will be amending today. I believe sanctions against our adversaries are warranted and justified and, indeed, should move forward. This amendment is not designed to undermine the intent of the bill, but it seeks to ensure that space exploration may continue as it is currently planned.

Without this bipartisan amendment, multiple missions on the books today—that are already planned today—will be delayed or even canceled and will be subjecting the U.S. taxpayers to significant cost increases. Without this amendment, missions like the commercial resupply program, which delivers critical supplies to the International Space Station, will be jeopardized by the language of the bill as it is written. American astronauts at the International Space Station, as we speak, are dependent on those supplies, but we are cutting off the American lifeline without the adoption of this amendment. Future missions, like the commercial crew program—a partnership between NASA and private industry to bring astronauts to the International Space Station on a U.S.-manufactured spacecraft—will be put at risk without the adoption of this amendment.

Without this bipartisan amendment, we will continue to rely on Russian spacecraft to take U.S. astronauts to the International Space Station. Let me just make that more clear. Without the adoption of this amendment, NASA and our astronauts will be dependent on Russia for access to space for even longer. Rejection of this bipartisan amendment results in further Russian dependence.

I do not believe this was the intent of the language when the bill was first written. The Gardner-Nelson-Warner-Shelby et al. amendment creates the certainty that NASA needs and supporters to ensure currently planned NASA and commercial launch missions can continue without interruption.

NASA contacted my office yesterday and said of amendment No. 250: "We believe this provides us the flexibility to maintain our commitments to our national space program."

It is not just the commercial crew and cargo missions that are going to be impacted. Several other missions will be subjected to delays—missions like

the Joint Polar Satellite System. This constellation of satellites will give us the ability to constantly monitor the globe for significant weather events, such as floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes. As I stand here today, the three Senators on the floor who are listening to this important debate—with more on C-SPAN—have been impacted dramatically by floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes.

In 2013, we had dramatic flooding in Colorado that damaged thousands and thousands of homes and cost lives. I know the Presiding Officer has faced the same challenge when it has come to tornadoes and incredibly tragic weather events. The Senator from Florida has faced hurricanes, floods, and tornadoes. That is the importance of this amendment—to understand our weather systems and predictions.

I am proud to say that JPSS is being developed in my home State of Colorado. The JPSS and other essential programs in which we have already invested hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars already, are now put at risk of significant delays or cost increases to the taxpayer without the adoption of this amendment.

I am also on the floor to talk about a longer term mission that I truly believe in and hope to see our Nation achieve, one that goes to the very heart of our pioneering spirit of who we are as a people. It is our future manned mission to Mars.

As I have spoken on the floor before, as I child I wanted to be an astronaut. I was inspired as I watched NASA astronauts explore that next frontier. I believe that the next destination for human beings to explore is, indeed, Mars, but without this bipartisan amendment, the Mars 2020 rover, which will continue to prepare us for that future manned mission, will be put in doubt. It will be a significant setback and will make the future goal of getting to Mars seem that much further away.

This amendment, amendment No. 250, allows these missions to move forward with certainty and as scheduled. It is a bipartisan effort to affirm America's leadership in space.

Let's be clear. Last summer we had a debate on this very same issue—that by 2022 we were going to have an "America first" opportunity. That is the spirit of this amendment—to make sure that we have access to these vital and critical space missions, access to space, and to continue to grow economic opportunities for the American people. That is what this debate is all about.

I yield the floor to my colleague Senator NELSON and then, of course, will continue with debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

MR. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank Senator GARDNER.

Indeed, this is an example of the Senate working together. There is, simply, a problem in the bill that was passed.

It is a technical problem, but it goes to the heart of our military-civilian space program. It goes to the heart of the co-operation that we have had with Russia that goes back to the Soviet Union days when, in fact, in 1975, in the middle of the Cold War, a crew from America rendezvoused and docked with the crew from the Soviet Union. Ever since that crew, which was led by Lt. Gen. Tom Stafford, of the United States, and General Alexey Leonov, of the Soviet Union, we have had cooperation in space, and that program continues today on the International Space Station.

Before I get into talking about the details of the amendment, as Senator GARDNER has discussed so well already, I hope that the Senate will treat it as technical in nature because it corrects what was not intended. Unless corrected, it will be disastrous not only for NASA but for all of the burgeoning commercial space industry, which we are bringing back to America. What has happened over the last four decades, in the meantime, is that a lot of that commercial space industry has flown the coop to other launchers from other nations. But it is coming back to America.

PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, before I get into the substance, I just want to speak with regard to the terrible tragedy that occurred yesterday and of my feelings about this violence that has occurred. I don't know whether it has occurred because of the excessive rhetoric and the sharpness and the fact that politics has become a blood sport, but we are so divided.

This is what I want to say. We are Americans first, regardless of party. In times of threat, we come together. We are all on the same team.

This Senator has prayed, as I know others have, for the complete recovery of all of those who were wounded yesterday, two of whom were apparently grievously wounded. We pray for their full recovery. It was a heinous attack. Let's come together in bipartisanship.

AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

Mr. President, right here is an example of coming together. Recognizing there is a technical problem, we are coming together to fix that problem. Let's do this in the spirit of what Americans do. We are Americans first.

I am obviously here, as I demonstrated in my vote yesterday, for the Iran sanctions bill, as well as the Russia sanctions amendment, which we adopted yesterday. Both were bipartisan efforts. I wish to thank our colleagues, especially the members of the Banking and Foreign Relations Committees.

This Senator is a cosponsor of the sanctions bill which addresses Iran's support for terrorism, ballistic missile activity, and human rights violations—these destabilizing activities—and this bill strengthens the hand of the United States in countering Iran. These are

destabilizing activities separate and apart from the Iran nuclear agreement, and to date, the United States has the evidence that they have complied with the Iran nuclear agreement.

At the same time, we are facing an aggressive Vladimir Putin. The Russia bill which we debated yesterday and which will come to final passage shortly strengthens our hand against Putin's Russia. The U.S. intelligence community has already made clear that Putin attempted to interfere in our election. Let me tell my colleagues, that didn't stop with the past election. It is continuing. And we better be ready for it next year in the 2018 elections because Putin and the GRU have done all the groundwork. But that is nothing new because he had done it in elections before in Europe, and he has been doing it in elections right now, as we saw in France. It boomeranged on him, thank goodness. We will see an attempt on the upcoming German elections.

The intelligence community has made it very clear—the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee is here—that Putin and the GRU are likely to do this again. That is why I say beware. They have laid the groundwork for next year's elections to try to interfere. Putin's influence campaign struck at the very core of our democracy and simply must not be permitted to do it again.

Now is not the time to cozy up to Russia; rather, the United States must redouble our cyber defenses and our cyber offenses to deter him, to make him feel enough pain so that he won't do it again. The sanctions we will adopt today are tough. We need this, but we need more.

Shortly, we are going to vote on the amendment Senator GARDNER has explained. Interestingly, in all of this angst and conflict with Russia, we get along with Russia in the civilian and commercial space program. We have had peaceful cooperation in outer space ever since what I told my colleagues about; that is, since 1975, in the middle of the Cold War, the rendezvous and docking and living together in space for 9 days, a Soviet crew and an American crew. That has been the central theme of our space program since that time. The shining example of that now is the cooperation in the International Space Station, the football field-sized—it is 120 yards long; think one goalpost to another. People don't have any idea of how big it is on orbit. It circles the Earth every 90 minutes.

We have been working in space together with many nations but especially our partner the Russians for over 16 years. So the peaceful cooperation in space has been good for business. It has been good for jobs in America. And we are working to grow our share of an over \$300 billion global space economy.

That is what this amendment is about. It is about fixing the question on the purchase of those RD-180 engines, the Russian engine that is used

in the Atlas V, that is used not only for defense launches but for commercial launches and will be one of the two rockets launching American astronauts within a year and a half to and from the International Space Station.

So this amendment is for the benefit of our economy, as well as the betterment of our civilization.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to thank my friend, the Senator from Florida, for his comments. There is no one in this body who is more familiar with and more knowledgeable about our space programs than is Senator NELSON.

I also want to associate myself with two comments he made. No. 1, as the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I echo what he said about the very real, tangible threat the Russians, their spy agencies, and their agents pose to not just our democratic process but—as the Senator from Florida has outlined, not only did they attack us in 2016, they attacked the Dutch, which is why they had to hand-count their ballots, and they attacked the French, and Facebook took down 30,000 Facebook accounts because of fear of Russian manipulation. They will attack the Germans.

One of the things that is so concerning to me is that if you add up the amount of disruption the Russians have caused in Western societies at large without firing a shot or shooting a missile—and all that for less than 5 percent of the cost of an aircraft carrier—it is a pretty good return.

Our country needs to be strong against Russia, and I support the Russia sanctions, but I also support, as the Senator has indicated, a really critical part—that we continue our space program. I stand here to join with Senator NELSON and my good friend, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. GARDNER, in support of this amendment No. 250, which will allow civilian agencies to continue to launch crucial science, civil, and commercial space missions and which will continue to support NOAA and NASA, which depend upon their research.

Without this amendment—and I think this is an amendment that corrects a mistake in the original bill—billions of dollars and years of planning that have gone into missions like, as the Senator mentioned, the International Space Station, commercial cargo, Mars 2020, and the Joint Polar Satellite System, just wouldn't be possible. In many ways, without this amendment, we could even become more dependent upon Russian technology.

Again, as the Senator mentioned, I think the overwhelming majority of this body is very supportive of sanctions against Iran. We are very supportive, and I appreciate the opportunity to add stronger sanctions against Russia and sanctions that this

President cannot arbitrarily withdraw. But we have to make sure that in this bill we don't do unintentional harm to our space interests—space interests that I know are in Colorado and Florida and my home State of Virginia, where we have a flight facility at NASA Wallops, which is over on our Eastern Shore, where we launch both NASA and commercial satellites.

We have one of America's leading commercial and military companies, Orbital ATK, which is headquartered in Virginia and launches the Antares rocket from Wallops. The fact is, without this amendment, Orbital ATK would be prevented from buying the Russian RD-181 engines for its Antares rockets. That will do nothing to help America's space mission. The fact is, without those engines, Orbital would not be able to fulfill a \$1.2 billion contract for launching from Wallops.

Quite simply, as the Senator indicated and I am repeating, this amendment is broadly bipartisan. My friend Senator GARDNER and I chair the Cyber Caucus. The amendment is supported by our leading expert in the Senate on space, Senator NELSON, as well as Senator SHELBY and Senator BENNET and a host of others. I imagine the Presiding Officer is also a supporter of this. The amendment would simply provide civil and commercial space parity with the defense industry, for which an exemption has already been provided. It is in the interests of defense and civil space to continue the current status quo in order to maintain a competitive environment until a domestic capability has been developed.

Let me be clear. I think it is important that over a very short time, we get away from purchasing Russian rockets, but we need that transition period, and the transition period the chairman of the Armed Services Committee laid out on the defense side ought to be extended as well on the commercial side.

So a "yes" vote on amendment No. 250 will support continued access to space for NASA, as well as for those equally important commercial space missions. One of the things that I feel is so important about the commercial space missions is that we have to have that competition, candidly, with NASA and to push our defense industry if we are going to bring down space costs. To put a dagger in the heart of our commercial space industry as it has been slowly evolving would be a grave mistake.

I have taken on this issue on the intelligence side as I have tried to get smarter on the whole question of our overhead capabilities. The amount of dollars that we spend and the lack of competitiveness that we have in terms of some of our more traditional government-purchased space assets are both a waste of taxpayer dollars, and, candidly, we have an architecture overhead that is not modern enough to recognize the threats that Russians, Chinese, and others pose in terms of the

ability to jam our satellites and use laser beams and other things. In a sense, in many ways, it is almost as if our defense and the intelligence community, on overhead architecture—nobody ever saw a James Bond movie. We built these large, bulky platforms in the sky with the assumption that America would always dominate space. That dominance—it is unfortunate because our adversary changes, it is coming to an end, and we need the competition from the commercial industry, quite honestly, to push the IC and push the defense toward smaller, more resilient, and more flexible platforms.

While I share the desire of the chairman of the Arms Services Committee to get us off this Russian hardware, we do need this transition. I think the amendment that has been put forward by the Senator from Colorado provides that transition, led by the transition that was laid out on defense. I believe commercial space needs that same type of transition.

I hope the amendment will pass. I look forward to our continued bipartisan support of both NASA and commercial space and obviously our defense assets and IC assets as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the Russian sanctions amendment passed by this body 97 to 2 last year—I take it the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Virginia were here at the time; it was one person who was not—was negotiated between Senators of both parties on multiple committees, including Foreign Relations, Banking, and Armed Services. It was specifically designed to impose tough sanctions on Russian defense and intelligence sectors, to impose tough sanctions on the Russian military industrial complex and intelligence agencies that have made it possible for Russia to invade Ukraine, annex Crimea, terrorize Syria, threaten our NATO allies, and attack America's election in 2016. Have no doubt about what this amendment is, my dear colleagues and friends. It is a giveaway to the Russian military industrial complex.

There has always been a collection of lawmakers, executives, and lobbyists who have accepted continuing, even deepening, our Nation's dependence on Russian rocket engines. That is exactly what will happen if we allow this amendment to pass, and the door will once again fly open for taxpayer dollars to be used to subsidize purchases of Russian rocket engines—purchases which line the pockets of Vladimir Putin's cronies.

My friends, if you want to vote to buy more Russian rocket engines, just say it. That is fine. That is fine with me, but to cloak it in some kind of bipartisan agreement that somehow we are going to have to continue to buy these Russian rocket engines, after we had an agreement last year 97 to 2—97 to 2—what does this do? This undoes

last year's 97-to-2 agreement. We don't need this amendment to meet America's needs in space.

As a result of last year's bipartisan agreement and the NDAA, the Department of Defense is on a path to gradually eliminate dependence on Russia as quickly as possible while fostering competition among American companies. NASA needs to do the same. NASA needs to do the same. NASA needs to do the same.

Sanctions, by definition, require tradeoffs. Sanctions are not free. Countries that impose sanctions must be willing to pay a cost, too, if and when a greater principle, a great national security interest, is at stake.

Let me conclude because I note the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the ranking member here. There are costs and tradeoffs the United States has been asking our European allies to make in the last few years. We have leaned on France to cancel a sale of naval vessels to Russia. We have been warning Central and Eastern European allies against deepening their dependence on Russian energy with various energy deals and infrastructure projects. We should not be asking our allies to make these sacrifices unless we are prepared to do the same.

We will probably pass this amendment. If there is ever a doubt in any of our constituents' minds about the influence of special interests, it will be with passage of this amendment—which, by the way, with all due respect to my friends and colleagues, was the one thing they didn't want. The one thing they didn't want was an on-the-record vote on this amendment, which is why I am confident it will lose, but I want every Member of the U.S. Senate to look in the eyes of the mother whose son was just killed by a Russian sniper, as I did, down in Mariupol not too long ago.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment. I know how it is going to come out, but Members of the U.S. Senate will at least be on record. I say this is not the most courageous chapter in the history of this institution. I urge a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am not involving myself in this debate.

I just want to say to Senator McCAIN: You demonstrated yesterday the best of the U.S. Senate when an issue like this arose, and instead of blocking a vote, you said you were glad to have a vote. You are obviously in strong disagreement with the substance of this amendment.

I just want to tell you how much I personally appreciate your allowing a vote on this, the role you played in all things Russia and Iran, your forceful nature on these issues, your great leadership, and the role you have played in getting us today to a vote that isn't requiring cloture, where you have allowed this amendment to take place. I

cannot tell you how much I appreciate that and appreciate the role you play in this body.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and my friend from Maryland.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Arizona as well for allowing this vote to move forward, but in his statements, he said NASA needs to do the same. He repeated it several times.

I would just say that this amendment could actually be titled "NASA Needs to Do the Same" because what we had agreed to last year, when it comes to defense, is a way forward on the Atlas V rocket, the RD-180. We agreed to that. I believe it was a unanimous consent agreement. If there was an objection at that time, then it should have been expressed when we made this agreement.

Our colleagues across the aisle, for a unanimous consent, it takes all of us 100 people to agree to a unanimous consent agreement. That agreement was made on the National Defense Authorization Act. NASA needs to do the same.

Our colleague, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, MARK WARNER, made the point of parity between civil, commercial, and defense. That is what this amendment does.

There are a lot of issues that we come to the floor and we talk about this issue not being rocket science. It is not that difficult. It is not rocket science. Well, we actually have an issue that is rocket science. The mission set before American astronauts is jeopardized if this amendment doesn't pass. The taxpayers of this country face billions of dollars in costs if this amendment doesn't pass. Reliance on Russian technology to get to the space station or resupplying American astronauts will increase if this amendment doesn't pass.

If we want to talk about protecting the people of this country, let's talk about the victims of floods in Colorado, let's talk about people who have died in tornadoes because we didn't have the most accurate ability to forecast where they were coming from, when they were going to strike, and who would be hit. This amendment will allow these weather satellites to go into space to protect the men and women of this country from natural disasters. Again, it brings parity to an agreement that was decided upon through unanimous consent last year.

I support the underlying legislation, and I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it as well. I thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for their leadership on this committee.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I applaud the bipartisan work that my Senate

colleagues have put into legislation to impose sanctions on Russia. Russia's interference in the 2016 election represents an assault on our democracy that, until this point, has gone largely unanswered by the Administration and Congress. Russia has also conducted cyber attacks on allies and illegally invaded and violated the sovereignty of Ukraine and Georgia. I know that my colleagues take this issue very seriously, and I support the bipartisan compromise, which will maintain existing sanctions on Russia for its cyber and military intrusions in Ukraine and require additional mandatory sanctions on Russia's energy sector, those providing arms to Syrian troops, corrupt Russian oligarchs and their networks, and human rights abusers. We cannot allow Russia's hostile actions toward Western democracies to go unchecked. This legislation sends an important message to Russia and the world that the United States stands strongly against Russia's anti-democratic actions.

At the same time, the original version of the legislation would have had unintended consequences for our nation's civil and commercial space sectors. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, and commercial space missions are critical to space exploration, weather data, and sending U.S. astronauts to the International Space Station, as well as supplying them with cargo and instruments for scientific research. Under the original legislation, these missions would have been threatened or prevented from moving forward. In response, Senator GARDNER introduced an amendment that would exempt NASA and commercial space-related launch activities from the sanctions bill. I was proud to cosponsor this amendment.

In addition to our defense assets, Virginia is at the epicenter of the Nation's civil space program and commercial space industry. For more than 70 years, NASA's Wallops Flight Facility has served as a key national asset to the U.S. space program, an economic driver for the Eastern Shore, and an invaluable benefit to the Commonwealth. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Spaceport at Wallops Island serves as a leader in commercial space, partnering with Virginia-headquartered Orbital ATK to launch critical cargo to the International Space Station. Finally, research projects at NASA Langley Research Center and Virginia's superb academic institutions are developing tomorrow's innovative technologies and scientific discoveries. As Governor and now Senator, I have remained a strong supporter of Virginia's booming industry, research, and launch services. Without Senator GARDNER's amendment, some of these activities in Virginia would cease to exist.

To be clear, I stand in agreement with my Senate colleagues on the issue of Russian sanctions. I also believe that our space program must transi-

tion to American-made rocket engines and parts, and I know that U.S. companies are working hard in conjunction with NASA toward that goal. But we need time for that transition to occur, and this important amendment would make it possible without hurting our current capabilities. In addition, while the Department of Defense has been afforded the opportunity to develop new technologies while maintaining the status quo, it is only fair that we provide the same chance to civil and commercial space entities.

For these reasons, I was proud to cosponsor Senator GARDNER's bipartisan amendment to S. 722. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future to enhance and expand our Nation's space program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator CARDIN and I will speak for a few moments, and then we will have three votes, one of which will be on the RD-180 issue, one of which will be on the NATO issue, and then final passage; is that correct? Am I correct in that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 6 minutes remaining before the first vote on the Gardner amendment.

Mr. CORKER. Then there will be a series of votes, with no comments made in advance of those votes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I will be very brief, and we will split our time.

I want to say that, to me, today the U.S. Senate is functioning in the way our Founders intended for it to function.

It has been my goal, since the beginning of my leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee, for our committee and for this Senate to reaffirm its role in foreign policy issues. Today, the U.S. Senate, in a time of uncertainty around our Nation and uncertainty about some of our foreign policy issues, is asserting its responsibilities as it relates to foreign policy for the United States of America. I thank Senators on both sides of the aisle for the role they have played in getting us here.

This is a very strong piece of legislation that in many ways has almost occurred under the radar screen because of the way it has been done. The fact that we have had no cloture vote, the fact that we are having amendments, as has been discussed before, and the fact that this legislation sends a very strong signal to Russia that the nefarious activities they have been involved in—it does the same with Iran, with the activities outside of the JCPOA that they have been involved in, affirming our commitment to NATO, which we will do to article 5, NATO, in just a few moments.

I thank this body. I thank Leaders McCONNELL and SCHUMER for allowing the environment to exist for us to work

in the manner we have. I thank our ranking member, Senator CARDIN, and those members—Senator CRAPO and BROWN and others—who have played such a significant role. Senator MCCAIN is on the floor, Senator GRAHAM, Senator RUBIO, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator SHAHEEN—so many members who have gotten us to this place.

This is a great moment for the U.S. Senate. This is the way the Senate is supposed to function, and this is the way the Senate is supposed to exercise its prerogatives as it relates to foreign policy, a great moment for our body.

Senator CARDIN.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, first, to Senator CORKER. There is a reason Members want to serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We had a long list of Members who wanted to join our committee in this Congress. Quite frankly, I think the reason they want to join is not only the challenges we have globally but the fact that this is a committee that works bipartisanship and respects the views of every single Member, both Democratic and Republican, on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The bill we have before us reflects that—in the best tradition of the U.S. Senate and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That is due, in large part, because of the talent, leadership, and commitment of our chairman. I thank Senator CORKER for allowing us to reach this very important moment in the U.S. Senate, to be able to vote on a bill that is consequential for America's national security.

I believe this is the first major bill we have had on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the first bill we have had amendments to, and I concur in the Senator's observations that our leaders allowed us to let the process work in the best traditions of the U.S. Senate.

It is difficult for many of us to explain how the Senate operates at times. It really is difficult, but it is a body which respects the rights of each Member, and they have certain abilities to slow things down or bring us to a stop, and the process doesn't work the way it is supposed to work, but this bill has been handled very quickly on a major subject because we respected the rights of every single Member of the U.S. Senate. It doesn't mean we reach total agreement. We didn't, but we have a bill that accomplishes three very important things:

First, it stands up to the aggression of Russia and Iran. Yes, we have been talking about this—and I am glad Senator MCCAIN is on the floor. Senator MCCAIN has been one of the most ardent crusaders to point out the risk factors of Russia to our national security and that of our allies.

I started with Senator MCCAIN in January. We sat down, and he informed me why we had to do certain things and make it very clear and not have any ambiguity because Russia would run right through that ambiguity. Thanks to that initial leadership, we

have those provisions in the underlying bill. There will be no ambiguity as to what Congress is saying in regard to Russia's behavior.

I also acknowledge we have a review process in here. Senator GRAHAM brought that to our attention very early in the process in January so Congress can insert itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. That review process will give Congress the right role to review executive actions so we are stronger, working together. It also gives the President a stronger hand in negotiating with Mr. Putin and Russia because Congress has said: You must accomplish certain objectives, such as getting Russia's aggression to end in Ukraine or get Russia to stop supporting war crimes in Syria, to stop interfering with our democratic election systems. That is what we say, and we are very clear about that.

Then we take the third step, which I think is very important; that is, provide the wherewithal of U.S. leadership, working with our European allies, to protect our democratic institutions.

All of that is included in the bill that we are going to have a chance to vote on in a few minutes, and I want to thank all who were involved. I am going to include staff who worked so hard on this.

They were here 24/7 putting this bill together—Damian Murphy, in my office; Margaret Taylor; and Jessica Lewis, Dana Stroul, Lowell Schwartz, Sean Bartlett, Chris Barr, John Ryan, Leslie Bull, Danny Ricchetti, as well as Todd Womack, Rob Strayer, David Kinzler, and Ben Purser.

They were extraordinary in helping us reach this day.

Mr. CORKER. No question. I thank the Senator for those comments.

Our staffs have been remarkable, and the years of experience and knowledge they bring to this no doubt allowed us to do something so substantial in an amount of time, yet do so in a methodical way.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 250, as modified, offered by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. GARDNER.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Harris	Portman
Booker	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Brown	Heinrich	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cantwell	Heller	Rubio
Capito	Hirono	Sanders
Cardin	Hoeven	Schatz
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Cochran	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Coons	King	Strange
Corker	Klobuchar	Tester
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Udall
Cruz	Markey	Van Hollen
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	
Flake	Murray	

NAYS—6

Blumenthal	Graham	Sasse
Ernst	McCain	Sullivan

The amendment (No. 250), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, evenly split between Senator CORKER and me, to speak on the NATO amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would add that my fellow Ohioan, Senator PORTMAN, is a cosponsor of this. Special thanks go to Senator GRAHAM—this is the Graham-Brown NATO amendment—also to Senators MCCAIN, RUBIO, CASEY, and JACK REED and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island.

This is especially important to the Ukrainian community in my State. A number of them have been in town the last couple of days. They know how critical support for our allies is and how important it is that this amendment sends a clear message that the United States will uphold our half-century commitment to NATO, combined with a strong signal to Russia to clean up its act. That is the importance of this amendment. I ask support from my colleagues.

I yield to Senator CORKER.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank all those involved in the message that is being sent. I support the amendment, and I urge a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 240, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. CORKER.

Mr. CORKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 146 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Brown	Heinrich	Rounds
Burr	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cantwell	Heller	Sanders
Capito	Hirono	Sasse
Cardin	Hoehen	Schatz
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Cochran	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Coons	King	Strange
Corker	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCain	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskey	Warner
Duckworth	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	
Flake	Murray	

The amendment (No. 240) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Under the previous order, the committee-reported substitute, as amended, is agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 147 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Collins	Franken
Baldwin	Coons	Gardner
Barrasso	Corker	Gillibrand
Bennet	Cornyn	Graham
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Grassley
Blunt	Cotton	Harris
Booker	Crapo	Hassan
Boozman	Cruz	Hatch
Brown	Daines	Heinrich
Burr	Donnelly	Heitkamp
Cantwell	Duckworth	Heller
Capito	Durbin	Hirono
Cardin	Enzi	Hoehen
Carper	Ernst	Inhofe
Casey	Feinstein	Isakson
Cassidy	Fischer	Johnson
Cochran	Flake	Kaine

Kennedy	Murray	Stabenow
King	Nelson	Strange
Klobuchar	Perdue	Sullivan
Lankford	Peters	Tester
Leahy	Portman	Thune
Lee	Reed	Tillis
Manchin	Risch	Toomey
Markey	Roberts	Udall
McCain	Rounds	Van Hollen
McCaskey	Rubio	Warner
McConnell	Sasse	Warren
Menendez	Schatz	Whitehouse
Merkley	Schumer	Wicker
Moran	Scott	Wyden
Murkowski	Shaheen	Young
Murphy	Shelby	

NAYS—2

Paul Sanders

The bill (S. 722), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 722

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Countering Iran’s Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Regional strategy for countering conventional and asymmetric Iranian threats in the Middle East and North Africa.

Sec. 4. Imposition of additional sanctions in response to Iran’s ballistic missile program.

Sec. 5. Imposition of terrorism-related sanctions with respect to the IRGC.

Sec. 6. Imposition of additional sanctions with respect to persons responsible for human rights abuses.

Sec. 7. Enforcement of arms embargos.

Sec. 8. Review of applicability of sanctions relating to Iran’s support for terrorism and its ballistic missile program.

Sec. 9. Report on coordination of sanctions between the United States and the European Union.

Sec. 10. Report on United States citizens detained by Iran.

Sec. 11. Exceptions for national security and humanitarian assistance; rule of construction.

Sec. 12. Presidential waiver authority.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND COMBATING TERRORISM AND ILLICIT FINANCING

Sec. 201. Short title.

Subtitle A—Sanctions and Other Measures With Respect to the Russian Federation

Sec. 211. Findings.

Sec. 212. Sense of Congress.

PART I—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Sec. 215. Short title.

Sec. 216. Congressional review of certain actions relating to sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation.

PART II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Sec. 221. Definitions.

Sec. 222. Codification of sanctions relating to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 223. Modification of implementation of Executive Order 13662.

Sec. 224. Imposition of sanctions with respect to activities of the Russian Federation undermining cybersecurity.

Sec. 225. Imposition of sanctions relating to special Russian crude oil projects.

Sec. 226. Imposition of sanctions with respect to Russian and other foreign financial institutions.

Sec. 227. Mandatory imposition of sanctions with respect to significant corruption in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 228. Mandatory imposition of sanctions with respect to certain transactions with foreign sanctions evaders and serious human rights abusers in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 229. Notifications to Congress under Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014.

Sec. 230. Standards for termination of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 231. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons engaging in transactions with the intelligence or defense sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 232. Sanctions with respect to the development of pipelines in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 233. Sanctions with respect to investment in or facilitation of privatization of state-owned assets by the Russian Federation.

Sec. 234. Sanctions with respect to the transfer of arms and related materiel to Syria.

Sec. 235. Sanctions described.

Sec. 236. Exceptions, waiver, and termination.

Sec. 237. Exception relating to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Sec. 238. Rule of construction.

PART III—REPORTS

Sec. 241. Report on oligarchs and parastatal entities of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 242. Report on effects of expanding sanctions to include sovereign debt and derivative products.

Sec. 243. Report on illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation.

Subtitle B—Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia

Sec. 251. Findings.

Sec. 252. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 253. Statement of policy.

Sec. 254. Coordinating aid and assistance across Europe and Eurasia.

Sec. 255. Report on media organizations controlled and funded by the Government of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 256. Report on Russian Federation influence on elections in Europe and Eurasia.

Sec. 257. Ukrainian energy security.

Sec. 258. Termination.

Sec. 259. Appropriate congressional committees defined.

Subtitle C—Combating Terrorism and Illicit Financing

PART I—NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORIST AND OTHER ILLICIT FINANCING

Sec. 261. Development of national strategy.

Sec. 262. Contents of national strategy.

PART II—ENHANCING ANTITERRORISM TOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Sec. 271. Improving antiterror finance monitoring of funds transfers.

Sec. 272. Sense of Congress on international cooperation regarding terrorist financing intelligence.

Sec. 273. Examining the counter-terror financing role of the Department of the Treasury in embassies.

Sec. 274. Inclusion of Secretary of the Treasury on the National Security Council.

Sec. 275. Inclusion of all funds.

PART III—DEFINITIONS

Sec. 281. Definitions.

Subtitle D—Rule of Construction

Sec. 291. Rule of construction.

Sec. 292. Sense of Senate on the strategic importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.**—The term “act of international terrorism” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) **IRANIAN PERSON.**—The term “Iranian person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of Iran; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of Iran or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran.

(5) **IRGC.**—The term “IRGC” means Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

(6) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly” has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(7) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 3. REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR COUNTERING CONVENTIONAL AND ASYMMETRIC IRANIAN THREATS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for deterring conventional and asymmetric Iranian activities and threats that directly threaten the United States and key allies in the Middle East, North Africa, and beyond.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include at a minimum the following:

(1) A summary of the near- and long-term United States objectives, plans, and means for countering Iran’s destabilizing activities, including identification of countries that share the objective of countering Iran’s destabilizing activities.

(2) A summary of the capabilities and contributions of individual countries to shared efforts to counter Iran’s destabilizing activities, and a summary of additional actions or contributions that each country could take to further contribute.

(3) An assessment of Iran’s conventional force capabilities and an assessment of Iran’s plans to upgrade its conventional force capabilities, including its acquisition, develop-

ment, and deployment of ballistic and cruise missile capabilities, unmanned aerial vehicles, and maritime offensive and anti-access or area denial capabilities.

(4) An assessment of Iran’s chemical and biological weapons capabilities and an assessment of Iranian plans to upgrade its chemical or biological weapons capabilities.

(5) An assessment of Iran’s asymmetric activities in the region, including—

(A) the size, capabilities, and activities of the IRGC, including the Quds Force;

(B) the size, capabilities, and activities of Iran’s cyber operations;

(C) the types and amount of support, including funding, lethal and nonlethal contributions, and training, provided to Hezbollah, Hamas, special groups in Iraq, the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Houthi fighters in Yemen, and other violent groups across the Middle East; and

(D) the scope and objectives of Iran’s information operations and use of propaganda.

(6) A summary of United States actions, unilaterally and in cooperation with foreign governments, to counter destabilizing Iranian activities, including—

(A) interdiction of Iranian lethal arms bound for groups designated as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) Iran’s interference in international commercial shipping lanes;

(C) attempts by Iran to undermine or subvert internationally recognized governments in the Middle East region; and

(D) Iran’s support for the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, including—

(i) financial assistance, military equipment and personnel, and other support provided to that regime; and

(ii) support and direction to other armed actors that are not Syrian or Iranian and are acting on behalf of that regime.

(c) **FORM OF STRATEGY.**—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS IN RESPONSE TO IRAN’S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State should continue to implement Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters).

(b) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to any person that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(2) is a successor entity to a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(4) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that would otherwise be imposed pursuant to paragraph (3);

(5) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4); or

(6) knowingly provides or attempts to provide financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in sup-

port of, a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4) or (5).

(c) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (b) that is an alien.

(d) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (c)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(e) **REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO IRAN’S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing each person that—

(A) has, during the period specified in paragraph (2), conducted any activity that has materially contributed to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program, or any other program in Iran for developing, deploying, or maintaining systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such capabilities;

(B) is a successor entity to a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) owns or controls or is owned or controlled by a person referred to in subparagraph (A);

(D) forms an entity with the purpose of evading sanctions that could be imposed as a result of a relationship described in subparagraph (C);

(E) is acting for or on behalf of a person referred to in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

(F) is known or believed to have provided, or attempted to provide, during the period specified in paragraph (2), financial, material, technological, or other support for, or goods or services in support of, any material contribution to a program described in subparagraph (A) carried out by a person described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E).

(2) **PERIOD SPECIFIED.**—The period specified in this paragraph is—

(A) in the case of the first report submitted under paragraph (1), the period beginning January 1, 2016, and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(B) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 5. IMPOSITION OF TERRORISM-RELATED SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IRGC.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The IRGC is subject to sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), Executive Order 13553 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of certain persons with respect to serious human rights abuses by the Government of Iran), and Executive Order 13606 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking the property and suspending entry into the United States of certain persons with respect to grave human rights abuses by the Governments of Iran and Syria via information technology).

(2) The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—Quds Force (in this section referred to as the “IRGC-QF”) is the primary arm of the Government of Iran for executing its policy of supporting terrorist and insurgent groups. The IRGC-QF provides material, logistical assistance, training, and financial support to militants and terrorist operatives throughout the Middle East and South Asia and was designated for the imposition of sanctions by the Secretary of Treasury pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism) in October 2007 for its support of terrorism.

(3) The IRGC, not just the IRGC-QF, is responsible for implementing Iran’s international program of destabilizing activities, support for acts of international terrorism, and ballistic missile program.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to the IRGC and foreign persons that are officials, agents, or affiliates of the IRGC.

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions applicable with respect to a foreign person pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of each person the Secretary determines, based on credible evidence, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) is responsible for extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed against individuals in Iran who seek—

(A) to expose illegal activity carried out by officials of the Government of Iran; or

(B) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote internationally recognized human rights and freedoms, such as the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections; or

(2) acts as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign person in a matter relating to an activity described in paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, in accordance with the International Emergency

Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person on the list required by subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 7. ENFORCEMENT OF ARMS EMBARGOS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(1) knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the supply, sale, or transfer directly or indirectly to or from Iran, or for the use in or benefit of Iran, of any battle tanks, armored combat vehicles, large caliber artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, missiles or missile systems, as defined for the purpose of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, or related materiel, including spare parts; or

(2) knowingly provides to Iran any technical training, financial resources or services, advice, other services or assistance related to the supply, sale, transfer, manufacture, maintenance, or use of arms and related materiel described in paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) EXCLUSION FROM UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any person subject to subsection (a) that is an alien.

(c) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) EXCEPTION.—The President is not required to impose sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person for engaging in an activity described in that subsection if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) permitting the activity is in the national security interest of the United States;

(2) Iran no longer presents a significant threat to the national security of the United States and to the allies of the United States; and

(3) the Government of Iran has ceased providing operational or financial support for acts of international terrorism and no longer satisfies the requirements for designation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(e) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM DEFINED.—In this section, the term “state spon-

sor of terrorism” means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

(1) section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)(1)(A)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(2) section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a));

(3) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

(4) any other provision of law.

SEC. 8. REVIEW OF APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO IRAN’S SUPPORT FOR TERRORISM AND ITS BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall conduct a review of all persons on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury for activities relating to Iran—

(1) to assess the conduct of such persons as that conduct relates to—

(A) any activity that materially contributes to the activities of the Government of Iran with respect to its ballistic missile program; or

(B) support by the Government of Iran for acts of international terrorism; and

(2) to determine the applicability of sanctions with respect to such persons under—

(A) Executive Order 13382 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of weapons of mass destruction delivery system proliferators and their supporters); or

(B) Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism).

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS.—If the President determines under subsection (a) that sanctions under an Executive Order specified in paragraph (2) of that subsection are applicable with respect to a person, the President shall—

(1) impose sanctions with respect to that person pursuant to that Executive Order; or

(2) exercise the waiver authority provided under section 12.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON COORDINATION OF SANCTIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN UNION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of each instance, during the period specified in subsection (b)—

(A) in which the United States has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the European Union has not imposed corresponding sanctions; and

(B) in which the European Union has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for such weapons to or by Iran, support for acts of international terrorism by Iran, or human rights abuses in Iran, but in which the United States has not imposed corresponding sanctions.

(2) An explanation for the reason for each discrepancy between sanctions imposed by the European Union and sanctions imposed

by the United States described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) PERIOD SPECIFIED.—The period specified in this subsection is—

(1) in the case of the first report submitted under subsection (a), the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(2) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 10. REPORT ON UNITED STATES CITIZENS DETAINED BY IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United States citizens, including United States citizens who are also citizens of other countries, detained by Iran or groups supported by Iran that includes—

(1) information regarding any officials of the Government of Iran involved in any way in the detentions; and

(2) a summary of efforts the United States Government has taken to secure the swift release of those United States citizens.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 11. EXCEPTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under sections 4, 5, 6, and 7:

(1) Any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations of the United States.

(3) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Iran or for the provision of humanitarian assistance to the people of Iran, including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.

(b) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—A requirement or the authority to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 shall not include the authority to impose sanctions with respect to the importation of goods.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this Act.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act (other than subsection (b)) shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emer-

gency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term “agricultural commodity” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) GOOD.—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term “medical device” has the meaning given the term “device” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) MEDICINE.—The term “medicine” has the meaning given the term “drug” in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

SEC. 12. PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.

(a) CASE-BY-CASE WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis and for a period of not more than 180 days, a requirement under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a person, and may waive the continued imposition of such sanctions, not less than 30 days after the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to waive such sanctions.

(2) RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.—The President may, on a case-by-case basis, renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for an additional period of not more than 180 days if, not later than 15 days before that waiver expires, the President makes the determination and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report described in paragraph (1).

(3) SUCCESSIVE RENEWAL.—The renewal authority provided under paragraph (2) may be exercised for additional successive periods of not more than 180 days if the President follows the procedures set forth in paragraph (2), and submits the report described in paragraph (1), for each such renewal.

(b) CONTENTS OF WAIVER REPORTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) in connection with a waiver of sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 with respect to a person, or the renewal of such a waiver, shall include—

(1) a specific and detailed rationale for the determination that the waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States;

(2) a description of the activity that resulted in the person being subject to sanctions;

(3) an explanation of any efforts made by the United States, as applicable, to secure the cooperation of the government with primary jurisdiction over the person or the location where the activity described in paragraph (2) occurred in terminating or, as appropriate, penalizing the activity; and

(4) an assessment of the significance of the activity described in paragraph (2) in contributing to the ability of Iran to threaten the interests of the United States or allies of the United States, develop systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, support acts of international terrorism, or violate the human rights of any person in Iran.

(c) EFFECT OF REPORT ON WAIVER.—If the President submits a report under subsection (a) in connection with a waiver of sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 with respect to a person, or the renewal of such a waiver, the President shall not be required to impose or maintain sanctions under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as applicable, with respect to the person described in the report during the 30-day period referred to in subsection (a).

TITLE II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND COMBATING TERRORISM AND ILLICIT FINANCING

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

Subtitle A—Sanctions and Other Measures With Respect to the Russian Federation

SEC. 211. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On March 6, 2014, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on those determined to be undermining democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine or threatening the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine. President Obama subsequently issued Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) and Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) to expand sanctions on certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine.

(2) On December 18, 2014, the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 was enacted (Public Law 113-272; 22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.), which includes provisions directing the President to impose sanctions on foreign persons that the President determines to be entities owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or nationals of the Russian Federation that manufacture, sell, transfer, or otherwise provide certain defense articles into Syria.

(3) On April 1, 2015, President Obama issued Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to impose sanctions on persons determined to be engaged in malicious cyber-hacking.

(4) On July 26, 2016, President Obama approved a Presidential Policy Directive on United States Cyber Incident Coordination, which states, “certain cyber incidents that have significant impacts on an entity, our national security, or the broader economy require a unique approach to response efforts”.

(5) On December 29, 2016, President Obama issued an annex to Executive Order 13694, which authorized sanctions on the following entities and individuals:

(A) The Main Intelligence Directorate (also known as Glavnoe Razvedyvatel'noe Upravlenie or the GRU) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(B) The Federal Security Service (also known as Federalnaya Sluzhba Bezopasnosti or the FSB) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(C) The Special Technology Center (also known as STLC, Ltd. Special Technology Center St. Petersburg) in St. Petersburg, Russian Federation.

(D) Zorsecurity (also known as Esage Lab) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(E) The autonomous noncommercial organization known as the Professional Association of Designers of Data Processing Systems (also known as ANO PO KSI) in Moscow, Russian Federation.

(F) Igor Valentinovich Korobov.

(G) Sergey Aleksandrovich Gizunov.

(H) Igor Olegovich Kostyukov.

(I) Vladimir Stepanovich Alexseyev.

(6) On January 6, 2017, an assessment of the United States intelligence community entitled, “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections” stated, “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the United States presidential election.” The assessment warns that “Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes”.

SEC. 212. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the President—

(1) should engage to the fullest extent possible with partner governments with regard to closing loopholes, including the allowance of extended prepayment for the delivery of goods and commodities and other loopholes, in multilateral and unilateral restrictive measures against the Russian Federation, with the aim of maximizing alignment of those measures; and

(2) should increase efforts to vigorously enforce compliance with sanctions in place as of the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to the Russian Federation in response to the crisis in eastern Ukraine, cyber intrusions and attacks, and human rights violators in the Russian Federation.

PART I—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 215. SHORT TITLE.

The part may be cited as the “Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017”.

SEC. 216. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIONS RELATING TO SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before taking any action described in paragraph (2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes the proposed action and the reasons for that action.

(2) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An action described in this paragraph is—

(i) an action to terminate the application of any sanctions described in subparagraph (B);

(ii) with respect to sanctions described in subparagraph (B) imposed by the President with respect to a person, an action to waive the application of those sanctions with respect to that person; or

(iii) a licensing action that significantly alters United States’ foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subparagraph are—

(i) sanctions provided for under—

(I) this title or any provision of law amended by this title, including the Executive Orders codified under section 222;

(II) the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.); or

(III) the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.); and

(ii) the prohibition on access to the properties of the Government of the Russian Federation located in Maryland and New York that the President ordered vacated on December 29, 2016.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF ACTION.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) shall include a description of whether the action—

(A) is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; or

(B) is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(4) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation shall include a description of—

(i) the significant alteration to United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation;

(ii) the anticipated effect of the action on the national security interests of the United States; and

(iii) the policy objectives for which the sanctions affected by the action were initially imposed.

(B) REQUESTS FROM BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEES.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives may request the submission to the Committee of the matter described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report; and

(B) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a)(1) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under paragraph (1) of a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not take that action unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that action is enacted in accordance with subsection (c).

(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that

action for a period of 12 calendar days after the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), and the President vetoes the joint resolution, the President may not take that action for a period of 10 calendar days after the date of the President’s veto.

(6) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) is enacted in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection:

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of approval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution approving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.”; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress approves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on _____ relating to _____,” with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(2) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of disapproval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.”; and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on _____ relating to _____,” with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader’s designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader’s designee).

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred

has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(B) **PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.**—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) **CONSIDERATION.**—The joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(5) **CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.**—

(A) **COMMITTEE REFERRAL.**—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

(i) referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs if the joint resolution relates to a report under section 216 A3 that is described as an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; and

(ii) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations if the joint resolution relates to a report under section 216 A3 that is described as an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to the Russian Federation.

(B) **REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.**—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) **PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.**—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(D) **RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.**—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or

joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(E) **CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.**—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(6) **RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(A) **COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.**—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of that House, that House receives an identical joint resolution from the other House, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the joint resolution from the other House—

(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(B) **TREATMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.**—If one House fails to introduce a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval of the other House shall be entitled to expedited procedures in that House under this subsection.

(C) **TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.**—If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

(D) **APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.**—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

(7) **RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.**—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

PART II—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 221. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **GOOD.**—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4618) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(3) **INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “international financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)).

(4) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(6) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 222. CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **CODIFICATION.**—United States sanctions provided for in Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine), Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), and Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including with respect to all persons sanctioned under such Executive Orders, shall remain in effect except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) **TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions described in subsection (a) that are imposed on a person in connection with activity conducted by the person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions described in subsection (a) in the future.

(c) **APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive

Order 13694 or 13757 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) APPLICATION OF NEW UKRAINE-RELATED SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person under Executive Order 13660, 13661, 13662, or 13685 only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

SEC. 223. MODIFICATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13662.

(a) DETERMINATION THAT CERTAIN ENTITIES ARE SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may determine that a person meets one or more of the criteria in section 1(a) of Executive Order 13662 if that person is a state-owned entity operating in the railway, shipping, or metals and mining sector of the economy of the Russian Federation.

(b) MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 1 WITH RESPECT TO THE FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 14 days maturity or new equity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(c) MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 2 WITH RESPECT TO THE ENERGY SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ECONOMY.—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 2 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the conduct by United States persons or persons within the United States of all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of longer than 30 days maturity of persons determined to be subject to the directive, their property, or their interests in property.

(d) MODIFICATION OF DIRECTIVE 4.—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall modify Directive 4, dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662, or any successor directive, to ensure that the directive prohibits the provision, exportation, or reexportation, directly or indirectly, by United States persons or persons within the United States, of goods, services (except for

financial services), or technology in support of exploration or production for deepwater, Arctic offshore, or shale projects—

(1) that have the potential to produce oil; (2) in which a Russian energy firm is involved; and

(3) that involve any person determined to be subject to the directive or the property or interests in property of such a person.

SEC. 224. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ACTIVITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(1) impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person that the President determines—

(A) knowingly engages in significant activities undermining cybersecurity against any person, including a democratic institution, or government on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person described in subparagraph (A);

(2) impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services (except financial services) in support of, an activity described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(3) impose 3 or more of the sanctions described in section 4(c) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(c)) with respect to any person that the President determines knowingly provides financial services in support of an activity described in paragraph (1)(A).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a)(1), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(c) APPLICATION OF NEW CYBER SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application under subsection (a) of sanctions with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

(d) SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “significant activities undermining cybersecurity” includes—

(1) significant efforts—

(A) to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy an information and communications technology system or network; or

(B) to exfiltrate, degrade, corrupt, destroy, or release information from such a system or network without authorization for purposes of—

(i) conducting influence operations; or

(ii) causing a significant misappropriation of funds, economic resources, trade secrets, personal identifications, or financial information for commercial or competitive advantage or private financial gain;

(2) significant destructive malware attacks; and

(3) significant denial of service activities.

SEC. 225. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO SPECIAL RUSSIAN CRUDE OIL PROJECTS.

Section 4(b)(1) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(b)(1)) is amended by striking “on and after the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may impose” and inserting “on and after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017, the President shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so,”.

SEC. 226. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Section 5 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so,”; and

(B) by striking “on or after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “may impose” and inserting “shall impose, unless the President determines that it is not in the national interest of the United States to do so,”; and

(B) by striking “on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017”.

SEC. 227. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908(a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “is authorized and encouraged to” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “President determines is” and inserting “President determines is, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017,”; and

(ii) by inserting “or elsewhere” after “in the Russian Federation”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “The President” and inserting “except as provided in subsection (d), the President”; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application

of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.”.

SEC. 228. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSERS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 10. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS THAT EVADE SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) materially violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any license, order, regulation, or prohibition contained in or issued pursuant to any covered Executive order; or

“(2) facilitates significant deceptive or structured transactions for or on behalf of—

“(A) any person subject to sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to the Russian Federation; or

“(B) any child, spouse, parent, or sibling of an individual described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b).

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(d) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application

of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act;

“(2) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine; and

“(3) in the case of sanctions imposed under this section in connection with a covered Executive order described in subparagraphs (E) or (F) of subsection (f)(1), a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

“(e) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice that—

“(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ‘covered Executive order’ means any of the following:

“(A) Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(B) Executive Order 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(C) Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(D) Executive Order 13685 (79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

“(E) Executive Order 13694 (80 Fed. Reg. 18077; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(F) Executive Order 13757 (82 Fed. Reg. 1; relating to taking additional steps to address the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities).

“(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ‘foreign person’ has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017).

“(3) STRUCTURED.—The term ‘structured’, with respect to a transaction, has the meaning given the term ‘structure’ in paragraph (xx) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of

Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

“SEC. 11. MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person, based on credible information, on or after the date of the enactment of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017—

“(1) is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation;

“(2) materially assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to, a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

“(3) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

“(c) APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a written determination that the waiver—

“(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

“(B) will further the enforcement of this Act; and

“(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made efforts to reduce serious human rights abuses in territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by that Government.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b)(1).

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (b)(1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(e) TERMINATION.—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017,

the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(2) a notice—

“(A) that—

“(i) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future; or

“(B) that the President determines that insufficient basis exists for the determination by the President under subsection (a) with respect to the person.”.

(b) **DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—Section 2(2) of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,” before “the Committee on Foreign Relations”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “the Committee on Financial Services” before “the Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

SEC. 229. NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS UNDER UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014.

(a) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO DEFENSE AND ENERGY SECTORS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**—Section 4 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively;

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

“(g) **NOTIFICATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign person under subsection (a) or (b).

“(2) **TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO RUSSIAN PRODUCERS, TRANSFERORS, OR BROKERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.**—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a)(2) with respect to a foreign person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

“(A) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

“(B) a notice that—

“(i) the foreign person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the foreign person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a)(2) in the future.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (B)(ii) of subsection (a)(3), by striking “subsection (h)” and inserting “subsection (i)”.

(b) **SANCTIONS ON RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—Section 5 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days after

imposing sanctions with respect to a foreign financial institution under subsection (a) or (b).”;

(3) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “section 4(h)” and inserting “section 4(i)”.

SEC. 230. STANDARDS FOR TERMINATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING THE PEACE, SECURITY, STABILITY, SOVEREIGNTY, OR TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF UKRAINE.**—Section 8 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8907) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”.

(b) **SANCTIONS RELATING TO CORRUPTION.**—Section 9 of the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8908) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216 of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice that—

“(1) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

“(2) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under subsection (a) in the future.”.

SEC. 231. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS ENGAGING IN TRANSACTIONS WITH THE INTELLIGENCE OR DEFENSE SECTORS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to a person the President determines knowingly, on or after such date of enactment, engages in a significant transaction with a person that is part of, or operates for or on behalf of, the defense or intelligence sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation, including the Main Intelligence Agency of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation or the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation.

(b) **APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has made significant efforts to reduce the number and intensity of cyber intrusions conducted by that Government.

SEC. 232. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PIPELINES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment described in subsection (b) or sells, leases, or provides to the Russian Federation, for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, goods, services, technology, information, or support described in subsection (c)—

(1) any of which has a fair market value of \$1,000,000 or more; or

(2) that, during a 12-month period, have an aggregate fair market value of \$5,000,000 or more.

(b) **INVESTMENT DESCRIBED.**—An investment described in this subsection is an investment that directly and significantly contributes to the enhancement of the ability of the Russian Federation to construct energy export pipelines.

(c) **GOODS, SERVICES, TECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION, OR SUPPORT DESCRIBED.**—Goods, services, technology, information, or support described in this subsection are goods, services, technology, information, or support that could directly and significantly facilitate the maintenance or expansion of the construction, modernization, or repair of energy pipelines by the Russian Federation.

SEC. 233. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO INVESTMENT IN OR FACILITATION OF PRIVATIZATION OF STATE-OWNED ASSETS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 235 if the President determines that a person, with actual knowledge, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, makes an investment of \$10,000,000 or more (or any combination of investments of not less than \$1,000,000 each, which in the aggregate equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period), or facilitates such an investment, if the investment directly and significantly contributes to the ability of the Russian Federation to privatize state-owned assets in a manner that unjustly benefits—

(1) officials of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) close associates or family members of those officials.

(b) **APPLICATION OF NEW SANCTIONS.**—The President may waive the initial application of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a written determination that the waiver—

(A) is in the vital national security interests of the United States; or

(B) will further the enforcement of this title; and

(2) a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation is taking steps to implement the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014, and any successor agreements that are agreed to by the Government of Ukraine.

SEC. 234. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF ARMS AND RELATED MATERIEL TO SYRIA.

(a) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose on a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that such foreign person has, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly exported, transferred, or otherwise provided to Syria significant financial, material, or technological support that contributes materially to the ability of the Government of Syria to—

(A) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies;

(B) acquire or develop ballistic or cruise missile capabilities;

(C) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

(D) acquire significant defense articles, defense services, or defense information (as such terms are defined under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.)); or

(E) acquire items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

(2) APPLICABILITY TO OTHER FOREIGN PERSONS.—The sanctions described in subsection (b) shall also be imposed on any foreign person that—

(A) is a successor entity to a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

(B) is owned or controlled by, or has acted for or on behalf of, a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed on a foreign person described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES.—If the foreign person is an individual, the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, the foreign person.

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to the foreign person regardless of when issued.

(ii) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under clause (i) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the foreign person.

(c) WAIVER.—Subject to section 216, the President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FINANCIAL, MATERIAL, OR TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT.—The term “financial, material, or technological support” has the meaning given such term in section 542.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” has the meaning given such term in section 594.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(3) SYRIA.—The term “Syria” has the meaning given such term in section 542.316 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

SEC. 235. SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.

(a) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed with respect to a person under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a) are the following:

(1) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ASSISTANCE FOR EXPORTS TO SANCTIONED PERSONS.—The President may direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States not to give approval to the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in the extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the sanctioned person.

(2) EXPORT SANCTION.—The President may order the United States Government not to issue any specific license and not to grant any other specific permission or authority to export any goods or technology to the sanctioned person under—

(A) the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(B) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.);

(C) the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); or

(D) any other statute that requires the prior review and approval of the United States Government as a condition for the export or reexport of goods or services.

(3) LOANS FROM UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President may prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to the sanctioned person totaling more than \$10,000,000 in any 12-month period unless the person is engaged in activities to relieve human suffering and the loans or credits are provided for such activities.

(4) LOANS FROM INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President may direct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any loan from the international financial institution that would benefit the sanctioned person.

(5) PROHIBITIONS ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The following prohibitions may be imposed against the sanctioned person if that person is a financial institution:

(A) PROHIBITION ON DESIGNATION AS PRIMARY DEALER.—Neither the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System nor the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may designate, or permit the continuation of any prior designation of, the financial institution as a primary dealer in United States Government debt instruments.

(B) PROHIBITION ON SERVICE AS A REPOSITORY OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS.—The financial institution may not serve as agent of the United States Government or serve as repository for United States Government funds.

The imposition of either sanction under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as 1 sanction for purposes of subsection (b), and the imposition of both such sanctions shall be treated as 2 sanctions for purposes of subsection (b).

(6) PROCUREMENT SANCTION.—The United States Government may not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from the sanctioned person.

(7) FOREIGN EXCHANGE.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and

in which the sanctioned person has any interest.

(8) BANKING TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the sanctioned person.

(9) PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any person from—

(A) acquiring, holding, withholding, using, transferring, withdrawing, transporting, importing, or exporting any property that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and with respect to which the sanctioned person has any interest;

(B) dealing in or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to such property; or

(C) conducting any transaction involving such property.

(10) BAN ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations or guidelines as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of the sanctioned person.

(11) EXCLUSION OF CORPORATE OFFICERS.—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, the sanctioned person.

(12) SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.—The President may impose on the principal executive officer or officers of the sanctioned person, or on persons performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions under this subsection.

(b) SANCTIONED PERSON DEFINED.—In this section, the term “sanctioned person” means a person subject to sanctions under section 224(a)(2), 231(b), 232(a), or 233(a).

SEC. 236. EXCEPTIONS, WAIVER, AND TERMINATION.

(a) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of this part and amendments made by this part shall not apply with respect to the following:

(1) Activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) The admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or under other international agreements.

(b) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—No requirement to impose sanctions under this part or an amendment made by this part shall include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(c) WAIVER OF SANCTIONS THAT ARE IMPOSED.—Subject to section 216, if the President imposes sanctions with respect to a person under this part or the amendments made by this part, the President may waive the application of those sanctions if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—Subject to section 216, the President may terminate the application of sanctions under section 224, 231, 232, 233, or 234 with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a notice of and justification for the termination; and

(2) a notice that—

(A) the person is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or has taken significant verifiable steps toward stopping the activity; and

(B) the President has received reliable assurances that the person will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions under this part in the future.

SEC. 237. EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(2) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

SEC. 238. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this part or the amendments made by this part shall be construed—

(1) to supersede the limitations or exceptions on the use of rocket engines for national security purposes under section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note), as amended by section 1607 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1100) and section 1602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2582); or

(2) to prohibit a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Defense from acquiring components referred to in such section 1608.

PART III—REPORTS

SEC. 241. REPORT ON OLIGARCHS AND PARASTATAL ENTITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the following:

(1) Senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, including the following:

(A) An identification of the most significant senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, as determined by their closeness to the Russian regime and their net worth.

(B) An assessment of the relationship between individuals identified under subparagraph (A) and President Vladimir Putin or other members of the Russian ruling elite.

(C) An identification of any indices of corruption with respect to those individuals.

(D) The estimated net worth and known sources of income of those individuals and

their family members (including spouses, children, parents, and siblings), including assets, investments, other business interests, and relevant beneficial ownership information.

(E) An identification of the non-Russian business affiliations of those individuals.

(2) Russian parastatal entities, including an assessment of the following:

(A) The emergence of Russian parastatal entities and their role in the economy of the Russian Federation.

(B) The leadership structures and beneficial ownership of those entities.

(C) The scope of the non-Russian business affiliations of those entities.

(3) The exposure of key economic sectors of the United States to Russian politically exposed persons and parastatal entities, including, at a minimum, the banking, securities, insurance, and real estate sectors.

(4) The likely effects of imposing debt and equity restrictions on Russian parastatal entities, as well as the anticipated effects of adding Russian parastatal entities to the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(5) The potential impacts of imposing secondary sanctions with respect to Russian oligarchs, Russian state-owned enterprises, and Russian parastatal entities, including impacts on the entities themselves and on the economy of the Russian Federation, as well as on the economies of the United States and allies of the United States.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.**—The term “senior foreign political figure” has the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

SEC. 242. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF EXPANDING SANCTIONS TO INCLUDE SOVEREIGN DEBT AND DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing in detail the potential effects of expanding sanctions under Directive 1 (as amended), dated September 12, 2014, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control under Executive Order 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16169; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine), or any successor directive, to include sovereign debt and the full range of derivative products.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on For-

eign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 243. REPORT ON ILLICIT FINANCE RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the end of each one-year period thereafter until 2021, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing interagency efforts in the United States to combat illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain a summary of efforts by the United States to do the following:

(1) Identify, investigate, map, and disrupt illicit financial flows linked to the Russian Federation if such flows affect the United States financial system or those of major allies of the United States.

(2) Conduct outreach to the private sector, including information sharing efforts to strengthen compliance efforts by entities, including financial institutions, to prevent illicit financial flows described in paragraph (1).

(3) Engage and coordinate with allied international partners on illicit finance, especially in Europe, to coordinate efforts to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for illicit financial flows described in paragraph (1), including examples of that engagement and coordination.

(4) Identify foreign sanctions evaders and loopholes within the sanctions regimes of foreign partners of the United States.

(5) Expand the number of real estate geographic targeting orders or other regulatory actions, as appropriate, to degrade illicit financial activity relating to the Russian Federation in relation to the financial system of the United States.

(6) Provide support to counter those involved in illicit finance relating to the Russian Federation across all appropriate law enforcement, intelligence, regulatory, and financial authorities of the Federal Government, including by imposing sanctions with respect to or prosecuting those involved.

(7) In the case of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice, investigate or otherwise develop major cases, including a description of those cases.

(c) **BRIEFING.**—After submitting a report under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide briefings to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to that report.

(d) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall coordinate with the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of State in preparing each report under this section.

(e) **FORM.**—Each report submitted under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **ILLICIT FINANCE.**—The term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism,

narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President.

Subtitle B—Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia

SEC. 251. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the Russian Federation has sought to exert influence throughout Europe and Eurasia, including in the former states of the Soviet Union, by providing resources to political parties, think tanks, and civil society groups that sow distrust in democratic institutions and actors, promote xenophobic and illiberal views, and otherwise undermine European unity. The Government of the Russian Federation has also engaged in well-documented corruption practices as a means toward undermining and buying influence in European and Eurasian countries.

(2) The Government of the Russian Federation has largely eliminated a once-vibrant Russian-language independent media sector and severely curtails free and independent media within the borders of the Russian Federation. Russian-language media organizations that are funded and controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation and disseminate information within and outside of the Russian Federation routinely traffic in anti-Western disinformation, while few independent, fact-based media sources provide objective reporting for Russian-speaking audiences inside or outside of the Russian Federation.

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to violate its commitments under the Memorandum on Security Assurances in connection with Ukraine's Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Budapest December 5, 1994, and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe Final Act, concluded at Helsinki August 1, 1975 (commonly referred to as the "Helsinki Final Act"), which laid the ground-work for the establishment of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, of which the Russian Federation is a member, by its illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014, its illegal occupation of South Ossetia and Abkhazia in Georgia in 2008, and its ongoing destabilizing activities in eastern Ukraine.

(4) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to ignore the terms of the August 2008 ceasefire agreement relating to Georgia, which requires the withdrawal of Russian Federation troops, free access by humanitarian groups to the regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and monitoring of the conflict areas by the European Union Monitoring Mission.

(5) The Government of the Russian Federation is failing to comply with the terms of the Minsk Agreement to address the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, signed in Minsk, Belarus, on February 11, 2015, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany, as well as the Minsk Protocol, which was agreed to on September 5, 2014.

(6) The Government of the Russian Federation is—

(A) in violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly known as the "INF Treaty"); and

(B) failing to meet its obligations under the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002 (commonly known as the "Open Skies Treaty").

SEC. 252. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation bears responsibility for the continuing violence in Eastern Ukraine, including the death on April 24, 2017, of Joseph Stone, a citizen of the United States working as a monitor for the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

(2) the President should call on the Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) to withdraw all of its forces from the territories of Georgia, Ukraine, and Moldova;

(B) to return control of the borders of those territories to their respective governments; and

(C) to cease all efforts to undermine the popularly elected governments of those countries;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation has applied, and continues to apply, to the countries and peoples of Georgia and Ukraine, traditional uses of force, intelligence operations, and influence campaigns, which represent clear and present threats to the countries of Europe and Eurasia;

(4) in response, the countries of Europe and Eurasia should redouble efforts to build resilience within their institutions, political systems, and civil societies;

(5) the United States supports the institutions that the Government of the Russian Federation seeks to undermine, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union;

(6) a strong North Atlantic Treaty Organization is critical to maintaining peace and security in Europe and Eurasia;

(7) the United States should continue to work with the European Union as a partner against aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation, coordinating aid programs, development assistance, and other counter-Russian efforts;

(8) the United States should encourage the establishment of a commission for media freedom within the Council of Europe, modeled on the Venice Commission regarding rule of law issues, that would be chartered to provide governments with expert recommendations on maintaining legal and regulatory regimes supportive of free and independent media and an informed citizenry able to distinguish between fact-based reporting, opinion, and disinformation;

(9) in addition to working to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, the United States should work with the individual countries of Europe and Eurasia—

(A) to identify vulnerabilities to aggression, disinformation, corruption, and so-called hybrid warfare by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(B) to establish strategic and technical plans for addressing those vulnerabilities;

(C) to ensure that the financial systems of those countries are not being used to shield illicit financial activity by officials of the Government of the Russian Federation or individuals in President Vladimir Putin's inner circle who have been enriched through corruption;

(D) to investigate and prosecute cases of corruption by Russian actors; and

(E) to work toward full compliance with the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (commonly referred to as the "Anti-Bribery Convention") of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development; and

(10) the President of the United States should use the authority of the President to impose sanctions under—

(A) the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112-208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note); and

(B) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

SEC. 253. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The United States, consistent with the principle of *ex injuria jus non oritur*, supports the policy known as the "Stimson Doctrine" and thus does not recognize territorial changes effected by force, including the illegal invasions and occupations of Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Crimea, Eastern Ukraine, and Transnistria.

SEC. 254. COORDINATING AID AND ASSISTANCE ACROSS EUROPE AND EURASIA.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Countering Russian Influence Fund \$250,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund shall be used to effectively implement, prioritized in the following order and subject to the availability of funds, the following goals:

(1) To assist in protecting critical infrastructure and electoral mechanisms from cyberattacks in the following countries:

(A) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union that the Secretary of State determines—

(i) are vulnerable to influence by the Russian Federation; and

(ii) lack the economic capability to effectively respond to aggression by the Russian Federation without the support of the United States.

(B) Countries that are participating in the enlargement process of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union, including Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Macedonia, Moldova, Kosovo, Serbia, and Ukraine.

(2) To combat corruption, improve the rule of law, and otherwise strengthen independent judiciaries and prosecutors general offices in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(3) To respond to the humanitarian crises and instability caused or aggravated by the invasions and occupations of Georgia and Ukraine by the Russian Federation.

(4) To improve participatory legislative processes and legal education, political transparency and competition, and compliance with international obligations in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(5) To build the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations countering the influence and propaganda of the Russian Federation to combat corruption, prioritize access to truthful information, and operate freely in all regions in the countries described in paragraph (1).

(6) To assist the Secretary of State in executing the functions specified in section 1287(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) for the purposes of recognizing, understanding, exposing, and countering propaganda and disinformation efforts by foreign governments, in coordination with the relevant regional Assistant Secretary or Assistant Secretaries of the Department of State.

(c) **REVISION OF ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH AMOUNTS MAY BE USED.**—The Secretary of State may modify the goals described in subsection (b) if, not later than 15 days before revising such a goal, the Secretary notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the revision.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia (authorized pursuant to section 601 of the Support for East European Democracy

(SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5461) and section 102 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5812)), and in consultation with the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, the Director of the Global Engagement Center of the Department of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, coordinate and carry out activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) **METHOD.**—Activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) shall be carried out through—

(A) initiatives of the United States Government;

(B) Federal grant programs such as the Information Access Fund; or

(C) nongovernmental or international organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Black Sea Trust, the Balkan Trust for Democracy, the Prague Civil Society Centre, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, the European Endowment for Democracy, and related organizations.

(3) **REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the programs and activities carried out to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) during the preceding fiscal year.

(B) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall include, with respect to each program or activity described in that subparagraph—

(i) the amount of funding for the program or activity;

(ii) the goal described in subsection (b) to which the program or activity relates; and

(iii) an assessment of whether or not the goal was met.

(C) **COORDINATION WITH GLOBAL PARTNERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to maximize cost efficiency, eliminate duplication, and speed the achievement of the goals described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall ensure coordination with—

(A) the European Union and its institutions;

(B) the governments of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union; and

(C) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) **REPORT BY SECRETARY OF STATE.**—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) the amount of funding provided to each country referred to in subsection (b) by—

(i) the European Union or its institutions;

(ii) the government of each country that is a member of the European Union or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(iii) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b); and

(B) an assessment of whether the funding described in subparagraph (A) is commensurate with funding provided by the United States for those goals.

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to or limit United States foreign assistance not provided using amounts available in the Countering Russian Influence Fund.

(g) **ENSURING ADEQUATE STAFFING FOR GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES.**—In order to ensure that the United States Government is properly focused on combating corruption, improving rule of law, and building the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations in countries described in subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of State shall establish a pilot program for Foreign Service officer positions focused on governance and anticorruption activities in such countries.

SEC. 255. REPORT ON MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS CONTROLLED AND FUNDED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a description of media organizations that are controlled and funded by the Government of the Russian Federation, and any affiliated entities, whether operating within or outside the Russian Federation, including broadcast and satellite-based television, radio, Internet, and print media organizations.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 256. REPORT ON RUSSIAN FEDERATION INFLUENCE ON ELECTIONS IN EUROPE AND EURASIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on funds provided by, or funds the use of which was directed by, the Government of the Russian Federation or any Russian person with the intention of influencing the outcome of any election or campaign in any country in Europe or Eurasia during the preceding year, including through direct support to any political party, candidate, lobbying campaign, nongovernmental organization, or civic organization.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) **RUSSIAN PERSON DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Russian person” means—

(1) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(2) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

SEC. 257. UKRAINIAN ENERGY SECURITY.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereign and territorial integrity;

(2) to condemn and oppose all of the destabilizing efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine in violation of its obligations and international commitments;

(3) to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Government of the Russian Federation or the separation of any portion of Ukrainian territory through the use of military force;

(4) to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus;

(5) to assist in promoting reform in regulatory oversight and operations in Ukraine’s

energy sector, including the establishment and empowerment of an independent regulatory organization;

(6) to encourage and support fair competition, market liberalization, and reliability in Ukraine’s energy sector;

(7) to help Ukraine and United States allies and partners in Europe reduce their dependence on Russian energy resources, especially natural gas, which the Government of the Russian Federation uses as a weapon to coerce, intimidate, and influence other countries;

(8) to work with European Union member states and European Union institutions to promote energy security through developing diversified and liberalized energy markets that provide diversified sources, suppliers, and routes;

(9) to continue to oppose the NordStream 2 pipeline given its detrimental impacts on the European Union’s energy security, gas market development in Central and Eastern Europe, and energy reforms in Ukraine; and

(10) that the United States Government should prioritize the export of United States energy resources in order to create American jobs, help United States allies and partners, and strengthen United States foreign policy.

(b) **PLAN TO PROMOTE ENERGY SECURITY IN UKRAINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Energy, shall work with the Government of Ukraine to develop a plan to increase energy security in Ukraine, increase the amount of energy produced in Ukraine, and reduce Ukraine’s reliance on energy imports from the Russian Federation.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall include strategies for market liberalization, effective regulation and oversight, supply diversification, energy reliability, and energy efficiency, such as through supporting—

(A) the promotion of advanced technology and modern operating practices in Ukraine’s oil and gas sector;

(B) modern geophysical and meteorological survey work as needed followed by international tenders to help attract qualified investment into exploration and development of areas with untapped resources in Ukraine;

(C) a broadening of Ukraine’s electric power transmission interconnection with Europe;

(D) the strengthening of Ukraine’s capability to maintain electric power grid stability and reliability;

(E) independent regulatory oversight and operations of Ukraine’s gas market and electricity sector;

(F) the implementation of primary gas law including pricing, tariff structure, and legal regulatory implementation;

(G) privatization of government owned energy companies through credible legal frameworks and a transparent process compliant with international best practices;

(H) procurement and transport of emergency fuel supplies, including reverse pipeline flows from Europe;

(I) provision of technical assistance for crisis planning, crisis response, and public outreach;

(J) repair of infrastructure to enable the transport of fuel supplies;

(K) repair of power generating or power transmission equipment or facilities; and

(L) improved building energy efficiency and other measures designed to reduce energy demand in Ukraine.

(3) **REPORTS.**—

(A) **IMPLEMENTATION OF UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014 PROVISIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment

of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the status of implementing the provisions required under section 7(c) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926(c)), including detailing the plans required under that section, the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth under that section, and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies developed pursuant to that section.

(B) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the plan developed under paragraph (1), the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth in paragraph (2), and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies.

(C) **BRIEFINGS.**—The Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall brief the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days after the submission of each report under subparagraph (B). In addition, the Department of State shall make relevant officials available upon request to brief the appropriate congressional committees on all available information that relates directly or indirectly to Ukraine or energy security in Eastern Europe.

(D) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(C) **SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF COUNTRIES IN EUROPE AND EURASIA TO DECREASE THEIR DEPENDENCE ON RUSSIAN SOURCES OF ENERGY.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) The Government of the Russian Federation uses its strong position in the energy sector as leverage to manipulate the internal politics and foreign relations of the countries of Europe and Eurasia.

(B) This influence is based not only on the Russian Federation’s oil and natural gas resources, but also on its state-owned nuclear power and electricity companies.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the United States should assist the efforts of the countries of Europe and Eurasia to enhance their energy security through diversification of energy supplies in order to lessen dependencies on Russian Federation energy resources and state-owned entities; and

(B) the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should play key roles in supporting critical energy projects that contribute to that goal.

(3) **USE OF COUNTERING RUSSIAN INFLUENCE FUND TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund pursuant to section 254 shall be used to provide technical advice to countries described in subsection (b)(1) of such section designed to enhance energy security and lessen dependence on energy from Russian Federation sources.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State a total of \$30,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 to carry out the strategies set forth in subsection (b)(2) and other activities under this section related to the promotion of energy security in Ukraine.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibilities required and authorities provided under section 7 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926).

SEC. 258. TERMINATION.

The provisions of this subtitle shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 259. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

Except as otherwise provided, in this subtitle, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle C—Combating Terrorism and Illicit Financing

PART I—NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORIST AND OTHER ILLICIT FINANCING

SEC. 261. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President, acting through the Secretary, shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the appropriate Federal banking agencies and Federal functional regulators, develop a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance.

(b) **TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive national strategy developed in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) **UPDATES.**—Not later than January 31, 2020, and January 31, 2022, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees updated versions of the national strategy submitted under paragraph (1).

(c) **SEPARATE PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL.**—Any part of the national strategy that involves information that is properly classified under criteria established by the President shall be submitted to Congress separately in a classified annex and, if requested by the chairman or ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees, as a briefing at an appropriate level of security.

SEC. 262. CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

The strategy described in section 261 shall contain the following:

(1) **EVALUATION OF EXISTING EFFORTS.**—An assessment of the effectiveness of and ways in which the United States is currently addressing the highest levels of risk of various forms of illicit finance, including those identified in the documents entitled “2015 National Money Laundering Risk Assessment” and “2015 National Terrorist Financing Risk Assessment”, published by the Department of the Treasury and a description of how the strategy is integrated into, and supports, the broader counter terrorism strategy of the United States.

(2) **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES.**—A comprehensive, research-based, long-range,

quantifiable discussion of goals, objectives, and priorities for disrupting and preventing illicit finance activities within and transiting the financial system of the United States that outlines priorities to reduce the incidence, dollar value, and effects of illicit finance.

(3) **THREATS.**—An identification of the most significant illicit finance threats to the financial system of the United States.

(4) **REVIEWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES.**—Reviews of enforcement efforts, relevant regulations and relevant provisions of law and, if appropriate, discussions of proposed changes determined to be appropriate to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective efforts at all levels of government, and with international partners of the United States, in the fight against illicit finance.

(5) **DETECTION AND PROSECUTION INITIATIVES.**—A description of efforts to improve, as necessary, detection and prosecution of illicit finance, including efforts to ensure that—

(A) subject to legal restrictions, all appropriate data collected by the Federal Government that is relevant to the efforts described in this section be available in a timely fashion to—

(i) all appropriate Federal departments and agencies; and

(ii) as appropriate and consistent with section 314 of the International Money Laundering Abatement and Financial Anti-Terrorism Act of 2001 (31 U.S.C. 5311 note), to financial institutions to assist the financial institutions in efforts to comply with laws aimed at curbing illicit finance; and

(B) appropriate efforts are undertaken to ensure that Federal departments and agencies charged with reducing and preventing illicit finance make thorough use of publicly available data in furtherance of this effort.

(6) **THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE FINANCIAL SECTOR IN PREVENTION OF ILLICIT FINANCE.**—A discussion of ways to enhance partnerships between the private financial sector and Federal departments and agencies with regard to the prevention and detection of illicit finance, including—

(A) efforts to facilitate compliance with laws aimed at stopping such illicit finance while maintaining the effectiveness of such efforts; and

(B) providing guidance to strengthen internal controls and to adopt on an industry-wide basis more effective policies.

(7) **ENHANCEMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION.**—A discussion of ways to combat illicit finance by enhancing—

(A) cooperative efforts between and among Federal, State, and local officials, including State regulators, State and local prosecutors, and other law enforcement officials; and

(B) cooperative efforts with and between governments of countries and with and between multinational institutions with expertise in fighting illicit finance, including the Financial Action Task Force and the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units.

(8) **TREND ANALYSIS OF EMERGING ILLICIT FINANCE THREATS.**—A discussion of and data regarding trends in illicit finance, including evolving forms of value transfer such as so-called cryptocurrencies, other methods that are computer, telecommunications, or Internet-based, cyber crime, or any other threats that the Secretary may choose to identify.

(9) **BUDGET PRIORITIES.**—A multiyear budget plan that identifies sufficient resources needed to successfully execute the full range of missions called for in this section.

(10) **TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENTS.**—An analysis of current and developing ways to leverage technology to improve the effectiveness

of efforts to stop the financing of terrorism and other forms of illicit finance, including better integration of open-source data.

PART II—ENHANCING ANTITERRORISM TOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SEC. 271. IMPROVING ANTITERROR FINANCE MONITORING OF FUNDS TRANSFERS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To improve the ability of the Department of the Treasury to better track cross-border fund transfers and identify potential financing of terrorist or other forms of illicit finance, the Secretary shall carry out a study to assess—

(A) the potential efficacy of requiring banking regulators to establish a pilot program to provide technical assistance to depository institutions and credit unions that wish to provide account services to money services businesses serving individuals in Somalia;

(B) whether such a pilot program could be a model for improving the ability of United States persons to make legitimate funds transfers through transparent and easily monitored channels while preserving strict compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act (Public Law 91-508; 84 Stat. 1114) and related controls aimed at stopping money laundering and the financing of terrorism; and

(C) consistent with current legal requirements regarding confidential supervisory information, the potential impact of allowing money services businesses to share certain State examination information with depository institutions and credit unions, or whether another appropriate mechanism could be identified to allow a similar exchange of information to give the depository institutions and credit unions a better understanding of whether an individual money services business is adequately meeting its anti-money laundering and counter-terror financing obligations to combat money laundering, the financing of terror, or related illicit finance.

(2) PUBLIC INPUT.—The Secretary should solicit and consider public input as appropriate in developing the study required under subsection (a).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

SEC. 272. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION REGARDING TERRORIST FINANCING INTELLIGENCE.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, should intensify work with foreign partners to help the foreign partners develop intelligence analytic capacities, in a financial intelligence unit, finance ministry, or other appropriate agency, that are—

(1) commensurate to the threats faced by the foreign partner; and

(2) designed to better integrate intelligence efforts with the anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing regimes of the foreign partner.

SEC. 273. EXAMINING THE COUNTER-TERROR FINANCING ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY IN EMBASSIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Banking,

Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(1) a list of the United States embassies in which a full-time Department of the Treasury financial attaché is stationed and a description of how the interests of the Department of the Treasury relating to terrorist financing and money laundering are addressed (via regional attachés or otherwise) at United States embassies where no such attachés are present;

(2) a list of the United States embassies at which the Department of the Treasury has assigned a technical assistance advisor from the Office of Technical Assistance of the Department of the Treasury;

(3) an overview of how Department of the Treasury financial attachés and technical assistance advisors assist in efforts to counter illicit finance, to include money laundering, terrorist financing, and proliferation financing; and

(4) an overview of patterns, trends, or other issues identified by the Department of the Treasury and whether resources are sufficient to address these issues.

SEC. 274. INCLUSION OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(c)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(c)(1)) is amended by inserting “the Secretary of the Treasury,” before “and such other officers”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) may not be construed to authorize the National Security Council to have a professional staff level that exceeds the limitation set forth under section 101(e)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(e)(3)).

SEC. 275. INCLUSION OF ALL FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5326 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by striking “coin and currency”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “subtitle and” and inserting “subtitle or to”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “United States coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in such order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in such order);” and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “coins or currency (or monetary instruments)” and inserting “funds”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “coins or currency (or such other monetary instruments as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order)” and inserting “funds (as the Secretary may describe in the regulation or order)”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 5326 by striking “coin and currency”.

PART III—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 281. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle—

(1) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Com-

mittee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term “appropriate Federal banking agencies” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

(3) the term “Bank Secrecy Act” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91-508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code;

(4) the term “Federal functional regulator” has the meaning given that term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809);

(5) the term “illicit finance” means the financing of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, or proliferation, money laundering, or other forms of illicit financing domestically or internationally, as defined by the President;

(6) the term “money services business” has the meaning given the term under section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations;

(7) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(8) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each territory or possession of the United States.

Subtitle D—Rule of Construction

SEC. 291. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title (other than sections 216 and 236(b)) shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 292. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The principle of collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is immortalized in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty in which members pledge that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all”.

(2) For almost 7 decades, the principle of collective defense has effectively served as a strategic deterrent for the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and provided stability throughout the world, strengthening the security of the United States and all 28 other member nations.

(3) Following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, the Alliance agreed to invoke Article 5 for the first time, affirming its commitment to collective defense.

(4) Countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have made historic contributions and sacrifices while combating terrorism in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and the Resolute Support Mission.

(5) The recent attacks in the United Kingdom underscore the importance of an international alliance to combat hostile nation states and terrorist groups.

(6) At the 2014 NATO summit in Wales, the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization decided that all countries that are members of NATO would spend an amount equal to 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense by 2024.

(7) Collective defense unites the 29 members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, each committing to protecting and supporting one another from external adversaries, which bolsters the North Atlantic Alliance.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to express the vital importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as it continues to serve as a critical deterrent to potential hostile nations and terrorist organizations;

(2) to remember the first and only invocation of Article 5 by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in support of the United States after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

(3) to affirm that the United States remains fully committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will honor its obligations enshrined in Article 5; and

(4) to condemn any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom, or democracy of any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 255

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment at the desk be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 255) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:
“An Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments’ Aggression.”

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Monday, June 19, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of Executive Calendar No. 108. I further ask that there be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s actions.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 94.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Orrin G. Hatch, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 97.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Steve Daines, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to both cloture motions be waived.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MARKETPLACE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to speak about the ongoing debate in the body concerning the next chapter in healthcare and what we can do about it together and, especially, to address one part of the healthcare market—the individual market.

As most know—and this has been an item about which we are deep into discussions, the people and the Members of this body—before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, Americans with preexisting conditions faced unfair barriers to accessing health insurance coverage, and healthcare costs had risen rapidly. Prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, my own family, which is probably like the healthiest family in America because the five of us have only had three hospitalizations for three childbirths—all for my wife—we had twice been turned down for insurance coverage for at least one member of our family because of preexisting conditions.

Since 2010, the rate of uninsured Americans has declined to a historic low. More than 20 million Americans have gained access to health insurance coverage—many for the first time in their lives. In Virginia, over 410,000 Virginians have accessed care on the individual marketplace and another 400,000 would be eligible if Virginia decided to expand Medicaid.

Many Virginians use the individual market, and they have shared their stories with me on my website. I have on my Senate website “ACA Stories,” where I encourage people to share their stories.

The individual marketplace, as folks know, is if you are buying health insurance, not through an employer, and you are buying individually—you may or may not be qualified for a subsidy—that particular marketplace is really important for people who aren’t employed by companies that offer group plans, but it also has its challenges.

One of my stories was from Lauren Carter, who lives in Lovingson, VA, in Nelson County. She wrote in to say:

My 39-year-old son has cerebral palsy and a blood clotting disorder. His “pre-existing conditions” started at conception. Three years ago, he lost his full time job with health insurance benefits.

The ACA allows him to continue receiving medical care and purchase his life saving medications. He supports himself through multiple part time jobs—

This young man with cerebral palsy—

employer based insurance is not an option for him at this time.

Laura Kreynus from Mechanicsville, VA, near Richmond wrote:

My daughter was diagnosed with Crohn’s Disease in April of 2013. That September, my husband was diagnosed with Parkinson’s Disease. We are farmers, we raise the food for America. As such, we are independently insured.

They have no large employer to cover them.

Prior to finding a plan through the ACA in January 2015, our monthly insurance premiums were to increase to nearly \$3,000 a month . . . yes, each MONTH! On top of that, our health insurance had an annual cap on prescription coverage of \$5,000. The Humira that my daughter takes to combat her Crohn's Disease retails for \$3,800 a month, and that is not the only medication she requires. So basically, after one month, we reached the prescription coverage cap, meaning we would have to pay \$3,800 a month for medication on top of \$3,000 a month premiums. Who has an extra \$6,800 a month to pay for this? That is way more than we earn monthly as farmers.

With the health insurance plan we got through the ACA, our premiums for 2015 were \$1,500 a month, less than half of what we would have been paying under the previous plan. But the real saving grace was no prescription cap, so my daughter's medications are covered with a copay after we reach the deductible. This is still a lot of money, but at least we can treat our daughter's disease and hopefully keep her healthy. And even though our premiums have gone up to nearly \$2,000 a month from \$1,500 a month under the ACA, at least we can still have insurance.

For families like Lauren's and Laura's, the individual marketplace is critical. But like Laura said, premiums are frequently too high. You have to have robust enrollment, competition, and certainty for premiums to come down.

Unfortunately, there has been increasing uncertainty in the individual market due to actions taken by the current administration. On January 20, 2017, President Trump signed an Executive order directing relevant agencies not to enforce key provisions of the Affordable Care Act. Later in January, the administration terminated components of outreach and enrollment spending, including advertising to encourage people to enroll in the individual marketplace.

The administration has also repeatedly threatened to end cost-sharing reduction payments, which reduce costs for approximately 6 million people with incomes below 250 percent of the poverty level. These actions, these statements, these inactions, and this uncertainty have created uncertainty in the individual marketplace, leading to instability for insurance carriers, higher premiums, and reduced competition.

In Virginia, we have seen Aetna and United leave the individual marketplace, and they have cited this uncertainty created by this administration as the principal reason. In other States, there are counties that are at risk to have no insurers offering coverage on the marketplace in particular States or sometimes in regions in the States.

So this is a problem we can address, and we don't have to repeal the Affordable Care Act to do it. We just need to improve the Affordable Care Act, using a tool that has had bipartisan support in this body for some time.

So yesterday Senator CARPER and I introduced the Individual Health Insurance Marketplace Improvement Act,

and I want to thank the other original cosponsors of the bill: Senators NELSON, SHAHEEN, and HASSAN.

One way to address uncertainty is to use a common insurance tool, reinsurance—a permanent reinsurance program to help stabilize premiums and increase competition. The Affordable Care Act originally had a reinsurance program. It was temporary. It lasted for the first 3 years of the program, and it did hold premiums down. What we would do is that we would take that idea, which worked, and we would make it permanent. We would make it permanent and modeled after a very successful and bipartisan program: Medicare Part D. Medicare Part D provides a prescription drug benefit for seniors. It was passed with bipartisan support during the administration of President George W. Bush, now more than a decade ago, and the reinsurance program has helped hold down costs.

This reinsurance program would provide funding to offset larger than expected insurance claims for health insurance companies participating in State and Federal marketplaces. It would encourage them to offer more plans in a greater number of markets, thereby improving competition and driving down costs for patients and families. Basically, if reinsurance can cover high costs, an insurance company will know it has a backstop, which gives it a measure of stability, and also can set premiums at a more reasonable level for everyone.

The bill would also do one other thing that is important. It would provide \$500 million a year from 2018 to 2020 to help States improve outreach and enrollment for the health insurance marketplaces, especially to draw in new members and educate the public—especially young people who are maybe moving just past their 26th birthdays and can no longer be contained on family policies—about the need to be insured. The outreach funding prioritizes counties where there are limited insurers left in the marketplace.

This is not the only improvement that is needed for our healthcare system. We need to do more to keep costs down, figure out a way to have prescription drugs be more affordable, and we can certainly use technology and data to drive better health outcomes, but this is a fix. It is a fix of an important part of our system, the individual market. It is a fix using an idea that has already worked and has already compelled the support of both Democrats and Republicans—reinsurance in Medicare Part D. This should be something Democrats and Republicans can agree to.

My worry is that we are participating now in a secretive effort to write a healthcare bill behind closed doors and possibly put it on the floor for a vote without hearing from a single patient, without hearing from a single provider, a hospital, a business that has a hard time buying insurance

for its employees, an insurance company, or pharmaceutical company.

We ought to be debating these bills in the world's greatest deliberative body and proposing amendments and hearing from stakeholders and then doing the best job we can when we are dealing with the most important expenditure that anybody ever makes in their life, healthcare. Healthcare is also one of the largest segments of the American economy, one-sixth of the economy. Why would we want to pass a bill in secret?

Senator CARPER, my colleagues, and I have introduced this bill as a good faith effort to say what I actually said when I first got on the HELP Committee in early January of 2015. There is a huge group of us just waiting for the door to open so that we can have a meaningful discussion about moving our system forward, and I believe this bill could be a very good part of stabilizing and improving the individual market and bringing relief to many Americans.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to reiterate my support for the resolution of disapproval related to the sale of certain defense articles to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. While the resolution, unfortunately, did not pass the Senate in a recent vote, I believe its goals remain important.

The Saudi-led military campaign in Yemen is fueling a humanitarian disaster. Over 10,000 people have died, and over 3 million people have been displaced as the conflict has exacerbated poverty, famine, and disease. According to UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, a cholera outbreak in Yemen could quadruple to infect 300,000 people in the coming weeks. Half of the current cholera cases affect children, and the ongoing conflict leaves few hospitals to turn to and almost no medical supplies.

In addition to deaths related to famine and the outbreak of other diseases, we are seeing civilian casualties as a direct result of Saudi military action. Earlier this year at a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, I asked General Votel, the commander of U.S. Central Command, which is responsible for the Middle East, to assess the cause of the large number of civilian casualties in Yemen. General Votel responded: "I attribute those type situations more to the competence of the forces that are operating there, and their ability to properly target."

I am concerned that even with the precision munitions the United States

has sold to Saudi Arabia in the past, air strikes continue to hit civilian targets. The number of civilian injuries and deaths shows that there is simply not enough progress to reduce civilian casualties.

I could not in good conscience vote to support providing advanced precision munitions—bombs capable of hitting targets guided by laser targeting or GPS—to a campaign conducted by forces unable or unwilling to limit strikes to targets of military necessity.

Civilian casualties are a tragedy, and they threaten to make us less safe by radicalizing populations that otherwise would not be sympathetic to violent extremist groups like al-Qaida. It is critical that the U.S. military is certainly able to hunt down terrorists wherever they operate or wherever they seek haven.

The deployment of remotely piloted aircraft has allowed for persistent intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, which is used to minimize the risk of civilian casualties. When the U.S. military carries out air strikes, we know our men and women in uniform are the best trained in the world and are informed by the best available intelligence.

Precision-guided munitions alone do not avoid preventable tragedies. It takes capable and fully trained personnel. This is what we must expect from our partners for the sake of innocent civilians caught in conflict zones and for our own national security. Failing to do so sets back the potential for a political solution.

We simply should not send precision munitions or any weapons system to any partner with personnel who are not capable or trained to use them. That is why I supported the resolution of disapproval, which specifically objects to the sale of three specific types of precision-guided munitions and related technology. While this measure failed, I will continue to work as a member of the Armed Services Committee to provide oversight and hold the Saudi Government and military accountable.

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES BILL

Mr. President, I was proud to support the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act. This is important legislation that I was also proud to cosponsor. It will require sanctions on those supporting Iran's ballistic missile program and imposes terrorism-related sanctions on Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps.

For too long, Iran's state sponsorship of terrorism and their repeated ballistic missile tests in defiance of U.N. Security Council resolutions have destabilized the Middle East and threatened Israel, our strongest ally in the region. Their destabilizing actions are fueling the ongoing violence causing widespread humanitarian suffering in Yemen. Iran provides weapons and troops that fuel conflicts, and Iran's military consistently behaves in an unprofessional manner, putting American troops at risk.

I believe most Iranian citizens want to play a productive role in the world. It is their government that is the problem. I believe that pressure provided by additional sanctions for destabilizing activity can improve the behavior of the Iranian regime, and we must send a clear signal to this regime that their actions are simply unacceptable.

This legislation also provided a vehicle to address another nation's leadership whose actions have warranted international condemnation—Russia. This bill includes an amendment that I supported to enhance sanctions on Russia.

This amendment ensures that sanctions imposed by President Obama are codified in law and cannot be removed without congressional review. It also imposes new sanctions on Russians who facilitate human rights violations, supply weapons to the Syrian Government, conduct cyber attacks on behalf of the Russian Government, and do business in the Russian intelligence and defense sectors.

Let me be clear: Russia is not our friend. The Russian Government has conducted an information warfare campaign against our own country and sought to undermine our democratic process.

This is not a one-time incident. Russia continues to attempt to disrupt democratic institutions and interfere with our allies.

Congress has supported imposing tough sanctions on Russia, and it is important that Congress has an opportunity to review any attempt to remove them. I am glad this amendment was adopted on a broadly bipartisan basis.

Finally, I am a cosponsor of an amendment offered by Senator GRAHAM that reaffirms the importance of NATO, particularly article 5, the collective defense provision, which states that an attack on one is an attack on all. Article 5 has been invoked only once, in response to the September 11 attacks on the United States. With the inclusion of this amendment, the Senate sends a strong, clear signal that the United States stands by our commitment to security and stability throughout the world, and we always will.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BUILDING AND SUSTAINING A LARGER NAVY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise to continue my discussion about the case for a bigger Navy, a bigger fleet, and to endorse the requirement of the experts in the Department of Defense that we move to a 355-ship Navy.

When a crisis strikes around the world, the President asks his national

security team: Where are the carriers? Where are the aircraft carriers?

Each of our carriers is a 100,000-ton giant, accompanied by an entire carrier group that consists of mighty warships and aircraft. The carrier, itself, represents 4.5 acres of sovereign U.S. territory.

In early January of this year—and Senators do not know this—a strange and profoundly disturbing thing happened. The answer to the Commander in Chief's question, had it been asked at that point—where are the carriers?—would have been that none of them had been deployed—not a single one. For the first time since World War II, the United States had no carriers deployed anywhere—not in the Persian Gulf, not in the Mediterranean, not in the Western Pacific.

There is a gap in our global carrier presence, and there is a gap in our fleet. This comes from years of complacency. Also, it comes from a different set of facts that we are faced with and a different set of challenges that we are faced with in our quest to make our presence known and to protect our national security interests on the open seas. We have ignored the great naval competition that is taking place elsewhere—the fact that it is accelerating. We have taken our Navy and our sailors and marines for granted.

Simply put, the Navy we have today is too small. We cannot accomplish the critical missions that we have by preserving the status quo. Right now, we have 277 ships, and we need to get to 355 ships. That was reiterated today by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Secretary of the Navy in a hearing before the full Armed Services Committee.

I will reiterate to my colleagues and to the American people what the Navy does for America and why the current fleet is too small to meet current and emerging challenges.

First, the global presence of the Navy ship matters to American prosperity—to the quality of life of Americans. Ninety percent of global trade is sea-borne. Maritime traffic has increased by 400 percent over the past quarter century. In addition to commerce, nearly all intercontinental telecommunications transit via a web of undersea cables. Undersea cables are responsible for nearly all of our intercontinental telecommunications.

Second, a strong Navy deters aggressive behavior and reassures our allies as the Nation's first-on-the-scene force. A strong Navy can help keep bad situations from spiraling out of control and getting worse. For example, the President recently dispatched multiple carrier strike groups to the Sea of Japan following North Korea's missile tests. The President asked where the carriers were, and he dispatched them to a place of crisis. A mix of ships gives our Commander in Chief a range of military options, and their deployments to areas of instability can send a message of resolve to our friends and foes alike.

Third, if deterrence fails, our naval forces can provide a decisive response to aggression. Surface ships, submarines, and the aircraft on the carriers can launch missile strikes, control air and sea traffic, and intercept missile threats. The recent U.S. action in Syria is a good example, as the Presiding Officer knows. In using destroyers in the Mediterranean, the Commander in Chief delivered precision strikes against Syrian airfields. He enforced the redline against outlawed chemical weapons, and President Assad has not crossed that redline again.

Accomplishing these missions as the Nation's sentinel and first responder requires a big Navy. Admiral John Richardson, the Chief of Naval Operations, put it best in "The Future Navy" white paper that was released last month. He said:

Numbers matter. The number of ships in the Navy's fleet determines where we can be, and being there is a key to naval power.

Again, the current fleet of about 277 ships is way too small. It is important to remember that not all ships are deployed or deployable. In fact, only about 100 ships out of the 277 are currently deployed. The other two-thirds are undergoing heavy maintenance, routine sustainment, or are training to deploy. The Navy recently validated its requirement for 355 ships—a 47-ship increase over the previous requirement.

The lack of ships has created coverage gaps all over the world. I will give two examples.

First, the commander of Pacific Command, ADM Harry Harris, recently told Congress he has only half the submarines he needs. Admiral Harris is responsible for deterring China and North Korea, but he is missing half of the submarines he needs. Closer to home, the commander of Southern Command, ADM Kurt Tidd, has zero Navy ships permanently assigned to his area of operations. These are just two of the many alarming instances where the lack of ships is having major consequences.

While we watch our edge erode, America's real and potential adversaries are building the size and capability of their fleets. They are on the field competing while, in America, many of our players are still in the locker room.

China is building a modern navy capable of projecting global power. China is modernizing every type of ship and submarine in its fleet. China commissioned 18 ships last year. In April, China launched its first domestically built carrier and plans to build at least six more carriers. By 2030, China will have more than twice as many attack submarines and four times as many small surface ships as the United States. Beijing is developing its first overseas naval base in the Horn of Africa. China's naval buildup may attempt to push the United States first out of the Western Pacific, away from critical trade chokepoints and our allies in South Korea and Japan.

I would call the attention of Members to the poster that I have, and I hope it is printed large enough for my colleagues to see. In terms of five types of ships, it compares where we were in 2000, where we are today, and where we are projected to be if current trends continue.

For example, on the farthest column shown on the chart, in attack submarines—and the black portion of each circle represents China's capability, and the blue represents our capability in the United States of America. In 2000, it was 64 to 55 in favor of the Chinese. In 2016, as we can see, 56 to 57. But under current projections, by the year 2030, when it comes to attack submarines, the Chinese will have 87 and the United States will have only 42—a disturbing trend which the Navy would like to reverse if we have the ability and the wisdom to give them the requirement they have said they need.

With regard to ballistic missile submarines, in 2000, quite a mismatch—only 1 for China as compared to 18 for the United States; then, only last year, 4 for China and 14 for the U.S. Navy; and then projected for 2030—and really that is in only 13 short years, which is hard to believe—there will be more Chinese ballistic missile submarines than American ballistic missile submarines unless we take the Navy's requirement to heart and take action beginning this year to rectify that situation.

With regard to small surface ships, as we can see, there was a 79-to-62 advantage in sheer numbers in 2000 and a 103-to-23 advantage of the Chinese in 2016. In 2030, there will still be a mismatch, in terms of numbers, of 123 small surface ships compared to only 40 for the United States of America.

With large surface ships, it was 20 to 79, then 19 to 84, and by the year 2030, as we can see, the Chinese are projected to have 34 large surface ships.

With regard to aircraft carriers, as I pointed out, they were not in that game at all in 2000. They delivered their first last year, and they are projected to go to four by the year 2013.

It all adds up to 260—a 260-ship fleet for China and only 199 for the United States unless we act, and act responsibly, in response to what the Navy and the Marine Corps and the best military minds in the Pentagon are telling us, and I hope we will do that.

An increasingly aggressive Russia is also modernizing. The Kremlin is pouring money into new attack and nuclear ballistic missile submarines. Russian submarine patrols have doubled, and those patrols are stretching closer to the U.S. homeland. The Russian Navy's operating areas have expanded to include regular operations in the Baltic, Black, Mediterranean, and Caspian Seas. Russia is also exploiting new opportunities in the Arctic by building naval bases in the High North.

So both China and Russia are investing heavily in their fleets and in new ballistic and cruise missiles that can target U.S. naval forces.

And, of course, we need to turn to the subject matter of North Korea. Kim Jong Un will stop at nothing to develop a nuclear weapon that can strike our allies and that can strike deployed U.S. forces and eventually our homeland. A nuclear ballistic submarine would essentially make North Korea impervious to threats of preemption. North Korea is building fortified submarine bunkers and began testing submarine-launched ballistic missiles within the last year.

Iran is another rogue state developing a massive fleet of fast attack boats and mini-submarines to deny the free passage of ships through the vital Strait of Hormuz.

Naval competition is a fact. China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran have clearly been building up the size and the sophistication of their fleets. The Chief of Naval Operations has a word to describe the pace of competition, and that word is "exponential." The CNO puts it this way:

Time is an unforgiving characteristic of the maritime [environment]. Things are moving faster, including our competitors.

So let's start competing again. Building a larger fleet is a national project. It will require sustained commitment by the President, the Congress, and the Department of Defense. As chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, I intend to begin laying a firm foundation this year for a significant buildup in the future, and I hope my colleagues will join me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to start this afternoon with a reflection on what happened yesterday. We are thinking today of the individuals who were hurt in the attack during the baseball practice in Virginia, and, of course, we are praying for those who were injured. I will list them. Many of the names we already know, but it is important to list them.

Of course, Representative STEVE SCALISE from the State of Louisiana—we are thinking of his family and praying for them, and we hope for his speedy recovery. Matt Mika, who works for Tyson Foods, was also a shooting victim like Representative SCALISE. Zack Barth, who works for Congressman ROGER WILLIAMS, was a shooting victim, and Special Agent Crystal Griner, of course, of the Capitol Police, who exhibited such courage in the line of duty. We are thinking of Crystal at this time as well.

We know there were individuals injured at the scene, including Special Agent David Bailey of the Capitol Police, who was not shot, apparently, but suffered an injury and was released from the hospital. We are happy to hear he has been released. Representative ROGER WILLIAMS, who was hurt at the scene as well—not a shooting victim but hurt—and, of course, two of

our colleagues were there at the time, Senator RAND PAUL and Senator JEFF FLAKE. We are thankful they were not injured in any way.

On these days, we come together as a family to remember those who have been the victims, and we are thinking of them and their families and praying for them.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the healthcare debate and in particular not just the issue of healthcare but the effort underway by Senate Republicans in their attempts to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I have grave concerns about the substance of the legislation—what we know about it. It has been kind of a secret process. We don't know a lot, but we have some general sense of where they are headed. I also have grave concern about the lack of transparency employed by the Republican majority around the development of this healthcare plan.

Like millions of Americans, I oppose this secretive process—and I have to say it is a partisan process as well—that could result in major legislation that would harm children who will lose their healthcare, especially by way of the cuts to Medicaid. It could harm individuals with disabilities—and by one recent estimate in Pennsylvania, that means over 720,000 Pennsylvanians with a disability who rely upon Medicaid; and, of course, seniors—a lot of seniors across the country cannot get into a nursing home absent the full support of the Medicaid Program, and we are concerned about them as well; and finally, middle-class families who may not be able to afford healthcare if the House bill were to become law or a substantially similar bill passed by the Senate.

In 2009, the legislation passed the Senate after a yearlong, open process that included a total of 44 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and summits. That was in the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, of which I was a member at the time and remember well those hours and hours and days and days of hearings. The Committee on Finance at that time also had many hearings over many months. This whole process by two committees led to the consideration of some 435 amendments offered by both parties, majority and minority, and a full debate on the Senate floor that lasted over 25 consecutive days. In fact, a number of Republican Senators were able to offer and get a vote on their amendments, some of which passed and became part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Yet, in the last 5 months, there have been no Senate hearings on this proposed legislation, no hearings on the House proposal, and certainly no hearings on what is being developed here in the Senate. If that is the case—if that remains the case over the next couple of days and weeks—then I believe we

should institute a very basic rule: If you have no hearings, you have no vote. In other words, you can't have a vote on the Senate floor on a bill that will affect so many tens of millions of Americans and will change dramatically and, I would argue, adversely, to the detriment of a lot of people, our healthcare system. I hope the majority will agree with that—that if you don't have a hearing, you shouldn't have a vote on the Senate floor.

There have been no relevant bills considered in executive session by any of the committees of jurisdiction. Every indication is that the Republican majority will jam this legislation through with minimal opportunity for debate. This is unacceptable to me, but I also believe it is unacceptable to people across the country in both parties.

We know, for example, the reason—or one of the many reasons—folks would want a hearing before a vote, and that is because we are getting a sense of what the substance is. Just to give one example, I won't enter this whole report into the RECORD, but I am holding a full copy of the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate. This estimate is dated, May 24, 2017, analyzing H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017. This is the bill which passed the House. Page 17 of the CBO report says:

Medicaid enrollment would be lower throughout the coming decade, culminating in 14 million fewer Medicaid enrollees by 2026, a reduction of about 17 percent relative to the number under current law.

That is quoted directly from page 17 of the CBO report, that over the decade, 14 million people will lose their Medicaid coverage.

I know some here and across the city who were commenting on this legislation—either members of the administration, Members of Congress, or otherwise—are refuting this, but I think when you have a Congressional Budget Office report which is an independent entity that both parties have relied upon—and it is not only the CBO. This is a report authored by not just the Congressional Budget Office but also the Joint Committee on Taxation.

So 14 million fewer people on Medicaid—why is that relevant to the Senate debate if the CBO report was analyzing the House bill? Here is what one think tank, which has analyzed healthcare policy for years, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities—they put forth a report this Monday, June 12. In that report of just a couple of pages, they had a chart—I am holding it. I do not expect people to see it, but here is what it says. It has four columns. The first column has the major provisions of the House bill; and then what are likely, based upon reporting and information we can ascertain so far, major provisions of the House bill; what happens if the House bill passes; and then major provisions of the Senate bill.

There is a section entitled “Medicaid Expansion.” When the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities analyzed and

compared the House bill to what we know so far about the Senate bill being proposed or at least the development of it, basically the Center on Budget says there is no long-term impact on any reported changes from one bill to the other. The Medicaid per capita cap—another very disturbing development that is being considered—when they compare the Senate bill to the House bill, they say no major changes.

So we are very concerned about what happens to Medicaid. I am very concerned because of the 1.1 million children in Pennsylvania, the disability number I mentioned before of over 722,000 people with disabilities who get Medicaid, and of course the seniors who depend upon Medicaid. So we are concerned about the elimination, even over time, of the Medicaid expansion. We are also concerned about the Medicaid Program itself.

In addition to those numbers, I want to highlight a few individual stories of people to get a sense of what is at stake when it comes to this bill and when it comes to Medicaid.

This past Friday, I met with German Parodi from Philadelphia. Here is his story:

In 2001, he was a victim of a carjacking and was shot in the neck, leaving him paralyzed and unable to use his legs and having limited use of his arms. He was nursed back to health by his grandmother and has worked for the past 16 years to be a full citizen, going to school, working, owning his home, now caring for his grandmother who once cared for him. German, who now uses a wheelchair to get around, has worked to achieve what every American wants—to be a successful student, to own a home, and to care for his family. He can do this because of his knowledge, skills, and perseverance, and he has been able to achieve these goals because he gets direct care services paid for by Medicaid. His direct care professional helps him get out of bed in the morning, get showered, dressed, breakfast, and get to work. Medicaid and the services it provides makes it possible for him to use his skills to be successful.

German told me that without Medicaid, “I would end up having to live in an institution. This would dramatically affect my life and my grandmother's life.”

While talking with me, he said: “Please do everything in your power to protect my life and the lives of millions like me.”

I am short on time but here is another example. Latoya Maddox, whom I met at the same meeting, is from the Germantown section of Philadelphia. She was born with arthrogryposis multiplex congenital, a disability that limits the use of her limbs. Latoya also uses a wheelchair to get around, including getting to school and getting to work. She is smart, energetic, and the mother of a soon-to-be 6-year-old. She is now a junior at West Chester University working on her bachelor's

degree in social work and works part time at Liberty Resources, Incorporated, one of Pennsylvania's independent living centers.

Like German, Latoya is a successful young professional because she works hard and takes advantage of the opportunities presented to her. She has support from Medicaid in the form of direct support professionals who help her with her daily tasks. Without Medicaid, the wheelchair and other medical equipment she needs and her direct care workers, Latoya would not be able to work, attend school, and care for her son.

While I was talking with Latoya, she told me: "Medicaid makes it possible for me to live a regular, full, productive life, to be a parent, to go to school, and to be a reliable employee."

While talking with her, it was clear that Latoya was proud of her son and proud to be his mother. She was clear that the support she receives from Medicaid makes it possible for her to be that proud parent.

She closed her remarks by saying that Medicaid "makes it possible for me to be me."

My last example is Karen Stauffer. Karen Stauffer is from Bucks County, PA. She is a small business owner. She operates the River of Life Natural Foods store. Karen purchased her healthcare policy from the Pennsylvania Affordable Care Act exchange. She said to me that prior to the passage of the ACA, she saw her healthcare premiums increase from \$300 a month in the late 1990s to \$1,300 in the mid-2000s. She said to me that because of preexisting conditions such as high blood pressure and a long bout of Lyme disease, she was worried she would lose her healthcare. She said passage of the ACA was both an emotional and financial relief for her. Her premiums were reduced to \$500 a month after being as high as \$1,300, and she knew she had the protection of the law when it came to nondiscrimination because of her preexisting conditions.

As she spoke, she shared her fears from what she has been hearing about the House bill and what might come out of the Senate; that, at 61 years of age, her premiums could be five times that of younger policyholders and that the meager subsidies proposed by the Republican majority would make healthcare unaffordable for her. She said to me: I am frankly terrified about what could happen to me in the next 4 years. My income has gone down, I have preexisting conditions, and instead of making adjustments and improvements to the ACA, legislators are causing insurers to become concerned about the future.

Karen was distraught when talking about the future and reminded me that "we all could be one accident or illness away from disaster." That is what Karen said.

So German, Karen, and Latoya, I think, give us a lot to think about. I hope the majority, when they are mak-

ing the final edits to their bill, will make sure that any American with Medicaid, for example, who has it now—a child who comes from a low-income family, an adult or child with a disability or a senior trying to get into a nursing home—if they have Medicaid today and need it in the future, that there would be a guarantee that they don't lose their Medicaid, that they don't lose it this year or 5 years from now or 10 years from now, or longer. Stretching it out over many years and eliminating that coverage year after year, a little bit each year, is going to be just as bad in the long run.

I hope the majority would think of those families and the families in their own States when they are considering healthcare legislation in the Senate. We should have a vote only if there is a hearing on this legislation or, frankly, more than one hearing to consider something this complicated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PRAYERS FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday we had a horrific tragedy here in the capital area. I know I speak for all of my colleagues who are holding the victims of that attack in their hearts and in their prayers: Congressman STEVE SCALISE, still in critical condition; Zack Barth, legislative correspondent who works for Congressman WILLIAMS of Texas, who was injured; Matt Mika of Tyson's Foods, who represents them here on the Hill; and two of our police officers, David Bailey and Crystal Griner of the U.S. Capitol Police. Without those two police officers present, this could have been a much more tragic event.

We have to reinforce the understanding that we are blessed to have the opportunity to raise our voices in our democratic Republic. We are able to raise them by speaking to our members who are elected in local and State and Federal Government, by writing to them, by meeting with them in town-halls. In my State, you can call them up, and they will sit down with you in a cafe. We have an opportunity to weigh in through writing letters to the editor, by protesting in the streets, by overflowing the email lines and flooding the phone lines. We have all kinds of ways to weigh in, in America, but violence is absolutely unacceptable. We have to try to diminish and eliminate the hate speech, which so often becomes the foundation for hate violence.

We have had a very divisive 18 months here in America, where various folks have sought to increase the divisions between groups of Americans, to attack women, to attack African Americans, to attack Hispanics, to attack Muslims, to attack LGBT citizens. We need to eliminate that strategy of division.

Here, in America, we are a tapestry of talents from all over the world, of different cultural backgrounds who

come together to make this Nation incredibly strong. Unless you are 100 percent Native American, you are either an immigrant yourself or the son or daughter of immigrants. We bring that diversity to bear and we make this Nation powerful in ways few other nations could even come close to having.

Let's take this as a moment in which we seek to encourage public participation in all the legitimate forms of free speech but put hate speech out of bounds and hate violence out of bounds.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, it is ironic that this conversation takes place at a moment where we really have a unique process underway designed to limit political discourse. Everything I am saying about participation assumes you will have a chance to weigh in, whether you are elected or whether you are a citizen.

We have a process in the Senate that is designed to prevent the citizens of America from weighing in and to prevent debate by the Members of the Senate. That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable that in a "we the people" constitutional republic, a democratic republic designed to facilitate conversation and dialogue to produce decisions that reflect the will of the people, that work for all Americans—instead, we have a secretive process, more the type of process you would expect in a kingdom where the King and the counselors hide themselves away, with no public input, and make decisions for the masses. That is not the design of our government. Our government is designed for public input.

Here is a phrase that should resonate: no public input, no vote; no hearing, no vote.

I am speaking specifically about the dialogue on TrumpCare. TrumpCare, which was passed by just a few votes in the House and came to the Senate, doesn't reflect a process of the people, by the people, and for the people. In fact, it is by the privileged, for the privileged, and by the privileged.

The House deliberately excluded the public. They had their own consolidated, confined process to make sure it was difficult to have a full debate and an amendment process, for folks to weigh in and consider alternatives and improvements.

Here we are in the Senate, and it is even worse because we have the secret 13 crafting a plan, planning and plotting to bring it to the floor of the Senate probably 2 weeks from today in order to hold a vote, with only a few hours of debate and no committee process of any kind—not a single committee hearing, not a single committee opportunity to consider amendments—and no chance for the public to get a copy and read through it and weigh in with their Members of the Senate. There is no chance for healthcare stakeholders and experts to examine it and point out the difficulties and the flaws. What I think is most egregious

of all is the complete exclusion of the United States of America. It is unacceptable.

I was fascinated by the fact that the majority decided to have this secret 13 committee. Thirteen is considered to be an unlucky number by much of America—Friday the 13th or buildings that don't have a 13th floor. In this case, I hope that having 13 Members meet in secret is unlucky; that is, unlucky in terms of trying to fulfill their mission of passing a bill with no input by the public.

Last week, the majority leader started the process to make this happen without a committee. It is called the rule XIV process. It is a process designed to bring up a healthcare bill that would rip healthcare coverage from millions of Americans and, by the way, give away billions of dollars to the richest Americans, all in the same bill, straight to the Senate floor without a committee being involved—not the Finance Committee, which certainly has many elements related to the financing of healthcare in America, and not the HELP Committee, which has Members of both parties who have worked for years to develop expertise and consult with stakeholders to understand what works and what doesn't work, and they benefit from each other's input.

I was part of the HELP Committee in 2009. For 5 weeks we sat in a room with a television camera operating so the public could see what we were doing, and we proposed amendments and debated them around this big square set of tables. There was full public scrutiny. There was 5 weeks of bipartisan dialogue about what should go in healthcare. That was 2009. The Finance Committee had a very similar process.

But now we have a different objective by the majority leader wanting to bring this bill with no Finance Committee involvement, no HELP Committee involvement, and no citizen involvement. In fact, there is no chance for Senators who aren't in the secret circle to participate and see the bill and hold townhalls and ask people what they think of this.

I do a lot of townhalls. I am doing a couple more this weekend. I have had 20 townhalls this year. I have had a townhall an average of every 10 days since I was elected in 2000 and came to the Senate in 2009. I am going to keep holding these townhalls.

I know that my citizens would like to see this bill and be able to go through the elements and give me feedback on what makes sense and what doesn't. That is a "we the people" democratic republic. This secrecy strategy—that is not. That is not. That is a strategy for nonconstitutional governments. That is a strategy for dictators. That is a strategy for Kings and Queens. That is a strategy for people who hate democracy.

Let's not have that process in the United States. Let's have colleagues from both sides of the aisle go to the

leadership and say: This is unacceptable. I want my citizens to have a chance to see this bill. I want to benefit from talking to the hospitals in my community and my State and get their feedback. I want to talk to the healthcare clinics and get their feedback. I want to talk to the doctors and find out what they think. I want to hear from the nurses because they are so respected in their understanding of the direct delivery of healthcare.

That is what every Member of the Senate should be saying to our majority leader. This process of secrecy, no debate, and the public being excluded is totally unacceptable.

Why is this process going on? In fact, earlier today, the secret 13 went into a room off a hallway where the press is not allowed so they couldn't be seen coming and going from the room. When they were coming and going from the room, they couldn't be talked to by the press. Why all this secrecy? It boils down to this: They know the American people don't like what is in this bill. They are terrified of getting that feedback. If they get that feedback, they might lose a majority in passing this bill.

How much public support is there for the TrumpCare bill? Just 21 percent, according to a recent Quinnipiac poll. That is not very much support for it.

Even President Trump said TrumpCare is terrible. He said it this way: That bill from the House is "mean." That was his exact quote, that it is "mean." Then he used another phrase, which I won't repeat on the floor of the Senate, to say just how absolutely awful that bill is.

Today in committee, I asked the Secretary of Health, Tom Price: Do you share, as Secretary of Health, the President's opinion that his own bill, his own TrumpCare bill passed out of the House, is an absolutely terrible bill, a mean bill?

He didn't want to answer the question. Certainly, I found that curious, that the Secretary of Health will not tell us whether he shares the President's opinion.

Then I asked him: Why did the President call it a mean bill? Is it because it throws 20 million people out of healthcare?

The Secretary didn't want to answer.

Did the President say it was a mean bill because it eliminates the guarantee of essential health benefits so that an insurance policy is, in fact, insuring you when you get sick rather than perhaps not even being worth the paper it is printed on?

There were a lot of healthcare insurance policies before we had an essential care package, essential benefits package. You paid the insurance company, but when you got sick, they didn't cover anything. Those policies weren't worth the paper they were printed on.

So I asked the Secretary of Health: Is that the reason the President said this is a mean process or a mean bill? Is that the reason he described this bill in terms that I won't repeat on the floor?

The Secretary of Health wasn't interested in relaying or giving insights into why the President said it was a mean bill.

I asked: Is it because the bill destroys the guarantee that if you have preexisting conditions, you can still get a policy at the same price as everyone else?

Again, there was no answer.

I said: Or is it a mean bill because if you are an older American, you have to pay perhaps up to eight times more for the same policy as you pay under current law?

You know, an individual who is 64 years old, a man who is earning \$26,500 a year, currently that individual would pay about \$140 a month for a policy under current law. The same policy under TrumpCare would cost \$1,200 a month. Is there anyone in this Senate Chamber who thinks an individual earning \$26,500 a year can afford a healthcare policy that costs \$1,200 a month?

Let me translate this. If you are earning \$26,000 a year, you are earning a little over \$2,000 a month. Is there anyone in this Chamber who believes—please come to the floor and tell us if you do—that individual can buy a healthcare policy costing \$1,200 a month? Is there anyone who thinks it is an egregious mistake to use high pricing to force older Americans out of our healthcare system? I believe in treating our citizens of all ages graciously, not forcing them out of healthcare through an eightfold increase in their premiums. Is that the reason the President said that this healthcare bill, this TrumpCare bill from the House, is a mean bill and spoke of it in derogatory terms?

The TrumpCare bill isn't even popular in the President's own party. Just 48 percent of Republicans surveyed in the same poll supported President Trump and Speaker RYAN's healthcare plan. But when asked if they like the current healthcare plan, 55 percent said they do.

Right now, regular order, the regular legislative, deliberative process that makes sure there is a full debate before a significant bill comes to a vote, that makes sure there is significant and substantial time for the citizens of America to weigh in, that regular order or regular process is being run over by a steamroller. It is being crushed. It is being demolished. Why would my colleagues support destroying the fundamental principles of legislative debate? I would love to hear the answer. Perhaps it is because, like President Trump said, the bill is mean. Perhaps it is because it is extremely unpopular with the American people, who believe there should be affordable, quality healthcare available to every single American.

We have heard that the secret 13 have a plan to sweeten the bill, a little spoonful of sugar to make the medicine go down. What is that plan? Well, we are hearing that maybe they will put

in extra funds to help take on the opioid addiction epidemic. That is a good thing. Why have they fought so hard against supporting such programs to help Americans on this crucial question?

We have heard they want to slow down the process of throwing people off healthcare so it will not hurt them in the 2018 elections and maybe not even hurt them so much in the 2020 elections. But if you are destroying something piece by piece, you are still destroying it. If you are cooking a lobster and you turn up the heat fast or you turn up the heat slowly, you still kill the lobster. And this bill is still going to kill healthcare for millions of Americans. Doing it more slowly doesn't make it a good thing. Putting in a spoonful of sugar doesn't make a diabolical act better.

Franklin Roosevelt once said:

Let us never forget that government is ourselves.

And he continued:

The ultimate rulers of our democracy are not a President and Senators and Congressmen and Government officials but the voters of this country.

And isn't that what "we the people" means—government of, by, and for the people? But nowhere in the Republican secret 13 process can the voices of the people of the United States be heard. How about if one of the 13 comes to the floor now and distributes the bill? I mean we should have weeks to consider this. We should have maybe a month to consider it. We had a whole year of process in 2009.

Wouldn't that be the right thing to do, to clue in folks about what is in this bill so we can get the stakeholders engaged and the citizens engaged and hold those townhalls and get that feedback? Wouldn't that be the right thing to do?

Well, unfortunately, we are still waiting. We are still paused, saying: Please, bring the bill to the floor. Distribute it. Maybe it is not your final draft, but that is OK.

We had draft after draft after draft of the healthcare bill in 2009. We had, in the Senate Finance Committee, 53 hearings on healthcare reform. They spent 8 days marking up their version of the ACA—the committee's longest markup in 22 years. During those 8 days, 135 amendments were considered—amendments from both Republicans and Democrats. Then, there was the HELP Committee, which I served on, and it held 47 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs. There were 300 amendments during a month-long markup—one of the longest in the history of Congress. More than 100 Republican amendments, minority amendments, were accepted into the committee's version of healthcare reform.

Right here in this Chamber, we spent 25 days considering the bill before we voted—25 days considering a lot of floor amendments, a lot of floor time. Is there a single member of the major-

ity party who will commit to having at least 25 days of debate on the floor of the Senate so we can get a full vetting of the issues, so we can get full input by the citizens of the United States of America?

Well, I am concerned that we are not on the path that values the construction of our government, our constitutional "we the people" government. I am concerned and afraid we are on a path where powerful special interests meeting secretly with 13 Members of the Senate are crafting a bill that is great for the powerful and the privileged but in fact is terrible for Americans, and that is why they are so afraid to show us the bill.

So this is unacceptable, and we need the citizens of America to pay attention because why is this happening right now? Well, because the fact that this secret process is going on, it can be camouflaged by all the conversation about Russiagate—how much did the Russians interfere in our elections, and what about all those secret meetings by members of the campaign team, were they coordinating or collaborating? We don't know the answer, but that question is central to whether there was treasonous conduct undermining the integrity of our elections.

So let's do this now, the secret healthcare plan, with no debate while America is trying to fight for the fairness and integrity of our elections. Let's do it now when schools are out of session and we are in summer and people are on vacation. Let's sneak it through now, this act that strips healthcare for millions of Americans.

Here is the principle we should come back to: No hearing; no vote. No hearing; no vote. No vote on a piece of legislation that affects the lives of millions of American families if we haven't had due deliberation by the key committees. No vote on a bill that destroys healthcare for millions of families if we haven't had the chance to consult with the experts in healthcare—the nurses, doctors, hospitals, and clinics.

No hearing; no vote. No vote if we haven't had a full chance for the citizens of America to weigh in, to see the full details, and say what they like and what they don't like and share that with their respective Senators. On an issue of this magnitude, one that will affect the peace of mind and the health of millions of Americans, we need a full, thorough legislative process.

The choices that are made in this Chamber over the next few weeks will have a big impact on the quality of life of millions of American citizens. A provision that eliminates Medicaid expansion, the Oregon health plan expansion in my State, whether it is implemented slowly or implemented fast is going to rip healthcare from 400,000 Oregonians. That is enough Oregonians that if they were holding hands, they would stretch from the Pacific Ocean to Idaho, 400 miles across the State. That is a profound impact.

In addition, those folks who are going to the clinics and hospitals who don't have healthcare, they will not be able to pay for it. So the finances of the clinics and the hospitals will be dramatically hurt. I asked Secretary Price today: Is that the reason the President said the TrumpCare bill out of the House is a mean bill? Is that the reason he used a derogatory phrase to attack the TrumpCare bill out of the House? Is it because of the fact it will undermine the finances of the clinics and the hospitals.

He said: You know, I don't accept the premise that will happen.

Well, covering your eyes and covering your ears and pretending, on such an important issue, is not a responsible act by a Secretary of Health. The clinics have been coming to us and saying this is how our finances improved when our citizens were able to pay for the services because our rate of uncompensated care dropped dramatically and, with that income, we hired a lot more people.

I have a clinic in the northeast corner of our State where the number of people employed, they told me, doubled from 20-something to 50-something. They are able to provide a lot more healthcare in that local, rural community, and that is true in clinic after clinic.

If one would take their hands off their ears or off from in front of their eyes and listen to the presidents or the executive directors of rural hospitals, they would hear them say: This will really hurt us. This will hurt, not just our ability to provide care to those who will not have insurance, it will hurt our finances. It will diminish our care for everyone in this rural community. Everyone will be hurt by TrumpCare.

Is that what the President meant when he said this bill is mean? Well, if that is what he meant, if what he meant is it is mean because it rips healthcare from 20 million Americans, then I agree with the President. If when the President criticizes the TrumpCare bill as being mean, if he meant that because it was going to destroy the guarantee of access by folks with preexisting conditions, then I agree with him. If he said it because it will destroy essential benefits and allow there to be insurance policies that aren't worth the paper they are written on, then I agree with the President.

If it does, it is going to greatly increase the cost of insurance for older Americans, up to eightfold times. If that is why the President said it is mean, I agree with the President.

The President should weigh in and say: No secret process on a bill so important to the healthcare of millions of Americans. President Trump should weigh in and say: I don't want a bill that looks anything like that House bill because it is defective in this area, in this area, and in this area, hurting everybody in the communities, undermining the clinics, undermining the

hospitals, destroying insurance, destroying the opportunity of access for preexisting conditions, and ripping away the guarantee that essential benefits will be covered. That is what the President should do.

He thinks the bill is terrible because he finally looked at it. Well, he is going to think the bill crafted by the secret 13 is terrible too. He has a chance to stand up and fight for the American people and say: I will never sign a bill that goes through a secret process that excluded the insights from our rural hospitals, insights from our rural clinics, insights from our nurses, and insights from our doctors. I will never sign a bill in the Oval Office that excluded the American people from being allowed to weigh in on the conversation. I will never sign a major bill that hurts so many people in my Oval Office if it never had a committee hearing and never had amendments, never had a chance to go through the legislative process the way envisioned in our “we the people” Constitution. That would be the right thing for President Trump to do.

He has recognized the bill is profoundly flawed. He has a chance to—not only a flawed bill but a profoundly, unacceptable process in our constitutional democratic Republic.

Former Chief Justice Hughes said: We are here not as masters but as servants, not to glory in power, but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by the people of the United States in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority.

Each one of us is here for a short period of time, but we take our constitutional roles as Senators from the foundation of the power of the American people, the “we the people” Constitution. To exclude them from the process is to violate the very premise on which our Nation is founded.

So we have to stop this process. We have to stop it in its tracks. Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, whether you come from a rural State or a highly populated State, it is a responsibility to stop this process, return to regular legislative deliberation so that we can, in fact, have a “we the people” conversation, fully honoring the experts and the feedback from ordinary citizens across our Nation.

No hearing, no legislative deliberation, no vote. No hearing; no vote.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, once again, we have more bad news about ObamaCare. Last week, Anthem announced it will pull out of Ohio's health insurance exchange for 2018. That means that a minimum of 18 Ohio counties will be without an exchange insurer next year. Twenty-five Missouri counties are in the same boat, and more Americans are likely to find themselves in the same situation.

On June 2, the Omaha World-Herald announced that 100,000 Nebraskans could end up with zero options for individual coverage in 2018. Insurers have been pulling out of the exchanges right and left.

In February, Humana announced its decision to completely pull out of the exchanges for 2018. Three months later, Aetna, which had already sharply reduced its exchange participation in 2017, also confirmed it would pull out completely in 2018.

In 2016, 7 percent of U.S. counties had just one choice of insurer on their healthcare exchange. In 2017, this year, roughly one-third of U.S. counties have just one choice of insurer. Based upon the information available so far, the New York Times is currently estimating that about 45 percent of U.S. counties will have one or no insurer next year.

One thing is for sure, Mr. President, Americans are facing fewer and fewer health insurance choices, and the prices of those choices are going up.

Proposed rates, proposed rate increases for 2018 are emerging, and once again they are not looking good. Some of the average rate hikes facing Americans around the country include 17.2 percent, 33.8 percent, 30 percent, 45 percent, 38 percent, 58.8 percent.

Three weeks ago, the Department of Health and Human Services released a report comparing the average individual market insurance premium in 2013, which is the year that most of ObamaCare's regulations and mandates were implemented, with the average individual market exchange premium in 2017 in the 39 States that use healthcare.gov. What they found is that between 2013 and 2017, the average individual market monthly premium in the healthcare.gov States increased by 105 percent—105 percent.

In other words, on average, individual market premiums more than doubled in just 5 years. That is from HHS in their report that just came out in the last couple of weeks. Three States saw their premiums triple over the same period—triple in just 5 years.

I don't know too many families who can afford to have their premiums triple over 5 years. What we know is that the ObamaCare status quo is unacceptable, and it is unsustainable.

More than one insurance CEO has suggested that ObamaCare is in a death spiral, and it is pretty hard to disagree. Combine soaring premiums with a steady insurer exodus, and sooner or later we get a partial or complete exchange collapse, which is what we are facing today, not to mention all the other ObamaCare problems, such as the deductibles that are so high that sometimes people can't actually afford to use their healthcare plans or narrow plan networks with few provider choices. We have higher premiums, higher deductibles, higher costs, fewer options, fewer choices.

Republicans are currently working on legislation to help Americans strug-

gling under ObamaCare. My colleagues in the House made a good start, and in the Senate we are working to build on the bill they passed.

We are committed to helping Americans trapped on the ObamaCare exchanges. We are committed to addressing ObamaCare's skyrocketing premium increases. We are committed to preserving access to care for Americans with preexisting conditions, and we are committed to making Medicaid more sustainable by giving States greater flexibility while ensuring those who rely on this program don't have the rug pulled out from under them. We need to make healthcare more affordable, more personal, more flexible, and less bureaucratic.

My colleague from Oregon was just talking about the complaints they have about the healthcare process, the discussions that are going on, and how much pain, if this passes, it is going to cause the American people. I can tell you one thing: Today, it is pretty darn painful for families I have talked to in my State of South Dakota, hard-working farm and ranch families who are having to pay \$2,000 a month, \$24,000 a year for insurance coverage—in some cases with \$5,000 deductibles, assuming they can even afford to use that expensive policy by being able to cover the deductible. There are people across this country who are hurting because of this failed healthcare insurance program. It is high time for us to fix it.

I believe the American people want to see Congress act in a way that will make healthcare insurance more affordable to them, more personal, so that they will have more choices, greater options, and more competition that will help bring those premiums down to a more reasonable level. They need to have more than one choice. When 45 percent of the counties in America have one choice or no options on the exchanges, that is an unacceptable situation and one that we have to fix.

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES BILL

Mr. President, I also want to take a few minutes today to discuss the national security bill the Senate just passed, the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act.

I hardly need to recite the long list of Iranian activities that make this country a clear and present danger to peace and stability in the Middle East and outside it. Iran remains the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. It engages in systematic human rights abuses from torture to the targeting of religious minorities. Of course, Iran has long provided critical support to Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, who is perhaps most notable for the repeated use of chemical weapons on his own people. The fact that Assad still remains in power after the long list of atrocities his regime has committed is due in no small part to the support that Iran has provided.

In addition to propping up Assad's reign of terror, Iran also provides support to the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Secretary of Defense James Mattis recently noted: "We see Iranian-supplied missiles being fired by the Houthis into Saudi Arabia."

Well, providing these missiles puts Iran in violation of at least two U.N. Security Council resolutions—not that Iran appears to care. In fact, violating U.N. Security Council resolutions and international law is common practice for the Iranian Government, whether it involves supplying missiles to the Houthis or increasing Iran's own stockpiles.

When it is not violating the letter of the law, Iran is also happy to violate the spirit of international agreements. After the misguided Iran deal went into effect, Iran resumed ballistic missile testing, even though the U.N. Security Council resolution endorsing the nuclear deal called upon Iran not to engage in these activities.

Most recently, Iran unsuccessfully tested a submarine missile in the Strait of Hormuz in May, following ground-based missile testing in January and March. Many of those missiles have a range to reach targets, not only throughout the Middle East but outside it.

Under the last administration, Iranian belligerence was too often ignored or even rewarded. That needs to end now. We cannot afford to let Iran continue to destabilize the Middle East. We need to make it clear that the United States and its new leadership will not tolerate Iranian aggression and the terrible human suffering that has resulted.

We need to assure our allies—especially Israel, our closest and most reliable ally in the Middle East—that we are committed to standing with them against Iranian threats. The Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act will send a clear signal to Iran that the United States and its new leadership are serious about cracking down on Iranian misconduct.

This bill will sanction individuals involved in Iran's ballistic missile program or any other program designed to deliver weapons of mass destruction. It will sanction individuals who contribute to Iranian violations of arms embargoes. It will allow the President to impose sanctions on individuals who have perpetrated human rights violations against human rights crusaders in Iran. Perhaps most importantly, this legislation identifies and will hold accountable the entire Iranian Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, not just the Quds Force, for its role in implementing Iran's destabilizing agenda.

There is no easy solution to the unrest and violence in the Middle East, but this bill offers one commonsense step forward.

Yesterday the Senate passed an amendment to this bill imposing additional sanctions against another country stirring up unrest in the Middle

East, and that is Russia. Russia's increasing boldness on the international stage is a natural consequence of the Obama administration's passive foreign policy. From annexing Crimea to supporting the murderous Assad regime in Syria, to meddling in elections, we cannot allow this level of Russian aggression to go unchallenged.

The Russia sanctions amendment codifies and strengthens existing Russia sanctions and imposes a number of new ones. Human rights abusers, individuals supplying weapons to Assad's regime, hackers acting on behalf of the Russian Government, and Russians involved in corruption are all sanctioned in this amendment.

I am grateful to Senators CORKER and CRAPO, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Banking Committee, for all the work they have done on this bill and on the Russia sanctions amendment. It was a bipartisan bill. Our colleagues on the other side, the Senator from Maryland and others, were involved in crafting this legislation, and it is a demonstration that this body can come together and do consequential things. These are two big national security and foreign policy measures that we have moved today.

There have to be consequences for Iranian and Russian aggression, and this legislation makes sure there will be. I am pleased that it moved today with largely bipartisan support in the U.S. Senate because it will send a clear message.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

MINORITY HEALTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, April was National Minority Health Month. I point that out because I have worked with many of my colleagues in order to advance minority health.

We have done some very important things in recent years that I am very proud of, and many of those are included in the Affordable Care Act. I know that Senator CARPER and Senator BLUMENTHAL will be on the floor; Senator CARPER is here now. They have been instrumental in advancing quality healthcare for all Americans, but we do recognize that we have a special role in regard to historic discrimination on minority health. I was pleased that the Affordable Care Act included the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities so that we could have a focal point at NIH to deal with the historic problems and have a game plan to advance that.

I was also pleased that the Affordable Care Act provided coverage for minorities in greater numbers because when we looked at the number of uninsured, the number of minorities were a much higher percentage than the general population of uninsured. When we looked at inadequate coverage, we saw the same numbers. So we have made advancements.

In April, historically, I had filed a resolution in order to acknowledge the

progress we made and to continue our commitment to make sure that all Americans have access to affordable, quality healthcare and that we do not discriminate. That resolution had always cleared without any difficulty until 2017. For reasons I cannot explain, there were Republican objections, and we were not able to adopt the resolution commemorating minority health month.

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

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

Promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2017, which include bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.

Whereas the origin of National Minority Health Month is National Negro Health Week, established in 1915 by Dr. Booker T. Washington;

Whereas the theme for National Minority Health Month in 2017 is "Bridging Health Equity Across Communities";

Whereas, through the National Stakeholder Strategy for Achieving Health Equity and the HHS Action Plan to Reduce Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities, the Department of Health and Human Services has set goals and strategies to advance the safety, health, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas a study by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, entitled "The Economic Burden of Health Inequalities in the United States", concludes that, between 2003 and 2006, the combined cost of health inequalities and premature death in the United States was \$1,240,000,000,000;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has identified 6 main categories in which racial and ethnic minorities experience the most disparate access to health care and health outcomes, including infant mortality, cancer screening and management, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, and immunizations;

Whereas, in 2012, African American women were as likely to have been diagnosed with breast cancer as non-Latina White women, but African American women were almost 40 percent more likely to die from breast cancer than non-Latina White women;

Whereas African American women are twice as likely to lose their lives to cervical cancer as non-Latina White women;

Whereas African American men are 60 percent more likely to die from a stroke than non-Latino White men;

Whereas Latinos are 1.7 times more likely to be diagnosed with diabetes by a physician, and are 40 percent more likely to die of diabetes, than non-Latino Whites;

Whereas Latino men are 3 times more likely to have HIV infections or AIDS than non-Latino White men;

Whereas Latina women are 4 times more likely to have AIDS than non-Latina White women;

Whereas, in 2014, although African Americans represented only 13 percent of the population of the United States, African Americans accounted for 43 percent of HIV infections;

Whereas, in 2010, African American youth accounted for an estimated 57 percent, and

Latino youth accounted for an estimated 20 percent, of all new HIV infections among youth in the United States;

Whereas, between 2005 and 2014, the number of Asian Americans diagnosed with HIV increased by nearly 70 percent;

Whereas, in 2014, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders were 1.7 times more likely to be diagnosed with HIV than non-Latino whites;

Whereas Native Hawaiians living in the State of Hawaii are 5.7 times more likely to die of diabetes than non-Latino Whites living in Hawaii;

Whereas Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders are 30 percent more likely to be diagnosed with cancer than non-Latino whites;

Whereas, although the prevalence of obesity is high among all population groups in the United States, 42 percent of American Indian and Alaskan Natives, 41 percent of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, 40 percent of African Americans, 31 percent of Latinos, 24 percent of non-Latino whites, and 11 percent of Asian Americans are obese;

Whereas, in 2013, Asian Americans were 1.2 times more likely than non-Latino Whites to contract Hepatitis A;

Whereas, among all ethnic groups in 2013, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders had the highest incidence of Hepatitis A;

Whereas Asian American women are 1.3 times more likely than non-Latina Whites to die from viral hepatitis;

Whereas Asian Americans are 3 times more likely than non-Latino Whites to develop chronic Hepatitis B;

Whereas of the children living with diagnosed perinatal HIV in 2014, 65 percent were African American, 15 percent were Latino Americans, and 11 percent were non-Latino whites;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has identified heart disease, stroke, cancer, and diabetes as some of the leading causes of death among American Indians and Alaskan Natives;

Whereas American Indians and Alaskan Natives die from diabetes, alcoholism, unintentional injuries, homicide, and suicide at higher rates than other people in the United States;

Whereas American Indians and Alaskan Natives have a life expectancy that is 4.4 years shorter than the life expectancy of the overall population of the United States;

Whereas African American babies are 3.5 times more likely than non-Latino White babies to die due to complications related to low birth weight;

Whereas American Indian and Alaskan Native babies are twice as likely as non-Latino White babies to die from sudden infant death syndrome;

Whereas American Indian and Alaskan Natives have 1.5 times the infant mortality rate as that of non-Latino whites;

Whereas American Indian and Alaskan Native babies are 70 percent more likely to die from accidental deaths before their first birthday than non-Latino White babies;

Whereas only 5 percent of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, 6 percent of Asian Americans, 8 percent of Latinos, 9 percent of African Americans, and 14 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives received mental health treatment or counseling in the past year, compared to 18 percent of non-Latino whites;

Whereas marked differences in the social determinants of health, described by the World Health Organization as “the high burden of illness responsible for appalling premature loss of life” that “arises in large part because of the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age”, lead to poor health outcomes and declines in longevity;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 119)—

(1) has reduced the uninsured rate for minority communities by at least 35 percent;

(2) has helped further combat health disparities for low-income individuals through coverage expansions in the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and the individual health insurance marketplaces; and

(3) provides specific protections and rights for American Indians and Alaskan Natives, 21.4 percent of whom lack health insurance;

Whereas, despite the substantial improvements in health insurance coverage among women overall, women of color are more likely to be uninsured;

Whereas, in 2012, 36 percent of Latina women, 29 percent of American Indian women, 23 percent of African American women, 19 percent of Asian and Pacific Islander women, and 14 percent of non-Latina White women were uninsured;

Whereas community-based health care initiatives, such as prevention-focused programs, present a unique opportunity to use innovative approaches to improve health practices across the United States and to sharply reduce disparities among racial and ethnic minority populations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2017, which include bringing attention to the severe health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank Senators Menendez, Blumenthal, Brown, Hirono, Markey, Klobuchar, Van Hollen, Booker, Peters, Duckworth, and Carper for their help in regard to minority health and the resolution.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

So we couldn't do that, which is a pretty easy thing to do, but now the Republicans are looking to bring out in the next 2 weeks a rewriting of our entire healthcare law, one-sixth of our economy, and they are talking about bringing this out for perhaps passage in the U.S. Senate during the next 2 weeks.

I don't know of anyone who has seen a copy of this bill. I certainly have not seen it, and I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee. Senator CARPER is a member of the Senate Finance Committee. We have not seen a copy of the bill, even though we are the committee of jurisdiction, along with the HELP Committee. I certainly want to be able to look at this bill, make sure that there are public hearings and an opportunity for input from all Members of the U.S. Senate—first those who serve on the relevant committees through the committee markups and then on the floor of the U.S. Senate. But what I understand from the majority leader is that may not be the case. That would be an affront to our Democratic institution. That would be insulting the Members of the Senate and the committee that I serve on, the Senate Finance Committee.

I need to mention that because we do know what the House of Representa-

tives sent over to us. We don't know if that is going to be the bill that is going to be brought out, but there hasn't been any hearing on the bill that the House of Representatives sent over to us.

Compare that to the passage of the Affordable Care Act. We had numerous, dozens of hearings on the Affordable Care Act. We had months of negotiations on the Affordable Care Act back and forth—bipartisan negotiations. We had committee markups in two of our committees, and hundreds of amendments were considered. Many Republican-sponsored amendments were adopted on the Affordable Care Act. We went through a regular legislative process.

Yet the Republican leadership is telling us that we are going to totally change the Affordable Care Act, totally change the healthcare system, and not offer the American people an opportunity to see what we are doing—or their elected Representatives to be able to offer comments or amendments to that? That is outrageous. That is not a democratic institution. We need to speak out about it.

Now we are all vulnerable to that, all Americans. I have thought about the people in my State, the 400,000 who have coverage under the Affordable Care Act, who didn't have coverage prior to the Affordable Care Act. They are very much at risk because, according to the Congressional Budget Office, if we have on the floor of the Senate anything similar to what the House passed, most of those 400,000 are going to lose their insurance coverage. What are they going to do?

Then we are talking about putting a cap on Medicaid. Well, have you talked to the Governor of your State? Have you talked to your State legislature as to how they are doing with their budgets? Do you really believe the States can pick up what we cut? The answer is obviously no.

We offered an expansion of Medicaid so more working families, more veterans, more people who are vulnerable could get coverage. That is gone under the caps that the Republicans are talking about, putting our most vulnerable at risk.

I started talking about minority health. Let me just underscore that with Medicaid. In my State and in every State, when you look at the percentage of people who are covered under Medicaid, it is much higher for the minority community because they historically have been discriminated against. They do not have the coverage going into the Affordable Care Act. That is going to affect our most vulnerable. It is also interesting to note that a higher percentage of veterans is under the Medicaid system. That will affect our veterans. Of course, our seniors depend upon Medicaid for longer long-term care. They are going to be adversely affected by these caps under the Medicaid Program.

Then we have the impact on all of us who have insurance and may be able to

keep our insurance after this type of legislation. We are going to be adversely affected. Why? Because who do you think pays for those who do not have health insurance? You get cost shifting, and it is done in a more costly, expensive way so our healthcare costs go up. Those of us who have insurance pay more, and those who do not have insurance do not get the early interventions they need in order to stay healthy.

The vulnerabilities continue because one of the things that was affected by the House-passed bill was what we call the essential health benefits. What we did is require that those benefits be provided under all healthcare plans, including Medicaid.

So, yes, I could talk about obstetrics for women, which would be covered under all plans, and that women who need obstetrics would not have to pay a much higher premium as they would be in a high-risk pool. Because of the way the insurance would be done, only women who would need that would get into the plan, and it would cost a lot more. Yes, that discriminates against women.

Again, I could also talk about minority communities that now have coverage for mental health and addiction because that is required under the Affordable Care Act. When it becomes discretionary with the States and they get into tight budget problems, they will lose that coverage.

We are all talking about the explosion of opioid addiction in our communities. In Maryland, I think the rate now is 60 percent higher this year than last year of overdose deaths. Do we really want to cut one of the major tools we have in trying to get this epidemic under control? That is what we are talking about in regard to what the House-passed bill does.

At a minimum, we need to have public hearings to know what we are doing. This is a democratic institution. Under the Affordable Care Act, we had dozens of hearings. The committees of jurisdiction need to work on this bill. They need to be able to mark it up. They need to be able to offer amendments, which was afforded to every Senator in this body under the Affordable Care Act. Many of our colleagues who voted against the Affordable Care Act have amendments that were included in the Affordable Care Act. That is how a democracy works.

Everyone is affected by this process but particularly the vulnerable, particularly those who are uninsured and those who will become uninsured. Those who have insurance and who have very few other options are going to find their benefits reduced. Minorities, our disabled population, older Americans, and women all will be discriminated against.

At a time at which we want to focus on the progress that we have made to narrow the gap in minority health and health disparities, it would just be a tragedy to move in the wrong way, to

reverse the progress we have made, and to do that without an appropriate process of transparency, which has been the hallmark of American democracy.

I urge my colleagues in that there is still time. If you have proposals, work with us—all 100 Senators. I, certainly, have worked with my Republican colleagues on many healthcare issues that are now the law of this land.

We offer to work with you. All we say is don't tell us that you are going to do this by repealing a bill and then come to us to try to fix it. Work with us to improve our healthcare system, and we will work with you. There is still time. Let's work together. Let's have public hearings. Let's get public input. Let's use the old-fashioned process of allowing us to offer amendments. Let's debate those amendments. The end result will not only be better legislation for the American people but legislation that we know will stand the test of time and give predictability to the healthcare stakeholders in our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, my neighbor from Maryland, for inviting a number of us to come to the floor today, this afternoon, to talk a bit about the Affordable Care Act. I am really honored to stand next to him here as we do sit next to each other on the Finance Committee and on the Environment and Public Works Committee. He is a great leader on both of those committees.

SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. President, Senator CARDIN and I were on the floor earlier today, along with the Presiding Officer, and we voted on legislation that attempts to send a message to Iran.

By the way, it just had elections, gosh, not even a month ago, whereby the reformist President Rouhani was reelected by a big margin. Reformist-moderates were elected as the mayor of Tehran and in other municipalities across the country. There are a lot of young people in that country who want a better relationship with this country, and they actually had a chance to speak at the voting box. They elected a number of women to serve in positions of real responsibility, not just in their Parliament but as members, say, of Tehran's city council.

By the way, the Iranians are basically keeping their word with respect to the agreement between five nations, including the United States, China, Russia, Britain, France, and Germany. They are actually keeping their word with respect to complying with the nuclear agreement that was entered into, oh, gosh, 2 years ago. What they are doing and that we disagree with is they are testing ballistic missiles, and there is basically the U.N.'s strong message to Iran not to do that. "If you do, we will sanction you in different ways," but they have continued to test ballistic missiles. They say it is for defen-

sive purposes, but you cannot be sure so we strengthened those sanctions.

With those sanctions, we also included sanctions that basically say to Russia—and all 17 intelligence agencies say Russia intervened in our last election—no question. They intervened on behalf of one candidate, Mr. Trump. They wanted to elect him, and they wanted to make sure Hillary Clinton did not get elected. They succeeded. That is not just Democratic messaging. Every one of our 17 intelligence agencies has come to the same conclusion and has testified publicly to that effect.

As a result, this legislation was initially focused just on Iran, but it refocused and pivoted—maybe refocused even more—on Russia in order to sanction them for their misdeeds, which I think are, in many ways, more significant than what the Iranians have done and have been sanctioned for again.

Why do I go back to this legislation that we just debated and adopted here this morning?

Consistent with what Senator CARDIN has talked about—and he is very much an architect involved right in the middle of the effort to bring that legislation to the floor. It came out of his committee. He is the senior Democrat, the ranking member. BOB CORKER, of Tennessee, is the chair. A number of members—Democratic and Republican—on that committee worked together to fashion that legislation, to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor.

I say to my colleague Senator CARDIN that I didn't know what the final vote count was. It was 98 to 2. That is what we can accomplish when we work together, and I think it is a great message as we pivot and talk about the Affordable Care Act.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, when our friend from South Dakota, Senator THUNE—a great friend for, I think, all of us and admired by both sides—was talking about how deplorable ObamaCare was and how it is in a death spiral and so forth, I just wanted to stand up and ask him to yield to me so I can say that when Barack Obama and Joe Biden stepped down as President and Vice President of the United States, my recollection was that every county of every State in this country had access to healthcare through the health exchanges.

Where did the idea for health exchanges come from? It came from the Republicans in 1993, from the Heritage Foundation, the rightwing Republican think tank.

They came up with an idea that says: Let's create exchanges in every State, where people who don't have healthcare coverage can get their coverage through large purchasing pool. There would be one in every State. The legislation said: Let's have a sliding scale tax credit to make sure low-income families who do not have coverage can afford that coverage in the

exchanges. As their income goes up, the tax credit buys down the cost of coverage. The exchange goes down, and it eventually goes away.

The Republican legislation in 1993, fashioned by Heritage, said there was going to be an individual mandate. People would have to get coverage in this country. If they did not, they would have to pay a fine. One could not make people get coverage, but there would be a fine. There was the idea that employers of a certain size and with a certain number of employees would have to get coverage. We call that an employer mandate. Finally, the health insurance companies could not deny coverage to people in this country because of preexisting conditions.

Those are all concepts that were in the 1993 legislation that was introduced by Senator John Chafee and was cosponsored by, among others, Senator HATCH, of Utah, Senator GRASSLEY, of Iowa, who are now two of the most senior Republicans in the Senate, including being the two most senior Republicans on the Finance Committee on which Senator CARDIN and I are privileged to serve.

I said as recently as last week, when the Secretary of Health and Human Services was before our committee to defend the President's budget, that I applauded Senator HATCH and I applauded Senator GRASSLEY for cosponsoring that 1993 legislation, which became the foundation for healthcare coverage in Massachusetts, which is where they cover everybody. It is called RomneyCare. It was adopted when he was the Governor, and it was fashioned very much under the same foundation.

Senator CARDIN and I are on the Finance Committee, and when we were debating the Affordable Care Act, we literally took those Republican ideas from Heritage, from Senator Chafee, from the 23 Republican cosponsors for RomneyCare and sort of made them the foundation of ObamaCare. It is ironic just to hear my friend Senator THUNE talk today about the tale of horrors from the Affordable Care Act. Actually, the things my Republican friends are criticizing the most were their ideas from 24 years ago. Personally, I think they were pretty good ideas, and if they were given a fair chance, they could be very effective.

One of my Republican friends said the other day that when the Affordable Care Act was debated and voted on and so forth, the Republicans were pretty much shut out of the process. So it is too bad the Democrats are shut out of the process now as we revisit healthcare coverage with the terrible legislation that has come out of the House of Representatives. I think, if I am not mistaken—correct me if I am wrong, Senator CARDIN—they adopted it without a hearing. I think they adopted it on a straight party-line vote. I think they did it without any kind of score from the Congressional

Budget Office and just sent it over here.

While they were doing that, I will just go back in time, if I can, to the year of 2009, when we debated the Affordable Care Act here. We had two committees of jurisdiction. One was the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. That committee held no fewer than 14 bipartisan roundtables. A roundtable is very much like a hearing, but it is not quite as formally structured. It held 14 bipartisan roundtables, which were designed to try to build a consensus around the Affordable Care Act, or healthcare coverage, in this country. Again, this was in 2009.

In 2009, the same committee—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, the HELP Committee—held 13 bipartisan hearings. So there were 14 bipartisan roundtables and 13 bipartisan hearings in all during the actual time they were debating on and voting on the legislation itself. During the HELP Committee's debate and in actually marking up the bill, some 300 amendments were considered that were offered by Democrats and Republicans. More than half of those were accepted. Of the more than half of those 300 accepted—we turned down 160 or so—160 of them happened to be offered by Republicans. Think about that. There were 14 bipartisan roundtables and 13 bipartisan hearings. There were 300 amendments offered, and over half of those were Republican amendments. Over half of those 300 were actually adopted, and 160 in all were Republican amendments. That does not sound like they were shut out on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

On the Finance Committee, on which Senator CARDIN and I serve, we had 17 roundtables and hearings. We held 13 member meetings, 38 negotiation meetings, and a 7-day-long actual business meeting and markup in public, during which we offered amendments and voted on amendments. I think, roughly, a dozen Republican amendments were offered and accepted.

I have a friend who, when you ask him how he is doing, always answers: "Compared to what?"

I would say, as to the process right now that we are looking at with the Republicans' belated response, if you will, to the Affordable Care Act that came out of the House and is now being negotiated in private—not debated but negotiated and some would say in secret. It is hard to keep a secret around here, but it is certainly in private. To my knowledge, there are no bipartisan roundtables and no bipartisan hearings. To my knowledge, there will not be an opportunity for markups or business meetings at which hundreds of amendments could be offered and debated and voted on—none of that. And it will use a process called reconciliation, where they will bring whatever they come up with in these closed meetings, and we have a chance to vote on it up or down.

The House never had it scored. The Congressional Budget Office never had a chance to say: This is how many people will lose coverage. This is what it is going to cost if people don't get help through Medicaid. This is what is going to happen to folks losing their coverage altogether.

They never did that in the House. I don't know if we will see that in the Senate either.

(Mr. CASSIDY assumed the Chair.)

There is a right way and a wrong way to do this stuff. Our Republican friends will probably never agree that we were trying to do it the right way in 2009. What we came up with was the Affordable Care Act at the end of the day, and I would be the first to say it is not perfect. There are things I would like to change. I am sure Senator CARDIN feels that way. I am sure the Presiding Officer who is with us today knows a lot about healthcare. He probably would be willing to change a number of things. For years, I have said: Why don't we just figure out as one, as a bipartisan group—as we were today on the sanctions legislation for Russia and Iran—why don't we try working together on this stuff? And we are sort of waiting to see if we might have a taker.

The Presiding Officer has been very good about reaching out, and I applaud him for that. I think he and I will be in a forum together maybe next week to talk about some of this stuff in public, but I applaud his efforts to reach out and see if we can't foster a better way forward.

Let me close with this: Some of you know I spent some of my years of life in uniform. For a while, I was a civil air patrol cadet growing up in Virginia. I wanted to go to the Air Force Academy, but I just didn't know how to apply. I applied too late and missed it. I learned about the Navy ROTC and applied for a scholarship, was fortunate enough to win it, and went to Ohio State. I became a midshipman and 4 years later a naval flight officer and then off to Pensacola. I spent 5 years in Active Duty in Southeast Asia and after that in the Cold War as a P-3 Navy aircraft commander. I loved the Navy. I feel privileged that it helped me go to undergraduate school and, after Active Duty, to move to Delaware and get an MBA thanks to the GI Bill. I was privileged to be elected Governor and serve as the commander in chief of the Delaware National Guard for 8 years beyond that. Over half of my life has been involved in the military.

A lot of times when I was younger, I would think about who is helped in healthcare under Medicaid. I used to think that folks who are helped the most by Medicaid are women, poor women, and their children. As it turns out, today, especially as the baby boomers get older, more and more of them are being covered by Medicaid. They receive their coverage because they spend down their assets. A lot of them have dementia and have other

disabilities, and they end up in nursing homes. More than half of the money we are spending on Medicaid these days is on those folks. A lot of them are part of my generation and older—our parents, uncles, and aunts.

As it turns out, unbeknownst to me, about 2 million of the roughly 23 million veterans we have in this country—22 million veterans we have in this country are served by Medicaid.

The day I showed up at Ohio State to be a Navy ROTC midshipman, we had only White males in our ROTC. It turned out that is what they had in the Army ROTC and in the Air Force ROTC at Ohio State. When I got to my squadron on Active Duty—in the many years I was in my Active Duty squadron, I think we had just two or three African-American officers. I don't remember ever having an Asian-American officer. There were no women who were officers or even among our enlisted personnel. That has all changed now. The face of our military officer corps and enlisted corps looks a whole lot more like America today than it used to.

As it turns out, the folks who are veterans in this country—those 22 million people—look a whole lot more like America today than maybe was the case a number of years ago. They are Caucasian, they are African American, they are Latino, they are Asian American—all of the above. A number of those 22 million veterans who are depending on Medicaid are minorities. They are going to be adversely affected if we are not careful of what we do in the House or if we in the Senate replicate something like that or similar to that and ultimately in a conference try to represent a compromise between what we do in the Senate and what they have done in the House.

I will close with this: This story can end badly, or it can end in a better way. We have just gotten a good example of how to do it right with the legislation we just passed earlier today, the sanctions against Russia and Iran. My hope is that we will use that as a template to come back and make changes to the Affordable Care Act and that we will do it in a way that fixes what needs to be fixed and preserves what needs to be preserved.

I thank my friend from Maryland for his leadership on this and God knows how many other issues.

If I could have one more moment to say that Senator Kaine and I have offered legislation that I think has probably been shared with the Presiding Officer's office that seeks to help stabilize the exchanges and the ability of the health insurance companies to have some additional predictability and certainty through reinsurance. My hope is that we will have a chance to share what we have offered and maybe see if that is something the Presiding Officer would be interested in joining us in supporting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

THE DEBT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a train wreck that is coming to our country right before our very eyes.

Yesterday, the Federal Reserve, for the fourth time in the last year and a half, increased the Federal discount rate by one-quarter point—one-quarter point. That is a rounding error in most people's imaginations; yet, I think it is a very impactful number. That is the fourth increase in the last year and a half that amounts to 100 basis points or a 1 full percentage point increase in the discount rate. With a \$20 trillion debt, that equates to about \$200 billion of new interest that we will be required to pay out of the revenue we get off the backs of working men and women in America.

I have frequently come to this floor to speak about the \$20 trillion debt, but, as we see what is happening now, we see the reality of what has been predicted over the last few years; that is, as we start talking about growth in the economy, we see a demand for capital and interest rates rising. We also see the Federal Reserve talking about adjusting their balance sheet—some \$4.5 trillion on their balance sheet, the largest balance sheet they have had in history—they are now talking about unwinding that.

So these are dramatic impacts on what we are talking about right now; that is, how we fund what we are going to be doing not only in healthcare but also our military, as well as the domestic programs we are here to talk about.

What is even more disturbing about the debt we are talking about and the increases in interest is the structure of that debt. Over the last 8 years, the prior administration decided strategically to keep our bond portfolio that supports this debt, the bonds we issue that pay for this debt—the average duration, the length of those bonds, is under 3 years. Some 60 percent, almost, of all the government debt we have in the United States today matures in 3 years or less. That means these increases we are talking about are going to roll on us and the backs of the American taxpayer almost immediately. This is not something that is going to happen in 10 or 15 years; it is right here on us.

Let me put that in perspective. Most every other country in the world that has significant debt—and there are a lot of them; not to the percentage that we do—have already dealt with this duration problem. The UK, for example, over the last 8 years, instead of going short when interest rates were virtually zero, they went long. Forty-eight percent of the United Kingdom's debt is 20 years or longer in maturity. Again, 60 percent of our debt, because of the last administration's strategic decision to stay short—borrow short and spend long—that is a prescription for failure, in business and in government.

Sixty percent of our debt matures in less than 3 years. That is a formula for

absolute disaster, and that is what I am talking about.

But even more important than the debt and the duration and the way these interest rate increases are going to impact us almost readily is the fact that we have about 43 days—I came to the floor last week and reported that we had 50 days left, and today we have 43 working days left in this fiscal year before September 30. That means we have to fund the Federal Government for fiscal year 2018 by the end of September. In the last 43 years, this body—Congress—has only done that four times in regular order; according to the 1974 Budget Act, only four times.

What is worse than that is that in the 43 days that we have, from an effective standpoint, we really only have 25 working days left in this Senate. I would argue that with the debt ceiling, with healthcare, with the tax package, with the appropriations process, and the funding of the government, I just don't see any way that is possible. I think that when we are talking to the American public, we need to come clean.

I believe that, like in most years in the past, we are going to be pressured in this body again, just like we have 178 times. We have been forced into a continuing resolution in this body in order to get past some arcade financing limitation we have had. So that means we have by the end of September to fund the Federal Government. Historically, we have only done that four times, according to regular order. The other times of the 43 years, either a CR or an omnibus was done. But 178 continuing resolutions got us past the end of the fiscal year, moved on to an omnibus of some sort, and then the release valve in all of those occasions was more debt, more spending.

It is very difficult because the budget process itself is broken. And because of that, between now and the end of September, I personally—I am just a business guy, but I have no imagination of how we are going to fund this government by passing 12 appropriations bills. As a matter of fact, since 1974, this body has only averaged passing 2.5 appropriations bills a year out of the 12. Now, you tell me, in the next 43 days, are we going to pass 12 bills to fund this Federal Government? There is no way.

So my call on our colleagues here on both sides of the aisle is, let's get busy right now. I don't care what the structure is, as long as it is not a continuing resolution because that ties the hands of our military. They cannot deal with that. It limits their ability to move money from one department to another. If they wanted to move money from armor to infantry just in the Army alone, they cannot do that. And with the risks we face around the world today, that is an impossibility.

We are working feverishly right now to change the budget process. It will not affect us this year. This is something we have to get serious on right now.

I believe we are poised to have a turnaround in this economy. Consumer confidence is up. It hasn't been higher than this level in 13 years. CEO confidence is higher than it has been in 15 years. Manufacturing confidence hasn't been this high in over 20 years. Why? Because they see some regulations being rolled back right now by this administration and this Senate.

We passed 13 bills out of 14 that we brought forward that pulled back onerous regulations. Just this week, we had the Secretary of Treasury tell us that some 70 percent of the limitations on our banks—not the controls that protect us against another 2008 and 2009 disaster but the controls that are unnecessary and keeping capital tied up in small and regional banks unnecessarily.

We have some \$6 trillion not at work in this economy because of bad fiscal policy right here in Washington. What we are trying to do is unwind that, get it back into the economy.

By the way, if the Federal Reserve releases their \$4.5 trillion and we don't find a way to unleash this \$6 trillion, tell me where the capital is going to come from.

I am here to tell you that I believe we are on the brink of an economic turnaround if we can, in fact, effect a reasonable improvement in healthcare, get on and fund the government in a responsible way before September 30, and move on and get a tax package done this year.

People right now are working on their budgets for business for fiscal year 2018—right now. By the end of their Q3, they will have that done. Their capital budgets, which go out many years, are being done too. So they are handicapping right now whether we will in fact get that tax package done.

My argument is this: Let's get these things dealt with right now on a timely basis—the debt ceiling, funding the government—and move on to this tax package so we can, in fact, get that done so that business entities and our free enterprise system can, in fact, budget accordingly so that we can get some of these benefits into the economy as early as late next year. If we don't get that tax package done before Christmas, I don't believe we will have any impact in fiscal year 2018 from that.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, with the events this week, I would hope our body could find a way to lower the vitriol, to lower the hysteria when we have a difference of opinion and to find a way to look at what we might agree on, on an issue, as well as what we might disagree on. Yet, as I stand here today listening to some of the speeches, just today I am shocked because it is business as usual in this body. The vitriol is at a very high level. The misinformation is at an extremely high level.

Remember when then-President Obama said: If you like your insurance

you can keep your insurance; if you like your doctor you can keep your doctor; premiums will go down under ObamaCare; deductibles will go down; everybody will have insurance. The CBO overestimated by 20 million the number of people who would sign up for ObamaCare, and, oh, by the way, we are going to institute a 30-hour work-week limitation to define “full-time work” and we are going to limit it so anybody with over 51 employees has to comply.

We now know—both sides even agree—that it is failing. What they are saying now, though, is that they are relying back on the argument: Let's move to regular order now; let's make sure we all get this done together. Where was that conversation in 2008 and 2009, when behind closed doors a supermajority crammed down the throat of the minority this thing called ObamaCare? Remember that in the House of Representatives then-Speaker PELOSI said: If you want to find out what is in the bill, you have to vote for the bill. I think it was a matter of hours that day before when the Senate got the bill. They had to look at the bill before they had to vote on it that night.

But let's look at the reality. ObamaCare is collapsing under its own weight. We know rates are up over 105 percent nationally. In my State alone, they have more than doubled in the last 3 years. Deductibles are up even more than that. Forty-five percent of the counties in the United States are down to one carrier. In my State alone, Georgia, we have 159 counties and 96 are down to one carrier. States like Ohio, Virginia, Iowa, Tennessee, and Missouri are told now that they are losing their last carrier in the individual market.

But let me highlight the reality here. Before the Affordable Care Act, 48 million people in the United States did not have insurance. That was a catastrophe. We all agree with that. Today, however, what nobody on the other side talks about is that 28 million people today in America—the richest country in the history of the world—still do not have healthcare coverage. I can't see how that is a success by any measure. Of the 20 million who got insurance over the last 6 years, 16 million of them did not get it through ObamaCare. It came through the Medicaid expansion. Of the remaining 4 million, 2 million are like me and my wife, who were canceled and then had to come back into the Affordable Care Act unwillingly. That was our only choice. Oh, by the way, we had to have a program that had so many other features in it that our rates doubled over that period of time.

It just seems to me that what we have before us today is an opportunity to clean up this mess and provide for the things that were broken in 2008. We know we have to cover preexisting conditions. We don't want people to have their insurance canceled just because

they get sick. That is not the American way. That had to be fixed, and we are going to continue that.

People have to have access, though, and right now, with the cost, many people are coming off of healthcare in the individual market because they simply can't make the financial equation work. The premiums are too much. In my own family, one of my sons can't understand the deductibles. So the financial equation for the very people who need it doesn't make any sense.

We can do things to get premiums down by allowing the free market to provide the types of services inside insurance products that people actually want and not ask them to pay for products they don't need.

We have to make sure Medicaid can be sustained long term.

Lastly, I think we have to make sure that, as we deal with the preexisting conditions, we make sure that everybody in America has access to healthcare. Nobody is talking about taking away access from the American people in terms of healthcare.

Whether it is healthcare, the military, the VA, or any of our domestic programs, we have a serious funding problem. Our mechanism that funds the programs is broken. It has never worked since 1974, except for four times, and that was prior to 1980, and we have to fix it. But right now, in 43 days—between now and September 30—we have to fund this government, or all the other rhetoric will be idle chatter.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

MR. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for such time as I may consume as in morning business.

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

MR. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I am really glad the junior Senator from Georgia has taken this on. This is something that some of us who have been around a little bit longer have gone through before.

I think everyone realizes that what was attempted to be done by President Obama was a single-payer system. Ultimately, that is what liberals want. I remember back in the 1990s what was referred to at that time as Hillary healthcare during the Clinton administration. I remember so well the efforts that were taking place.

Sometimes I go back to my State of Oklahoma just to be around logical people, and they will ask the question: If this system is not working in Canada, is not working in Sweden, and is not working in Great Britain, why do they think it will work here? Liberal individuals will never tell you this, but what they are really thinking is this: It would work if I were running the show.

So we are going through a similar thing again, and I am so happy we have leaders, as the occupier of the Chair,

and we have more doctors right now in the Senate. This is the time to make these changes and really accomplish things. But that is not why I am here.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I noticed in the news this morning one more of these incidents happened where they had groups of people going to either the Antarctic or the Arctic to try to reaffirm their positions that somehow the world is coming to an end because of global warming and global warming is because of manmade gases, which, of course, we know is not the case. The interesting thing about yesterday was that a group of some scientists, some individuals, and some environmental extremist activists was going to the Arctic to show that things were melting, and they got stuck in the ice. This is the fourth time this has happened in the last 4 years because they didn't anticipate the fact that we have actually some areas where it is increasing.

I thought, well, it is time to make one last compliment to the President when he had the courage to pull out of the Paris climate agreement.

A lot of people don't know what these climate agreements are. This was the 21st year we had a climate agreement. It was all started by the United Nations some 21 years ago. The idea was to go to exotic places around the world and invite all 192 countries to come in to convince them that they need to reduce their own greenhouse gases, their CO₂ emissions.

Toward the end of the Obama administration, after eight such meetings they decided this wasn't going to work. They finally decided they would go ahead and try to make one look like an agreement, and, hence, there was the Paris Agreement—not a treaty but an agreement, not anything that would come through ratification, obviously.

I have been over there for some of these meetings. What is interesting about this is that most of the 192 countries involved in these meetings think that if the President says something, it is going to happen. They forget about the fact that we have another branch of government called Congress, and we have to ratify some of these decisions.

So I do want to make a couple of comments about what the President has accomplished by getting out of this agreement.

First, since there is a deliberate effort to make people who are reluctant to believe one narrow view, in terms that the world is coming to an end is a reality, they try to make it change into the argument that as to climate change, anyone who is against the idea that we are having these problems out there is opposed to the idea of climate change.

Look, we have said so many times on the floor that the climate has always changed. All the evidence—historic evidence, scriptural evidence, archeological evidence—shows very clearly that climate is always changing. The arrogance is that somehow climate

change can be managed by man. Did man ever cause the ice age or any of the other extreme weather patterns the Earth has seen just over the last few thousand years? The answer is no.

But earlier this year, a climate change study was released which found that little agreement is found with climate modeling simulations and consistently overstate recent summer warming and underestimate preindustrial temperature changes. That was the study. It is no surprise they found forecasts to be inaccurate. According to the environmental extremists, every summer is going to be the hottest. I have yet to see a summer that wasn't going to be the hottest. Every year they say that is going to take place.

In one of the charts from the study I have here, all you have to do is go back and look historically at what has happened in this country. We go through warming periods. We go through ice ages. I will tell you what is interesting about this chart. The largest increase we had in global warming happened right after World War II, in 1945. That was the year we had the largest number of CO₂ emissions that took place. Historically, no one disagrees. That precipitated not a warming period but a 20-year cooling period. So we have been going through this for a very long period of time now.

Essentially, the findings of the study show that the climate patterns we see now are not significant in the grand scheme of things, as we can see by this chart. People like to vilify those of us who talk about this subject and openly question the inaccurate statements and so-called findings of fearmongering scientists who tell everyone the world is ending because of manmade gases. They think that just because many of us recognize that science is not settled and we question exactly how much man affects climate change, corruption must be involved, and so forth.

But we look at the real science. I have not yet met him personally, but I know about a guy named Dr. Richard Lindzen. Dr. Richard Lindzen is an MIT professor. He arguably could be considered the most knowledgeable person in this field. He made this statement: Regulating CO₂ is a bureaucrats dream. If you regulate CO, you regulate life. So that is what is behind this, and we have watched this play out now for about 20 years. To question the idea that man is single-handedly responsible for the changes in climate and doomsday is near due to the fact that we burn fossil fuels is entirely inappropriate and, frankly, unnecessary.

I remember very well a climate fanatic named Michael Mann. I mentioned that Paris was the 21st meeting the United Nations has had. In 2009, that meeting was held in Copenhagen. At that time, I chaired the Environment and Public Works Committee. The first year of the Obama administration, I remember getting ready to go to Copenhagen to explain to people

they had been lied to. At that time, Obama was going over, Hillary Clinton was going over, John Kerry was going over, and all the rest, saying we in the United States were going to pass cap and trade. I wanted to make sure they knew we were not going to be passing cap and trade.

I was getting ready to go over. Lisa Jackson was the first Obama designee to be the Director of the EPA. I looked at her, and I said: I have a feeling that as soon as I leave town, you are going to have an endangerment finding so you can start regulating this stuff. She kind of smiled. I said: When that happens, it has to be based on science. So tell me, what science will you base this on? She said: Well, it is going to be based on the IPCC.

IPCC stands for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. That is the United Nations.

As luck would have it, right after that, a matter of days after that statement was made by her, we had climategate. Do you remember climategate? Not many people remember it because the media didn't play it up here like they did in Europe and around the world. Climategate was where they caught two scientists—one was Michael Mann and one was Phil Jones—who had rigged—there was evidence of this through communications that were disclosed—they were actually rigging the science. They didn't pay much attention to it here in the United States, but I remember at the time that Christopher Booker of the UK Telegraph—that is one of the biggest communication operations in the UK—they called this the worst scientific scandal of our generation. That is climategate. That is cooking the books on science to make people believe things that weren't true.

Clive Cook of the Financial Times said:

The close-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any lengths to defend a preconceived message, is surprising, even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

That is the science on which they have relied for a long period of time. In fact, to give you an example of the hockey stick—that was what Michael Mann came up with in trying to show, instead of what we are showing on this chart here, that somehow this all happened in a recent period of time. It is another research exploration that was wrong.

I started off talking about what happened on the climate change research exploration that just took place in the last few days. Many of these were postponed in the Arctic because of the unusual amount of ice that has taken place. Before a research team could embark on their exploration to study climate change—keep in mind, this group went there to try to show what things are happening, that ice is melting all over the world. Their ship, the Canadian research icebreaker Amundsen, had to be borrowed by the Canadian Coast Guard for search and rescue

efforts to help fishing boats and supply ships that were trapped in the unexpected, large amount of ice.

This is at least the fourth time this has happened in recent years to research ships around the world. There was a situation a few years ago where a Russian ship carrying climate scientists and journalists and activists and tourists and an entire crew became trapped in ice that was at least 10 feet thick. An Australian icebreaker arrived 6 days later to rescue them, but it was unable to do so because of the ice. A few days after that, a Chinese icebreaker sent out a helicopter that was able to airlift 52 of the passengers from the Russian ship to safety on the Australian icebreaker. Unfortunately, during the rescue effort, the Chinese icebreaker became trapped as well.

I tell you these stories because all of these expeditions that were going to the various posts were doing so to try to prove that ice was not accumulating, and they got stuck in the ice.

Most of the predictions that have been published over the last few decades have been widely inaccurate, but most have been accepted by the environmental groups and some of the extremists because they are maintaining their war on fossil fuels, although Trump has ended that.

I have to say that one of the reasons I go back to my State of Oklahoma every weekend is to talk to real people. They will ask a question. I remember that during the Obama administration, he had a war on fossil fuels—fossil fuels are coal, oil, and gas—but he also didn't like nuclear. You don't get these questions asked in Washington. They asked me: Inhofe, explain this to me. We have a President who is trying to do away with fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gas—and nuclear, and we are currently dependent upon coal, oil, gas, and nuclear for 89 percent of the power it takes to run this machine called America. What is going to happen if we are not able to do it?

Of course, as I said, you don't hear those questions around Washington.

Anyway, by fearmongering techniques, environmental extremists and the Al Gore fan club can easily convince a large number of people that regulatory burdens like the EPA's Clean Power Plan, the Quad Oa, the venting and flaring rules, and the waters of the United States rule are a good thing and that we can save the Earth without any consideration of the effect these rules have on energy.

By the way, for any conservatives who are out there, I would like to remind them that even though it didn't get much play in the media, this President in the first 100 days in office has been able to do away with some 47 of the regulations. The two ways of doing away with a regulation—one is through Executive order, and the other is the CRA, the Congressional Review Act. In fact, I was proud that the first signing ceremony our new President had was signing a bill that I had passed. It is

one that has really made an effort to try to save enough of the oil and gas industry to run this machine, as I mentioned, called America.

Now we are actively working to face the problems inherited from the previous administration. For the past 8 years under the Obama administration, the American economy suffered under the effects of his climate agenda. That era is over. President Trump has delivered on his campaign promises since he was sworn in. The strongest signal of this was President Trump's decision to pull out of the Paris climate accord.

It was just a few weeks ago that I was on the Senate floor urging President Trump to pull out of this Paris Agreement. That same day, 21 of my Senate colleagues and I sent a letter to the White House with that same request. Our message resonated with the President, and it was clear that our voices were heard because it was exactly 1 week later that the President announced to the world he was getting out of a bad deal.

Let me mention one thing about this Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement supposedly is something that 192 countries—each said what it was going to do to reduce greenhouse gases, their CO₂ emissions. For example, the agreement President Obama said at that time—he said: We commit that we will reduce our CO₂ emissions by between 26 and 28 percent by 2096.

The interesting thing about that is that it can't be done. In fact, immediately after he made that statement, we had a televised public hearing of the EPA to ask them how in the world we could reduce by some 27 percent greenhouse gases in the United States of America. They said it is impossible and we couldn't do it. So what the President was doing then was telling people that we in the United States were able to do something—were going to do something that was very meaningful by our reduction, even though he knew at the time it could not be done.

Then we have the other countries—China, for example. China is the second largest emitter of CO₂. Currently, as we speak right now, they are cranking out one coal-fired powerplant every 10 days. What did they agree to in this Paris accord? They said: Well, we will continue to increase our output in China. We will continue to have a new powerplant every 10 days or so until 2025. At that time, we will consider reducing it.

Then along comes India, the third largest emitter of CO₂. India said: Yes, as long as we get \$2.5 trillion, we are willing to do it. Well, where would that \$2.5 trillion come from? The good old United States. The big green fund.

That is how ridiculous that whole thing was. It was the right decision for him to make this a reality.

Many believe that if we lose our ability to negotiate with other nations—this is the only legitimate complaint I have gotten that I really heard during the time. They said: Well, if we don't

have a place at the table, then we are not going to be able to be in on any future discussions.

That was wrong, and those who are using that argument were wrong because the agreement that gave us a seat at the table has already been ratified by the United States, meaning the Senate gave its advice and consent. It is known as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. This was in the 1992 treaty that supports all of the big parties that are held every December. We are still at that table. That decision was made a long period of time ago. We will be at any future activities that take place.

I will wrap up by saying that this was the right thing to do. Stop and think about it. The previous speaker on the floor, the junior Senator from Georgia, was talking about the dilemma we have in this country, the spending dilemma, and how we are going to have to do something about it. We are going to eventually have to get to some of the entitlements, the big spending items.

If we had stayed with the program that the President had outlined and had committed to the other 192 countries, that would have constituted arguably the largest single tax increase in the history of America, and there would have been nothing that would have been accomplished by it.

My final thought. I would like to thank President Trump for pulling out of the Paris Agreement. It is the right decision, and it will without question help the United States in the long run.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES
BILL

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I joined our colleagues today at lunch, and one of the conversations I had with one of my Democratic colleagues was how surprising, perhaps, but certainly how pleasing it was that today the Senate, in a bipartisan fashion, addressed some contentious issues related to sanctions in regard to Iran; issues related to sanctions in regard to Russia. Both of those issues, because of the political climate and because of past history, could be fraught with great opportunity for partisanship to be exhibited in full force. The conversation I had with my colleague was how surprising and, more importantly, how pleasing it was that didn't happen.

I commend the Senate and its leadership for working together to resolve their potential differences and creating this opportunity for us to have a debate, a discussion, both on public policy—that I think is important to the security of the world—and the safety of Americans here in the United States.

I am here, in part, to express my support for the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act, the legislation we addressed today. It permits our government to target those individuals and institutions responsible for a foreign policy that puts American lives at risk and undermines the security, particularly in the Middle East, but really of the globe.

The theocratic, autocratic regime's survival in Iran depends currently on the human rights abuses and political oppression. Eight years after the Green Movement's protests, the group's leaders remain under house arrest. Members of that movement were tortured. Still, today, Iranian Americans are unreasonably detained without hope for release in Iran. The Iranian regime's survival depends further on its control of its economy. When it was brokered, proponents of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action argued it would provide economic benefit to the Iranian people.

So when President Obama negotiated—and this Congress, this Senate, failed to reject the JCPOA—one of the arguments about its benefits is that everyday Iranians would enjoy greater economic opportunity. Instead, a recent Reuters study shows businesses directly tied to the Supreme Leader and the IRGC are the main beneficiaries of those changes in our relationship with Iran. Despite renewed economic growth, Iran's unemployment rate is estimated to be as high as 12 percent, and that figure could be as high as almost 30 percent among Iranian youth.

Survival of Khamenei's regime depends on stoking hatred of America as a way to whip up support. Iran uses small boats to swarm American Navy ships protecting the free navigation of the Strait of Hormuz in the Persian Gulf. This is disturbing for a number of reasons, but the importance of that Strait's role in global economy certainly is one of them. In addition, it is linked to scouting soft American targets for terrorism.

So we continue to see bad behavior, threatening behavior by the Iranian government toward the United States and our global interest in the Strait of Hormuz and the suggestion that Iran is preparing and looking for opportunities for terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies in the Middle East.

Last week, two Hezbollah operatives were arrested here in the United States. They were doing surveillance on targets in New York and on our embassies as well in Israel and Panama. Two terrorism specialists, Dan Byman of Georgetown and Scott Stewart of Stratfor, tweeted in reaction to this news that this could be a case of Iran

sending us an ominous message; that Iran can play the terror card if it wants to. If that is indeed the signal Tehran is sending to us, it is important—it is imperative, in fact, that we send a message of our own that no civilized country resorts to planning to kill innocent civilians. The legislation we passed today informs that regime that the JCPOA does not provide impunity for Iran to make such plans.

Iran threatens its neighbors with its ongoing ballistic missile development, which was not part of the JCPOA. Hezbollah is armed with tens of thousands of rockets, threatening Israel's security. This is the same group which has been instrumental in propping up the Assad regime in Syria and which is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands. The head of the IRGC forces was seen on the Syria and Iraq border just this past weekend. We know Assad's regime would have not survived without Iran's continued financial and military support. Again, this legislation underscores the Senate's belief that the Iranian regime must not be allowed to continue conducting and destabilizing activities under the shield of the JCPOA.

I was an opponent to the JCPOA, but today's actions are unrelated to undermining that agreement, which is now in place. They are designed to hold back further activities by the Iranian regime against America and its interests. It is really a requirement that Iran act within the nation-states' Code of Conduct—the normal behavior of a country around the globe.

Previous administrations, in my view, failed to challenge Iran on way too many fronts. With this legislation, the Senate is intent on pushing back on Iran's adventurism in the Middle East and beyond. By imposing appropriate sanctions and requiring the Secretaries of State, Defense and Treasury, as well as Director of National Intelligence, to formulate a coherent strategy to counter Iran's influence in the region, we say to the regime that their activities will be countered every step of the way.

This legislation plays a part in doing what Dan Byman, the professor—the terrorism expert—testified to our House counterparts last month. His words were to “highlight the costs of Iran's adventurism to ordinary Iranians to raise domestic awareness of, and discontent with, the regime's foreign policy.”

There remains more that can be done to challenge Iran and constrict its resources. Many amendments were filed to strengthen this legislation that were not ultimately considered. One of those was mine. Last year, the Obama administration announced it would pay \$1.7 billion to Iran in an effort to settle a longstanding financial dispute. Transferring cash to a leading state sponsor of terror was a bad idea when the Senate considered the 2015 nuclear agreement, and it remains a bad idea, a terrible idea today.

The amendment I offered to today's legislation would limit the President's ability to transfer funds to Iran. This amendment directs that the U.S. Government puts justice for American victims of Iranian terrorism ahead of the payments to the Iranian's regime. No administration should transfer funds related to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal without first requiring settlement of all damages already awarded in judgments made in the U.S. courts against Iran for their terrorism crimes against our own citizens. Paying our own citizens from that fund before any money is transferred to the Iranian regime makes sense, common sense, and it is surrounded by the sense of justice and right.

While my amendment was not one of those considered by the Senate yet, we will be introducing this concept as freestanding legislation in the near future.

I know sanctions alone will not change Iran's regime's behavior. Incidentally, we need our allies and friends to join us in this sanction effort. Yet we know the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act remains an important bill to impose costs on the regime in Iran and, hopefully, to encourage more of the discontent we saw during the recent elections. Perhaps there will rise an equivalent to the 2009 Green Movement that offers Iranians one more opportunity to throw off the yoke of theocratic rule of tyranny and get the government they deserve—one that respects their rights and has the desire to coexist peacefully with its neighbors.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks on healthcare and what is ahead over the next couple of weeks in this way.

For almost 7 years before I got elected to the Congress, I was the director of the Oregon Gray Panthers, which is a senior citizens group, and I ran a legal aid office for the elderly. I made the judgment then that healthcare was and always would be the most important issue. I made that judgment because I have always felt that if you and your loved ones do not have their health, then pretty much everything else does not matter.

The Presiding Officer of the Senate, of course, is a skilled healthcare provider and knows a lot about these issues, and I am really going to use that as my reference point today in making the judgment that having quality, affordable healthcare for your families and yourselves is paramount to everything else.

My view is that the proposal being considered here in the Senate of cutting hundreds of billions of dollars in funds from the social safety net—the Medicaid Program, which is the lifeline for seniors and kids with special needs and for the disabled—is going to put at risk the health and well-being of millions of Americans if it is passed.

It is why I want to take some time to explain what it actually does so that people all across this country will be in a position to make their voices heard—to speak up, to do their part—so that when this debate comes to the floor of the U.S. Senate, as I believe it will in the next couple of weeks—and it moves very quickly—every Member of this body will have heard, loud and clear, what Americans think of this proposal, and I do not think that that assessment is going to be too kind.

Now, the House passed their version of TrumpCare by a razor's edge, and to put it in a pleasant way, over here, Senators looked at it and said: No way. No thanks. My colleagues in the Senate majority said: We are throwing this bill out, starting fresh, and we are going to do it right. So I am going to start with where that process got lost.

The majority convened a special working group made up of 13 Republican Senators, all of them men, and it turns out, based on comments that have been reported, the Senate bill isn't going to be all that different from what the House was talking about. So Republicans in the Senate are pretty much picking up where the House left off on TrumpCare, and the legislation that is being crafted stays hidden—stays behind closed doors and in a position where, for example, if you are a Democrat on the Finance Committee, you don't even know what is in it. It is not going before committees. It will not be put forward for amendment in a markup. With barely any public notice, the bill will hit this floor for 28 hours of debate—that is that.

I will just briefly describe a session we had in the Finance Committee this week where there was discussion from the other side of the aisle that maybe there was a big partisan divide with respect to healthcare. I listened a bit. Finally, I said: I don't know how you can have a partisan divide about a bill that you can't read.

I am the senior Democrat on the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee is the committee that has jurisdiction over hundreds of billions of dollars in payments for Medicare and Medicaid and the various tax credits that are part of the Affordable Care Act. This is the committee with the authority to address the management of hundreds of billions of dollars for those programs—Medicare, Medicaid, tax credits—and we see nothing. Not only have there been no hearings, we haven't seen anything. Something has been sent to the Congressional Budget Office. Who knows the answer to that. We haven't seen that either.

So that is the process that would dictate a radical transformation of one-

sixth of the American economy—the American healthcare system—affecting millions and millions of Americans.

That is what we are looking at right now for the next couple of weeks, and it is pretty different than what happened during the Affordable Care Act.

I want to focus on a few points just with respect to that. The first is especially important, as I have said, to the Finance Committee that deals with Medicare and Medicaid and these crucial aspects of healthcare in America. The Senate Finance Committee has been cut out of this process. The chairman, Senator HATCH, I, and 24 other committee members—there has been nothing for us to examine as a group to do what the Finance Committee tries to do best, which is to work in a bipartisan way. That is what we have done so often in the past, which is to sit down and try to take the good ideas that come from both sides, from the staff who knows healthcare inside and out, with years of experience working on healthcare matters.

I have a little bit of a special interest in this because I wrote something called the Healthy Americans Act before the Presiding Officer was here in this body. Eight Democratic Senators and eight Republican Senators joined together in comprehensive healthcare reform for the first time—for the first time ever before.

We have done a lot of good work on issues that represent the big challenges ahead. We know, for example, Medicare today isn't the Medicare of 1965, when it was about broken ankles, Part A or Part B, a bad case of the flu. Today Medicare is about chronic illness—diabetes and heart disease and strokes and cancer. We have worked on that in a bipartisan way. Bipartisanship is what the Finance Committee is all about.

So in the runup to the Affordable Care Act, we held more than 50 hearings, roundtables, walk-through sessions. It wasn't exactly exciting. We always used to say: If you are having trouble sleeping, come by for a while and you will be knocked out in a matter of minutes. But that is where you do the hard work of legislating.

When the Finance Committee finished the drafting process, the legislation sat online for 6 days before we went through the formal committee consideration—what we know up here as a markup. A total of 564 amendments were posted online before the markup began for all to read. The markup lasted 8 days. There were 130 amendments in the longest markup in 22 years. Two dozen Republican amendments were adopted, and the bill passed with a bipartisan vote.

We all got pretty sick of the hearing room by the time it was over. I will just read a quote from Senator GRASSLEY with respect to the Finance Committee markup of the Affordable Care Act. Senator GRASSLEY is the chairman, of course, of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the former committee chairman of the Finance Committee,

and a very careful, thoughtful legislator. He said: "This was the most open and inclusive process the committee has undertaken in its history. . . ."

He went on to say: ". . . I believe, since I have been on the committee."

So that is not a Democrat. That is Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am sure Senator MURRAY has similar accounts of the process under the late Senator KENNEDY. That legislation was online for days as well.

That is what the legislative process is supposed to look like. It is a process that starts from the bottom up, and it is out in the open. Sunlight has always been the best disinfectant. You get hearings. You get study. You get debate. You marry the best ideas of both sides.

I have always felt that bipartisanship is not about taking each other's lousy ideas; bipartisanship is about taking each other's good ideas, but because of the process the Republican leader is insisting on, that is not what the majority has on offer. What is in the works is hidden away so the public and Americans across this country who might be sitting in a coffee shop and would like to pull up a proposal on their laptop, they can't do it, and there aren't any hearings on what might be going in the bill as well. That, in my view, is the wrong way to build a sweeping, massive proposal like this, which, for so many of those who are walking on an economic tightrope, balancing their food against their fuel and their fuel against their medical care, this isn't some abstract issue for them. It is a matter of life and death.

This proposal is built around an attack on Medicaid. The last version of the bill that anybody has been allowed to see cut the program by more than \$800 billion, but there haven't been any hearings on what that would mean for the 74 million Americans who get their healthcare coverage through Medicaid. Nobody has been brought before the Finance Committee to talk about how you would not endanger the Medicaid nursing home benefit with this proposal, and that benefit pays for two out of three nursing home beds in America. There hasn't been a hearing examining the effect of the staggering implications of Medicaid cuts on 37 million kids enrolled in the program, particularly what it means for kids with disabilities and kids in special education classes.

At home in Oregon, when we had town meetings and roundtables on it, I just brought up—just raised the issue very gently—about the prospect of those special needs kids being hurt with this proposal, and the room just broke out in sobs.

There haven't been any hearings on how much worse the opioid epidemic will get in States across the country when people enrolled in Medicaid lose access to treatment for mental health and substance abuse disorders. Just this morning, I talked about a

brandnew idea that seems to be picking up some interest in the majority about basically coming up with kind of a separate way to fund the coverage for opioids. Instead of it being a guarantee of being able to get access to services, it would sort of be a separate program, which also is not in line with sensible healthcare policy. As the Presiding Officer knows, so often those addicted to opioids have multiple conditions. In other words, if you are a young person who is addicted to opioids, you might well need mental health services. If you are an older person who is addicted to opioids, you might need services relating to chronic illness.

So I want everybody in those States across the country—particularly in the Midwest and in the industrial Northeast—although opioid addiction has hit this country like a wrecking ball from Portland, OR, to Portland, ME. There are a lot of people paying attention to what is going to happen with respect to coverage for those addicted to opioids, and based on this proposal I have been reading about that is being floated, this is a prescription for trouble for those trying to come back from opioid addiction.

Then, I want to mention the bill's provisions on preexisting conditions. When the Affordable Care Act was written in committee, the bedrock guarantee of protection against discrimination for those who have preexisting conditions and protecting those who have preexisting conditions with airtight, loophole-free protection—that was at the heart of the Affordable Care Act. My view is TrumpCare takes a jackhammer to that bedrock protection, cracking open loopholes that benefit insurance companies. Americans are aghast that their elected representatives would support the idea. I know that because I have had 46 townhall meetings in my State this year, and I hear about it at nearly every one.

So one would think this would generate a lot of interest in the Senate Finance Committee—the committee with jurisdiction over Medicaid, for example—because there are a lot of those folks who have preexisting conditions. No discussion. Zero discussion—zero—of any proposal that the Senate could be considering over the next couple of weeks that rolls back protections on preexisting conditions.

I gather the House bill just basically takes the waiver process, which in the Affordable Care Act was designed to let States do better; in the House, they let States do worse—considerably worse—and one of the most objectionable features is the States can get a waiver and unravel some of those strong protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Now, if the healthcare changes I have mentioned aren't bad enough, TrumpCare also takes hundreds of billions of dollars of healthcare from needy and vulnerable people and, in effect, hands it in tax breaks to the most

fortunate. Nobody has come before the Senate Finance Committee with authority over taxes to explain why the Congress ought to raid healthcare programs for the vulnerable to fund tax cuts for the fortunate few.

Our committee—the chairman and I, along with all the Democrats and several of the Republicans—has been prevented from legislating out in the open on this proposal because the Senate TrumpCare plan has essentially been pushed out of view. It is clear that this isn't just sidestepping the Finance Committee. The public—the American people—have been cut out of the process when healthcare policy that will affect millions for years to come is being written here.

The majority leader has said he pretty much is not interested in input from Democrats. The Republican healthcare plan is going to move by reconciliation. That is a Washington word, folks—when you are at a coffee shop, nobody is talking about reconciliation, but it is basically our way or the highway. We are going to do it our way, and that is that. It is the most partisan road you can go down in the Senate. It relies on moving as quickly as possible with the least possible sunlight.

As far as I can tell, the Senate bill is going to be hidden until virtually the last minute, at which point it will come straight to the floor for a very short, abbreviated debate.

That is not what happened when the Affordable Care Act came up. The Senate spent 25 consecutive days in session on healthcare reform, the second longest consecutive session in history—week after week, spirited debate, mid-November into late December, vote after vote after vote. In total, the Senate debated the Affordable Care Act for nearly 220 hours. That kind of extended give-and-take from both political parties you just can't have under this partisan “our way or the highway” approach known as reconciliation.

When the Senate plan hits the floor, there will be 20 hours of debate before time expires and the final votes are cast. That is it. That is it. We won't have seen a bill until the last minute, and then one-sixth of our economy is going to be handled and framed for decades to come in a short and regrettably partisan debate.

I have said from day one that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. No major piece of legislation ever is. For major legislation to work and for it to last, it has to be bipartisan. That is why I mentioned that I put in a bipartisan bill—eight Democrats and eight Republicans. But you don't get it exactly your way. So I was very glad when the Affordable Care Act took that portion of our bill—the portion of the bill that had airtight, guaranteed protection for Americans from discrimination when they had preexisting conditions.

The reason we felt it was so important—the 16 of us, eight Democrats and eight Republicans—is that if we open

up the opportunity for discriminating against people with preexisting conditions again, we take America back to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and the wealthy. That is what happens if you allow that discrimination. If you are healthy, there is no problem. If you are wealthy, there is no problem, either. You can just write out the checks if you have preexisting conditions.

The process the Senate is headed down now is as partisan as it gets. Unfortunately, what Senate Republicans are doing now makes what the House was up to almost transparent.

I am going to close here with just one last comment. Now is the time for the American people to get loud about healthcare—really loud—because the well-being and health of millions of Americans is at stake here in the Senate over the next 2 weeks. For older people who could need nursing home care, for seniors who aren't yet eligible for Medicare who are between 55 and 65 and who could face huge premium hikes, for the millions who work for employers who thought they were safe, the House bill removes the caps on the out-of-pocket expenses they have. If somebody gets cancer in America, they bust those caps in a hurry. Yet that is what the House is willing to do, and I don't see any evidence the Senate is willing to change.

This debate didn't end when the theatrical production on the South Lawn of the White House took place a few weeks after the vote in the House of Representatives. My hope is—and I sure heard about it from Oregonians last week when we had townhall meetings across the State; there is concern, there is fear, and there is frustration about why they can't be told what is in this bill—that there is still time for Americans to make a difference because political change doesn't start from the top and go down. It is bottom up. It is not top down. It is bottom up. There is still time for the American people to be heard and to make sure their Senator understands how they feel about this, what is at stake, and, in particular, to get an explanation about why they can't be told now what is in this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The Senator from Texas, the majority whip.

PROTECT OUR CHILDREN ACT OF 2017

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad to see my friend from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, on the floor because last week the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the PROTECT Our Children Act, which helps protect children across the country from exploitation over the internet.

This is a bipartisan bill, not surprisingly so because last time this legislation passed, originally back in 2008, it

had 60 cosponsors, including 41 Democrats and 18 Republicans. But I have introduced this reauthorization with Senator HELLER from Nevada and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut. It is something we call the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program. It reauthorizes those.

I have had the sad experience of seeing how dangerous the internet can be for our vulnerable children. When I was attorney general of Texas, I launched something we quaintly called at the time the Texas Internet Bureau. That was a long time ago, about 2000. Today, they call it the cyber crime unit, and they do a lot of even more sophisticated things. But the idea back then and the idea still today is to fight internet crimes and to work with law enforcement agencies around the State, including a Dallas-based task force.

Now, 17 years later, these task forces are a national network of 61 coordinated units dedicated to protecting children from internet predators and investigating perpetrators who engage in these horrific crimes. These task forces are on the frontline every day, protecting our children online and rescuing victims of exploitation and abuse. They also work with local agencies to create victim support programs and encourage proactive community education; for example, educating parents and adults of the sorts of things their children might be exposed to online that they might not know about. So we need to educate families and children about the risks the internet can hold, together with the wonderful opportunities it also presents. This is really the dark underbelly of the internet.

It requires a depth of resources to fight child predators online. My experience as attorney general was that local law enforcement agencies didn't have the tax base. They didn't have the expertise. They didn't have the computers and the other sophistication they needed in order to combat this in their local communities.

Over the past few years we have been able to save many lives from crime online, and it would be a mistake now to change course. We cannot lose this critical tool.

Just for the information of colleagues, we put this on the hotline which, for those who don't work in the Senate, means we asked all Members of the Senate to comment on this and to let us know if they had any objection to its passage.

Hearing none, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 122, S. 782.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 782) to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 782) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 782

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 "Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology To Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017" or the "PROTECT Our Children Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN TASK FORCE PROGRAM.

Title I of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 17601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 105(h) (42 U.S.C. 17615(h)), by striking "2016" and inserting "2022"; and

(2) in section 107(a)(10) (42 U.S.C. 17617(a)(10)), by striking "fiscal year 2018" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022".

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about healthcare, but I wanted to be here on this occasion to join my distinguished colleague from Texas in supporting this measure because it is so vital to protecting children.

Like the distinguished Senator from Texas, I, too, was attorney general, and we in Connecticut have been at the forefront of fighting this internet and cyber threat to the welfare of our children.

So I want to express my thanks to him for working in a very bipartisan way. At a time when the public, many commentators, and media question whether we work together across the aisle, this bill is a very apt example of how we can and we must work together to protect our children, to advance our national interests, and to make sure that criminal justice is effectively enforced in this country.

I look forward to working with my colleague in making sure this measure becomes law.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, one of the things we are debating right now is, What is the future of the Affordable Care Act or, I should say, healthcare in the United States? One thing we can all agree to is that the individual market under the Affordable Care Act—or

ObamaCare, as it is commonly called—is not doing well.

I will put up this Facebook post from a constituent in Louisiana named Brian. He wrote in to say:

My family plan is \$1,700 a month. Me, my wife, and 2 children. The ACA has brought me to my knees.

He doesn't say this, but we know that, most likely, his family deductible is \$13,000.

I hope we can get something done. . . . The middle class is dwindling away. Can everyone just come together and figure this out?

So his family is putting out \$20,000 a year for insurance. They most likely have a \$13,000 family deductible. They have two children, a young family, \$33,000 of out-of-pocket expenses before they would see significant benefit from their policy. Clearly, we have a problem.

When he was campaigning, Candidate Trump recognized this, and he said over and over that his contract with the voters was to maintain coverage, lower premiums, address and care for those with preexisting conditions, and to eliminate the ObamaCare mandates. This, if you will, was his contract with the voters—a pretty good contract. I think it is something both parties can get behind.

Candidate Trump and then President-elect Trump doubled down on this just before taking the oath of office, saying: "People covered under the law"—meaning the law that he would support to replace the Affordable Care Act—"can expect to have great healthcare. It will be in a much simplified form. Much less expensive and much better."

Indeed, the President of the United States seemed, again, to renew this commitment this past week at a lunch with 15 Senators at the White House, once more saying how we have to have a law that lowers premiums and cares for those with preexisting conditions.

That is the baseline. Some would argue, has President Trump committed himself to some right that previously did not exist that all Americans would have healthcare?

I am a physician, a doctor. I worked in a public hospital for the uninsured for so long. I can tell you, Congress created a right to healthcare when it passed the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act. I think President Clinton was the one who signed it into law. This said that anyone—whether they were a U.S. citizen or not—could come to an emergency room and receive all the care they needed, and if they could not pay, they would still receive care.

Whenever somebody says "My gosh, folks don't have a right to healthcare," I note that when I was in the emergency room at 2 o'clock in the morning, as long as those emergency door rooms were open, there were people coming through. They would have congestive heart failure, COPD, diabetes out of control, gunshot wounds, or vomiting blood. They could be schizophrenic or a drug overdose. As long as

that patient or those patients came through the door, we treated them, and someone paid.

I would say that it is the fiscally conservative way that if Congress is going to say “My gosh, everybody has a right to healthcare,” then we should come up with a considered way to pay for it, as opposed to forcing the hospital to shift the cost of this care to other sources—principally, by the way, small businesses paying higher premiums for their employees, higher rates to pay for the uninsured. The fiscally conservative way is “Let’s address these needs.”

As a physician, I will also say that the best business practice ways to address somebody with chronic health conditions is to actually manage the disease. If you have a diabetic who doesn’t have insurance, she may come to the hospital once a month with diabetes out of control. You have to start an IV and put her in the hospital, perhaps overnight, sometimes in the hospital for longer. This can cost thousands of dollars. Contrast this with having that patient with a primary care physician so that you can manage her disease. Not only is her health better, but you spend a lot less money.

In fact, the wisest corporations in our country now consider the health of their employees as a cost center. What can we do to have the best outcomes at the lowest price? This is the most fiscally conservative way. I think that is the approach we should take as a country.

This brings us to the next point. How do we achieve that which President Trump suggested, which was that we would maintain coverage, lower premiums, care for those with preexisting conditions, and eliminate mandates in a way that we could achieve it? Some folks say that you cannot achieve this. I disagree with this.

The way to achieve it is to embrace each of President Trump’s goals. SUSAN COLLINS and four other Senators and I have put forward a bill called the Patient Freedom Act. In the Patient Freedom Act, the approach we take is to first maintain the coverage President Trump spoke of, but we do it by eliminating mandates. We give the States the options of doing something called automatic enrollment. It means it is easy to be enrolled.

On our income taxes, for example, Republicans have always said: We want to make it easy to pay your taxes—not 16 pages of forms that you have to fill out with a CPA and an attorney but, rather, something you can do on one page. We need to make enrollment in insurance easy.

The second thing—if you can expand the enrollment, we can take from what we know works, which is on Medicare. When someone turns 65, he or she is automatically on Medicare. They don’t have to fill out a bunch of forms online. Rather, they are just on Medicare. They get a card. Here is your Medicare card. You are in unless you don’t want to be.

If you don’t want to be, we make it easy to get out. You just call up and say: I don’t want to be on Medicare. And you are not. It turns out that 99 percent of Americans like this simple approach, and they stay on Medicare.

We could expand coverage and make it simple, still eliminating mandates by giving States the option to say to their residents, you are in unless you are out. We are going to make it simple.

If you are eligible for this credit, you would get the credit. And unless you call us up and say that you don’t want it, you would be enrolled in an insurance program.

In this way, we care for those with preexisting conditions. How is that the case? If you have a few sick people in the insurance pool, then the only people whom you can spread that risk among are the few and the sick in the pool. Every year they pay higher and higher premiums.

On the other hand, if you can expand the risk pool to include all the young “healthies”—the folks who think themselves immortal, who on an average year may only have \$500 or \$800 worth of healthcare expenses—if you can incorporate all of them in your risk pool, then the expense of the few and the sick is spread out over the many and the healthy. Instead of premiums rising because of one person’s illness, premiums hardly budge because the cost of that care is spread over so many.

We call it a risk pool for a reason. If you take a cup of water and you pour it in a large swimming pool, the level of that swimming pool does not change because that big pool absorbs the water. If you take a cup of water and you pour it in a smaller cup of water, it overflows.

We need to make it where it is the former situation—where we have a big risk pool with lots of young, healthy people with whom we can share that risk over the many and not the few. In this way, we can lower premiums.

It was modeled that if we did automatic enrollment in my State, still maintain the enrollment of the older and the sicker who are already in, we would lower premiums by 20 percent. That is the power of giving the States the option to make it simpler for people to be enrolled in their insurance.

The conservative way to approach our healthcare reform is to recognize that President Trump’s contract with the voter on the campaign trail is the pathway to achieving his goals. As we do that in a fiscally conservative way, we recognize that we should not move this cost of care off to small businesses. We should go ahead and pay for it. It is fiscally conservative to manage these patients’ illnesses, as opposed to have them going to an emergency room every so often for emergency room care.

Lastly, we have to say that if we embrace Republican ideas of making it simpler to be in a plan, as opposed to

more complicated, we are more likely to have that risk pool that is inclusive of many who are healthy, not just a few who are sick.

I look forward to replacing the Affordable Care Act—the un-Affordable Care Act as it has become—with something that embraces conservative principles and fulfills President Trump’s campaign pledges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, it is nice to see the Presiding Officer again today—again and again. I don’t know if I will be your last speaker, but I will try not to keep you here too long just in case.

I know the Presiding Officer has been through Delaware a time or two and the Senator from Louisiana has been through my State. I have been through theirs.

I am going to talk about a 14-year-old young man who lives in Delaware. I used to say to my friend from Louisiana: Thanks for working, trying to get us to pull together and do something across the aisle on healthcare. We will see how it turns out.

If you come up I-95 on your way to Philadelphia, PA, Trenton, NJ, New York City, Boston, or Maine, you pass through Delaware. As you cross from Maryland into Delaware heading north, you cross into Delaware and go through the toll plaza, and then almost immediately you are at the intersection of a road called State Route 896, a north-south highway.

If you happen to go north on 896, you go into Newark, DE, and you go right by the University of Delaware, which is there in Newark, DE. We don’t pronounce it Newark. We pronounce it New-ark, as if it were two words—New-ark. Even though it is one word, we pronounce it as if it were two words, New-ark.

If you go north, you go on 896, you go right into the University of Delaware. I took that road over 40 years ago while I was still in the Navy and on leave with the Navy, trying to figure out where to go to graduate school. I went north on 896 and ended up falling in love with the University of Delaware and applied to graduate school there, and I made my life in Delaware.

If you go south on 896—when you intersect 896 and I-95, you don’t go to the University of Delaware. You don’t go to Newark. You go south to a town called Middletown. It is one word. There are some extraordinary athletes, high school athletes in Middletown.

For many years, their principal high school was Middletown High School. They have a couple of other schools there now, but one is Appoquinimink High School. In Middletown, they are the Cavaliers. The other is the Jaguars. The Jaguars have a new school; Appoquinimink is a newer school. Middletown has been around forever. They have a history of great athletes.

Year after year, they have won championships, including football—State

football championships—and men's sports and women's sports. The key to their successes is that these kids grew up together, and they played sports when they were Peewees. They played sports when they were in middle school. By the time they got to high school, they had worked together, trained together, and knew each other, and they did well as a team.

I met another athlete from Middletown a couple of weeks ago. He came by my office with, I believe, his mom. I think it was his mom. We have a photograph of him right here. He is an unlikely athlete. He is 14 years old. He is from Middletown, DE. His mom's name is Jennifer.

They told me what it was like for Michael—Michael Davis—to grow up in and live with a disease called cystic fibrosis. Before we talked much about cystic fibrosis and his preexisting condition, we talked about something we have a passion about, and that is running.

I am all of 70 years old. I still work out every day. I have been doing this since I was a brandnew ensign in the Navy and on my way to Pensacola, FL, to become a naval flight officer and serve our country around the world.

I like to run every day. This guy does, too—almost every day. There is a difference. The difference is that he has cystic fibrosis. I will talk about what that means in a minute, but despite the lung condition he has, he has defied the odds to be alive today—and not just to be alive today, but to become quite an athlete.

I don't know how many people in the Chamber—I look at our new pages who are here, their first week on the job, and I don't know how many of them have run half marathons. I run have run quite a few in Delaware over the years, but I don't have cystic fibrosis. This guy can run a half marathon and beat me into the floor and beat me into the road, at least. I need to yield to him when he goes by.

We have been joined on the floor today by the majority leader. When he shows up, along with a guy who is a fast runner, I yield to them. I will yield to the leader so he can take care of business, and then I will pick up when he finishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Delaware.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one thing we learn at a young age is the very basic principle that, when you give your word, you keep it. On June 1, on the international stage, President Trump signaled to the rest of the world that America cannot be relied upon to meet this very basic tenet. On one warm afternoon in Washington, President Trump withdrew the United States from one of the most sweeping global environmental accords in generations. Abandoning our obligations to the Paris climate accords doesn't make America great. It doesn't reflect America's traditional role as innovator, leader, and standard bearer in our shared commitment to protecting the environment.

The chief U.S. negotiator of those accords, Todd Stern, is a former member of my staff. No one among the ranks of our government was closer to these negotiations, which led to a deal that was a win for American workers and businesses and a first step toward ensuring the survival of our planet. His words, published by the Washington Post on June 1, should be required reading for every American, including the President.

By reneging on our pledge to honor these accords, which were forged through U.S. leadership, President Trump is ceding American leadership in emerging clean energy technologies and worsening one of the genuine existential threats to the world. The President's decision was a serious setback in our fight to save our planet. But as Mr. Stern writes, "This is not the end of the line. This is a call to arms."

Governors and mayors and State and local officials are heeding this call, rejecting the President's decision, and pledging to move forward with aggressive efforts to curb climate change. President Trump may think this is the end of America's involvement in the Paris climate accord. But, like Todd Stern, I believe a majority of Americans will reject this move. I, too, hope they will double down on our shared commitment to protecting our environment and our world for generations to come.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stern's column, "Trump just betrayed the world. Now the world will fight back," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 2017]

TRUMP JUST BETRAYED THE WORLD. NOW THE WORLD WILL FIGHT BACK.

(By Todd Stern)

President Trump has made a colossal mistake in deciding to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement. There is simply no case for withdrawal, other than a desire to double down on an ill-informed campaign promise, while the case for staying in is overwhelming. But damaging as it is, this decision is not the beginning of the end for efforts to contain climate change. The world decided in Paris to confront the climate threat, and it is not turning back.

Around the world, climate change is a metastasizing danger, for some countries even an existential threat. It was understood in the years leading up to the Paris negotiation that the climate challenge could be met only with a new kind of agreement premised on concerted effort by all. That agreement—ambitious, universal, transparent, balanced—was reached in Paris, with the help of U.S. leadership every step of the way.

Trump's suggestion Thursday that he is willing to renegotiate the deal to make it fairer to the United States doesn't pass the straight-face test. The Paris agreement—for anyone who actually understands it—is entirely fair to the United States. The idea that 194 other countries will listen to Trump's insulting Rose Garden blather and say, "Sure, let's sit down and negotiate a new deal" is ridiculous.

Instead, Trump's decision will be seen as an ugly betrayal—self-centered, callous, hollow, cruel. The ravages of climate change have been on display in recent years in the superstorms, floods, rising sea levels, droughts, fires and deadly heat waves that will only get worse as the carbon index mounts. Vulnerable countries will look at the United States, the richest power on Earth, the largest historic emitter of greenhouse gases, and think—even if they do not say—how dare you?

President Barack Obama once said to business leaders, in a Roosevelt Room meeting I attended, that climate change was the one threat, other than nuclear weapons, with the potential to alter the course of human progress. A near-consensus of major U.S. companies urged the Trump administration to stay in the agreement because they know climate change is real, that the Paris agreement is a good and balanced deal, that their own concerns on matters such as intellectual property and trade will be defended only if U.S. negotiators are at the table and that turning the United States into a climate-change pariah will be bad for business, for access to markets and for investment. But our chief-executive president decided to leave U.S. business in the lurch.

All this is more than disappointing. And watching the so-called internal battle on this issue play out between determined antagonists on the one side and diffident, sotto voce defenders on the other was downright depressing.

But let's be clear: This is not the end of the line. This is a call to arms.

Countries won't follow Trump out of the Paris climate agreement and over a cliff. They won't give Trump the satisfaction of "canceling" the agreement, as he promised during his campaign. They will want to show that they can carry on without the United States. And they know too well that climate change is real and that if the Paris regime fell apart, they'd just have to build it again. They will hold on to the hope that the current administration will be a one-term wonder. It is true that, in the longer run, it would be difficult for the Paris regime to produce accelerated action at the level that is needed without the United States. But other countries will probably bet that the United States will come back.

Progressive U.S. states and cities also have a crucial role to play, not only in extending the good work they are already doing on climate change, but also by sending a clear and resounding message to the global community: that while Trump's Washington may have gone dark on climate change, inspired centers of innovation and commitment are lighting the way forward all over the country. In states such as California and New York, Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Illinois and North Carolina, and in New England; in cities such as New York, Chicago,

Los Angeles, Houston and New Orleans, among many others. These entities account for a sizable chunk of both U.S. gross domestic product and carbon emissions. They may not be able to get the United States all the way to our 2025 Paris emissions target, but they have the potential to go far.

Private companies, too, have been instrumental in driving the clean-energy revolution, pursuing the massive economic opportunities presented by the need to decarbonize our energy system. And consumers are increasingly demanding that companies not only provide desirable products or services, but also stand as good corporate citizens.

Finally, for citizens, it is time to hold our leaders accountable at all levels of government. Protecting our nation, our children and our American heritage should not be optional for an elected leader. Nor should preserving America's singular standing in the world.

Thursday was not a good day for climate change, and it was not a good day for the United States. Nothing we say now can change that. But it is a day that needs to be remembered as the visible moment the rear-guard opposition went too far. It is a day to spark action and resolve. It is a day that needs to count.

RUSSIA SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the United States must send an unequivocal message to Vladimir Putin: we will not tolerate attacks on democracy in the United States or in Europe. That is why I have long pressed for harsher sanctions on Russia, including with Secretary of State Tillerson in his June 13 appearance before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations. I am a strong supporter of amendment No. 232 to S. 722 on Russia sanctions. While I missed the vote on June 14 due to an unanticipated illness, I would have voted yes had I been present. I voted yes on the passage of S. 722 today.

The Kremlin's ambitions are clear. It interferes in elections in the United States and Europe, in an attempt to undermine public faith in the democratic process. It wants to erode the cohesion and strength of our NATO alliance. It bolsters the hand of brutal dictators like Bashar al-Assad. It wages wars in Ukraine and Georgia, supporting insurrections against the government. It seeks to reestablish a leading role on the world's stage through an unraveling of the international order.

Russia's use of subversion, disinformation, and irregular warfare are nothing new. However, in this last U.S. presidential cycle, Russia launched an unprecedented and multifaceted campaign to undermine our elections—a view corroborated by our entire intelligence community. Russia paid more than 1,000 people—human trolls—to work out of a facility in St. Petersburg. These trolls spent their waking hours creating anti-Clinton fake news reports and disseminating these stories in key States and districts. Russia also used thousands of botnets to echo and amplify these fake news stories. Russia also targeted the

election boards of 39 States in our country, successfully infiltrating at least four voter registration databases and gaining access to hundreds of thousands of voter records. They even attempted to infiltrate the Maryland State Elections Board, but were not successful.

In response to these attacks, I filed an amendment to S. 722 that would ensure the United States develops a strategic, long-term approach to combat Russia's cyber warfare. My amendment requires a unified strategy developed with our NATO allies and European partners to counter Russia's cyber attacks, including Russia's efforts to undermine our democratic elections. It would also require the FBI to establish a high-level cybersecurity liaison for Presidential campaigns and major national campaign committees, so that the United States is prepared for Russia's next attempt to interfere with our elections. The liaison would share cyber threats as they arise and cyber security protocols with these organizations to stave off cyber attacks. Given the critical importance of shoring up our own cyber defenses, I plan to introduce this amendment as standalone legislation at a later point.

I also filed a second amendment to S. 722 that prohibits the President from returning diplomatic compounds in Maryland and New York that the United States seized last December, in response to Russian interference in our elections. It is outrageous that President Trump is considering allowing the Russians access to these facilities, which they used to spy on the United States. I am proud to have worked with Senator CARDIN to incorporate this provision into the larger Russia sanctions bill. Senator CARDIN and I will keep working to hold Russia and the Trump administration accountable.

This legislation demonstrates to our allies and partners around the world that the United States will not stand idly when our democracy is under attack. I commend my colleagues for working across the aisle to impose tougher sanctions on Russia. Today the Senate put patriotism over partisanship.

PRIDE ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Police Reporting of Information Data and Evidence Act, or PRIDE Act—legislation I introduced on Thursday, May 25, 2017. This bill would increase accountability and transparency for law enforcement by requiring States to report to the Department of Justice use of force incidents that occur between police officers and civilians. I am proud to have introduced this important bill and I want to thank Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN for joining the legislation as an original cosponsor. I also want to thank Representative JOAQUIN CASTRO for introducing a House companion of the PRIDE Act.

Across our Nation, law enforcement officers put their lives on the line each day to protect our communities. These individuals have answered the call to serve, and we owe these brave men and women our deepest respect and gratitude. As mayor of Newark, NJ, I saw firsthand the dangers police officers face each and every day. They must make tough, split-second decisions that have life and death consequences. They truly have one of the toughest jobs in America.

We must provide law enforcement with the tools and resources they need to do their jobs safely and effectively. That is why I have been a strong advocate for robust funding for the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant program, Bulletproof Vest Partnership program, and the Community Oriented Policing Services Hiring program. These programs support law enforcement in their mission and help make our communities safe.

While the vast majority of police officers serve with integrity and perform their duties without incident, we know that there are instances when officers engage in inappropriate uses of force. These cases are not emblematic of law enforcement as the whole; however, these incidents have eroded trust between law enforcement and the communities they are sworn to protect. This is especially the case today due to the number of incidents that are caught on video and shared on the internet. This phenomena only exacerbates the difficult job police officers have and fails to lend clarity to the actual number of cases of excessive use of force that occur nationwide.

We must work to shore up that trust deficit and ensure that those who break the law and use excessive force are held accountable and those who rightfully uphold the law are viewed in the correct light. We must collect more data on use of force incidents between law enforcement and civilians. As former Federal Bureau of Investigations Director James Comey said in an address to Georgetown University, "Without complete and accurate data, we are left with 'ideological thunderbolts.' And that helps spark unrest and distrust and does not help us get better."

For those reasons, I introduced the PRIDE Act. This legislation would require States to report to the Justice Department any incident where use of force is used against a civilian or against a law enforcement officer. It would mandate the collection of certain information such as national origin, sex, race, ethnicity, age, physical disability, mental disability, English language proficiency, housing status, and school status of each civilian against whom law enforcement used force. It would require officers to record the date, time, and location of the incident and whether the jurisdiction allows for the open-carry or concealed-carry of a firearm. It would require the officer to detail whether the

civilian was armed and the type of force used and the types of weapons used in the incident. The bill would require the officer to explain why force was used, provide a description of any injuries sustained as a result of the incident, detail how many officers and civilians were involved, and provide a brief description of the circumstances surrounding the incident.

The bill would create a grant program to help smaller law enforcement agencies—those with 100 employees or less—comply with the provisions of the bill. Also, it would allow those agencies to use the grant money to create public awareness campaigns designed to gain information regarding shootings and use of force incidents against police officers. Lastly, the legislation would allow agencies to use the funds to conduct use-of-force training, including deescalation and bias training.

There is no excuse not to collect more data on use of force incidents between law enforcement officers and civilians. Shining a spotlight on these instances will improve police-community relations, vindicate wrongly accused law enforcement officers, and provide lawmakers with the information they need to devise smart and effective policy. I am proud to have introduced the PRIDE Act, and I urge its speedy passage.

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF LEBANON, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Lebanon, ME. Lebanon was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

The year of Lebanon's incorporation, 1767, was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. For thousands of years, the land of fields, streams, and forests of what is now southwestern Maine was the home of the Abenaki, who called the area "Towwoh," meaning "a place to grind corn." The many archeological treasures unearthed in the region include a large ancient stone mortar used by the Abenaki for that very purpose.

In 1733, the Massachusetts General Court granted Towwoh Plantation to 60 colonists, and European settlement began. When the town was incorporated on June 11, 1767, the name Lebanon was chosen in reference to the Biblical land of fertile soil and towering trees.

With the Salmon Falls River and Little River providing power, Lebanon soon was home to many lumber, grain, and textile mills. The wealth produced by the land and by hard work and determination was invested in schools and churches to create a true community.

Among the many prominent residents of the town over the years was

the Reverend Oren Burbank Cheney, who established the Lebanon Academy in 1849. His courage and vision as an outspoken opponent of slavery and advocate for full rights for women and Native Americans so impressed Boston industrialist Benjamin Bates that, when Bates College was established in Lewiston in 1864, the Reverend Cheney was named as the first president of the esteemed school.

The coming of the railroads in the late 1800s helped to make Lebanon a tourism destination, with fine hotels, inns, and restaurants. An early visitor was the famed Norwegian violinist, Ole Bornemann Bull, who performed a concert at one of the town's remarkable attractions, the enormous cavern entrance known as Gully Oven, in 1871. The virtuoso was so impressed by the acoustics of the natural amphitheater that he bought a home in Lebanon, becoming one of the town's first summer residents.

Today visitors and residents alike enjoy Lebanon's quiet parks, beautiful historic buildings, and exciting outdoor recreation opportunities. The energy and planning that are going into Lebanon's 250th anniversary celebration this July demonstrate the pride townspeople have in their town.

The celebration of Lebanon's 250th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time; it is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for longer than America has been a nation, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Lebanon, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER SANTOS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend Jennifer Santos for her service on the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

She has served for 5 years as a very capable budget analyst for the Subcommittee on Defense. Her accomplishments have been very impressive and a credit to the Senate.

After graduating from Wheeling Jesuit University with a degree in mathematics, Jennifer joined a defense contractor in support of the Air Force's F-22 program. She played an important role in that program and can be proud of her contribution to fielding the most capable fighter aircraft ever developed.

Her talent was soon recognized by the Air Force where she served in a series of important positions, including those involving special programs that are key to protecting our national security. Jennifer established a reputation for competence in working with leaders from Department of Defense, Congress, and other agencies to ensure the responsible allocation of taxpayer dollars.

Jennifer's detailed knowledge of military budgeting and acquisition systems allowed her to make insightful

recommendations to the subcommittee, which have resulted in the better investment of tens of billions of taxpayer dollars over her Senate tenure. In particular, her efforts have supported increased Army helicopter procurement, important research and development projects funding, and legislation to improve the management of the Department of Defense.

Jennifer Santos has upheld the highest standards of a budget analyst, congressional staffer, and defense professional. Although she is soon leaving the committee, I wish her all the best on her next steps in her distinguished career and thank her for her work in the U.S. Senate.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL SARAH B. GOLDMAN

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to my constituent LTC Sarah B. Goldman for her exemplary dedication to duty and service to the U.S. Army and to the United States of America. She has served the last year as the chief of Congressional Affairs, Office of the Army Surgeon General. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman was born and raised in Nashville, TN, and received her commission as a lieutenant junior grade in the U.S. Navy in 1998. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman transferred to the U.S. Army in 2008.

Prior to her current assignment, LTC Sarah Goldman served as a congressional liaison in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, as the medical liaison for the Army Surgeon General.

Lieutenant Colonel Goldman served as the Army Traumatic Brain Injury Program director at the Office of the Surgeon General, Rehabilitation and Reintegration Division, in Falls Church, VA, from 2010–2013. In 2011, she deployed to Afghanistan as a member of the International Security Assistance Force Joint Command's special assistant for Health Affairs Health Service Support Assessment Team to review traumatic brain injury care in the Combined Joint Operations Area-Afghanistan.

Lieutenant Colonel Goldman served as the Army's service representative to multiple Department of Defense traumatic brain injury working groups and, in 2010, was appointed as a member of the NATO Technical Team "Mild traumatic brain injury in a Military Operational Setting." At the U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine's Military Performance Division Lieutenant Colonel Goldman conducted research studies related to rehabilitation from traumatic brain injury and upper extremity neuromusculoskeletal injuries. She deployed to Balad, Iraq, from August 2009 to February 2010 as a senior scientist with the Joint Combat Casualty Research

Team. Her Navy assignments include assistant department head, Physical and Occupational Therapy Department, Naval Hospital Jacksonville, and division officer, Educational and Developmental Intervention Services, Naval Hospital Yokosuka, Japan. In 2004, the Navy selected Lieutenant Colonel Goldman as the "Navy Occupational Therapist of the Year."

She holds a Ph.D. from Indiana University in kinesiology and is a graduate of Washington University in St. Louis, master's degree in occupational therapy and a bachelor of arts degree, with a follow-on fellowship at Vanderbilt University. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman has presented at numerous national conferences, authored peer-reviewed professional articles in five different scientific journals, has published a book chapter, and served as a reviewer for two major rehabilitation journals. Lieutenant Colonel Goldman was the first Department of Defense representative appointed to the American Occupational Therapy Association's research advisory panel and is a member of the American Hand Therapy Foundation Board.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending LTC Sarah Goldman for nearly two decades of Active service to her country. We wish Sarah and her family all the best as they continue their journey of service.●

TRIBUTE TO PAM MOORE

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Pam Moore, the Benchmark plant manager in Lewis and Clark County. Pam has spent many years supervising a staff of hard-working Montanans doing their best to produce useful products for a variety of government agencies.

For well over three decades, the Benchmark Manufacturing Plant in Helena has produced tens of thousands of backpacks that have been distributed across the United States. For nearly 18 years, Pam has supervised production at the plant. Over half of Pam's team at the plant are disabled Montanans, and that team has done highly respectable work under her guidance. Their quality products help U.S. Forest Service wildland firefighters carry their equipment. With our abundant forests in Montana, we know how important it is to have the proper equipment in the hands of our firefighters, and over the years, the employees at the Benchmark Manufacturing Plant have had abundant success getting the right equipment to the right customer. For that, we are very grateful.

Montanans have earned a well-deserved reputation for being reliable and hard-working, and Pam and her team are great examples of that assessment. When asked about her favorite part of the job, Pam said she enjoys that her teammates are able to work. Valuing

work is a Montana tradition. Thank you, Pam, for having a steady hand helping others to overcome obstacles, reach their potential, and get the job done.●

REMEMBERING QUARRIER "Q" COOK

● Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, from the moment she arrived in Santa Fe in 1983, Quarrier "Q" Cook gave back. She gave her time to the Santa Fe Community Foundation as a board member. She gave her knack for fundraising to the Santa Fe Chamber Music Festival as cochair of several endowment campaigns and as board president from 2002 to 2005. She gave her energy and attention to many of New Mexico's social services organizations.

She gave whatever she could give to make New Mexico a better place.

Last year, Q Cook and her husband Phillip Cook received the Santa Fe Community Foundation's Philanthropic Leadership Award during the annual Pinon Awards Ceremony. In her acceptance speech, she remarked that in order to be part of a community, "you have to help the community" in small and large ways.

Q Cook's commitment to these values and her interest in helping others came from growing up in a family that always gave back and expected their children to do the same. She was born on April 7, 1935, in Wheeling, WV, to Thomas Moffat Block and Nancy Fulton and grew up seeing her parents' commitment to activism and public service. She attended Vassar College, earned a political science degree, and became involved in political activism herself.

She had three children: Thomas McKittrick Jones, Nancy Jones Carter, and Clare Fitz-Gerald Jones. She shared her love for the Southwest's culture with her daughter Clare, with whom she opened a southwestern home furnishings boutique in Washington, DC, called Santa Fe Style. As the buyer for the store, Q made sure that New Mexico had a presence in our Nation's Capital.

Back at home, she was known as a driving force who achieved whatever goal she set out to reach. She was someone any New Mexican would want on their side, someone who was generous, always willing to open her home, and give her time.

At the Pinon Awards, she said, "We hope that a little bit of what we have done has made the world a better place for some people."

Q Cook made the world a better place for lots of us, and New Mexico is indebted to her lifetime of service.●

RECOGNIZING BALLARD FAMILY DAIRY AND CHEESE

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, it is not every day that we take a moment to commemorate America's family-owned businesses that dedicate themselves to

serving their local communities. I stand before you today to recognize a small business that emphasizes service, tradition, and family values. In my home State of Idaho, I have had the privilege of seeing firsthand Idahoans' dynamic use of natural resources. In our State, we continue to watch our agricultural small businesses advance and thrive. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my privilege to honor Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese of Gooding as the Senate Small Business of the Month for June 2017. Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese has been a pioneer in Idaho's artisan cheesemaking community and is a remarkable example of entrepreneurial innovation.

With just a few Jersey calves and a strong work ethic, the Ballard family started their dairy farm in 1995. Steve and Stacie Ballard, along with their children, Travis and Jessica, have worked hard to perfect cheeses that are distinctive and can only be cultivated in Idaho's unique climate. Their goal was to create a cheese that was specific to Idaho. Since then, the Ballard family has developed a successful in-house cheese facility that has produced numerous award-winning specialty cheeses. The Ballard family gained the skills to produce artisan cheeses over years of hard work and trial and error. Their determination has allowed them to produce a fresh and original-tasting commodity unique to Idaho.

The Ballard family produces numerous types of hand-crafted cheeses, including cheddar, gouda, and cheese curds. Their facility produces approximately 3,000 pounds of cheese daily. Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese cows are individually cared for, which ensures that the calves are healthy and allows for the finest cheese. This well-executed cheese production system combined with small batch sizes enables the Ballard family to achieve the right consistencies for high-quality cheeses.

Award-winning cheese is not the only noted accomplishments this family-run business has attained. In 2013, the Ballards' cheese facility was distinguished by the Innovation Center for U.S. Dairy as having "Outstanding Achievement in Energy Efficiency." By adjusting their operational processes, their facility in Gooding has reduced their energy costs by about \$23,000 annually.

Beyond the Ballard family's thriving retail throughout the State, the Ballards also provide educational resources with their cheese purchasing information to Idahoans who are interested in learning about cheesemaking methods. Ballard Family Dairy and Cheese is an exceptional example of the entrepreneurial spirit of Idaho agriculture and of innovative energy practices from a family-owned business. I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to the Ballard family and all of the employees of Ballard Family

Dairy and Cheese for being selected as the June 2017 Small Business of the Month. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1083. An act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 2:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2372. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit.

H.R. 2579. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1083. An act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 304. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to allow the Indian Health Service to cover the cost of a copayment of an Indian or Alaska Native veteran

receiving medical care or services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-112).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 346. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System (Rept. No. 115-113).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2022.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Vishal J. Amin, of Michigan, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President.

Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1361. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1362. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to consolidate certain eligibility tiers under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1363. A bill to streamline the process for broadband facility location applications on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1364. A bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1365. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to include victims of acts of terror in the evaluation and treatment of veterans and civilians at military treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1366. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1367. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study and issue a report that quantifies the energy savings benefits of operational efficiency programs and services for commercial, institutional, industrial, and governmental entities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1368. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an excise tax on certain prescription drugs which have been subject to a price spike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1370. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1371. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1372. A bill to require updated limits on levels of lead in fruit juice beverages and an updated tolerable daily level of lead exposure from foods, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1373. A bill to designate the Gulf of Mexico Alliance as a Regional Coordination Partnership of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1374. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1375. A bill to repeal section 3003 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1376. A bill to ensure that all fast-tracked reconciliation bills are subject to a committee hearing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORKER, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. STRANGE, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. Res. 191. A resolution designating June 20, 2017, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 192. A resolution congratulating the Golden State Warriors for their historic championship victory in the 2017 National Basketball Association Finals; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS,

Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 193. A resolution commending the bravery of the United States Capitol Police, the Police Department of Alexandria, Virginia, and all first responders who protected Members of Congress, their staff, and others during the shooting on June 14, 2017, at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in the Del Ray neighborhood of Alexandria, Virginia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. Res. 194. A resolution designating June 15, 2017, as "World Elder Abuse Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 236

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 372

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 372, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that merchandise arriving through the mail shall be subject to review by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and to require the provision of advance electronic information on shipments of mail to U.S. Customs and Border Protection and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, *supra*.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 593

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 635

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 667, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, 37, and 38, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304a or 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services and veterans for certain benefits and for calculating the deadlines for certain benefits.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the

United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

S. 967

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 967, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program, and for other purposes.

S. 981

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency materials pilot program.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1268

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1268, a bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse and to reauthorize grants to improve the well-being of families affected by substance abuse.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1311, a bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with re-

spect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. RES. 49

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 49, a resolution declaring that achieving the primary goal of the National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease of the Department of Health and Human Services to prevent and effectively treat Alzheimer's disease by 2025 is an urgent national priority.

AMENDMENT NO. 232

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 232 proposed to S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 240 proposed to S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

AMENDMENT NO. 250

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 250 proposed to S. 722, an Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 250 proposed to S. 722, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1374. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the introduction of the bipartisan Compassionate Access, Research Expansion, and Respect States Act, or CARERS Act. The bill would make our Federal laws dealing with medical marijuana fairer and help ensure that Americans have access to the care they need. I am proud to introduce this legislation, and I want to thank Senators RAND PAUL and KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND for working with me on this bill. I also want to thank Senators LISA MURKOWSKI, AL FRANKEN, and MIKE LEE for joining the

CARERS Act as original cosponsors and Representatives STEVE COHEN and DON YOUNG for introducing a House companion bill.

Right now, regardless of whether you are in a State that has legalized medical marijuana, it is illegal under Federal law. This inconsistency puts growers, distributors, and patients at great risk of Federal prosecution even though they are in compliance with State law.

In 2013, the Department of Justice issued guidance to Federal prosecutors to refrain from prosecuting individuals that use, purchase, or sell marijuana in States where it is legal as long as a State regulatory framework exists that maintains certain standards, such as a ban on sales to minors. As a result of this guidance, more and more States have taken steps to legalize medical marijuana.

Sadly, despite this guidance, the inability of the Federal Government to be aligned with States regarding the legality of medical marijuana has resulted in confusion and uncertainty for State lawmakers and the public about what the law requires. This lack of clarity is only part of the problem. Individual users of medical marijuana in States with legalized medical marijuana continue to be targeted by the Drug Enforcement Agency.

And now, more than ever, I am especially concerned with Attorney General Jeff Sessions as our Nation's top law enforcement officer. His radical stance on marijuana is way out of the mainstream, and he has taken steps to reinvigorate the failed War on Drugs. Recently, he wrote a letter to Senate and House leadership asking them not to renew an appropriations rider that prevents the Justice Department from spending money on cases that involve individuals who are in compliance with State medical marijuana laws. He said, "I believe it would be unwise for Congress to restrict the discretion of the Department to fund particular prosecutions, particularly in the midst of an historic drug epidemic and potentially long-term uptick in violent crime." Contrary to Attorney General Sessions' views, this is not a problem we can jail ourselves out of.

Individuals who use medical marijuana in States where it is legal should not fear prosecution simply based on prosecutorial discretion. It is time for Congress to act.

Today, I reintroduced the CARERS Act. First, and most importantly, the bill would end the Federal prohibition of medical marijuana. Millions of Americans need to gain access to the medicine that works best for them. The Federal Government's current stance on medical marijuana has only created confusion and uncertainty. This bill would prohibit the Federal Government from prosecuting persons who are in compliance with State medical marijuana laws and let people gain access to the care they need.

The bill would also allow States to import cannabidiol, commonly called

CBD for short. CBD is an oil substance made from a marijuana plant that contains virtually no THC—meaning you experience no high from the drug. CBD is the medicine so many children need—along with thousands of other individuals with Dravet syndrome—to control seizures. We must make this important drug more available so people can access the medication they need.

The bill would promote research. A large problem for our Nation is that not enough research exists on the impact of medical marijuana. We know there are legitimate medical uses of the drug, but we can learn much more. We need to allow experts to access the drug to conduct tests and clinical trials to fully understand the effects of the drug and how it can best be utilized. This will only benefit the doctors that prescribe it, the lawmakers that regulate it, and the people that need it.

Finally, the bill would allow VA doctors to recommend medical marijuana to veterans in States that have legalized medical marijuana. Many men and women in uniform who have bravely served our Nation come home with invisible wounds of war, and they deserve the best care available. This means allowing them access to the medicine they need to heal or control their condition. Those who have served our Nation deserve to be served by us, and that means receiving the best care available.

The CARERS Act was the first medical marijuana bill introduced in the Senate. Unfortunately, we did not pass it in the last Congress, but I am hopeful that in the 115th Congress we can get this bill across the finish line and send it to the President's desk for signature. I, again, want to thank my colleagues who worked with me on this bill, and I urge its speedy passage.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1376. A bill to ensure that all fast-tracked reconciliation bills are subject to a committee hearing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 1376

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 "No Hearing, No Vote Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. COMMITTEE HEARINGS FOR RECONCILIATION BILLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) COMMITTEE HEARINGS FOR RECONCILIATION BILLS.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution, unless—

"(1) the reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution was—

"(A) ordered reported to the Senate under subsection (b)(1) by the committee of the Senate receiving reconciliation instructions; or

"(B) reported by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate under subsection (b)(2) after receiving recommendations ordered to be reported to the Committee on the Budget by 1 or more committees of the Senate receiving reconciliation instructions; and

"(2) each committee that ordered reported the reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution or ordered recommendations to be reported to the Committee on the Budget held not less than 1 hearing regarding any major provision of the reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution within the jurisdiction of such committee."

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting "310(h)," after "310(d)(2),"; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting "310(h)," after "310(d)(2),".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 194—DESIGNATING JUNE 15, 2017, AS "WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY"

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 194

Whereas the Federal Government estimates that more than 1 in 10 persons over the age of 60 are victims of elder abuse each year;

Whereas abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults in the United States goes unidentified and unreported due to an inability to report or a fear of reporting;

Whereas only 1 in 14 cases of financial abuse of older adults is reported;

Whereas at least \$2,900,000,000 is taken from older adults each year due to financial abuse and exploitation;

Whereas elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation have no boundaries and cross all racial, social, class, gender, and geographic lines;

Whereas older adults who are abused are 3 times more likely to die earlier than older adults of the same age who are not abused;

Whereas ½ of all older adults with dementia will experience abuse;

Whereas providing unwanted medical treatment can be a form of elder abuse and exploitation;

Whereas public awareness has the potential to increase the identification and reporting of elder abuse by the public, professionals, and victims, and can act as a catalyst to promote issue-based education and long-term prevention;

Whereas private individuals and public agencies must work together on the Federal, State, and local levels to combat increasing occurrences of abuse, neglect, exploitation crime, and violence against vulnerable older adults and vulnerable adults, particularly in light of limited resources for vital protective services; and

Whereas 2017 is the 12th anniversary of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 15, 2017, as “World Elder Abuse Awareness Day”;

(2) recognizes judges, lawyers, adult protective services professionals, law enforcement officers, long-term care ombudsmen, social workers, health care providers, professional guardians, advocates for victims, and other professionals and agencies for the efforts to advance awareness of elder abuse; and

(3) encourages members of the public and professionals who work with older adults to act as catalysts to promote awareness and long-term prevention of elder abuse by reaching out to local adult protective services agencies, long-term care ombudsman programs, and the National Center on Elder Abuse, and by learning to recognize, detect, report, and respond to elder abuse.

SENATE RESOLUTION 191—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2017, AS “AMERICAN EAGLE DAY” AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORKER, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. STRANGE, and Mr. PERDUE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 191

Whereas the bald eagle was chosen as the central image of the Great Seal of the United States on June 20, 1782, by the Founding Fathers at the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is widely known as the living national symbol of the United States and for many generations has represented values, such as—

- (1) freedom;
- (2) democracy;
- (3) courage;
- (4) strength;
- (5) spirit;
- (6) independence;
- (7) justice; and
- (8) excellence;

Whereas the bald eagle is unique to North America and cannot be found naturally in any other part of the world, which was one of the primary reasons the Founding Fathers selected the bald eagle to symbolize the Government of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the official logos of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

- (1) the Executive Office of the President;
- (2) Congress;
- (3) the Supreme Court of the United States;

- (4) the Department of Defense;
- (5) the Department of the Treasury;
- (6) the Department of Justice;
- (7) the Department of State;
- (8) the Department of Commerce;
- (9) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (10) the Department of Veterans Affairs;
- (11) the Department of Labor;
- (12) the Department of Health and Human Services;
- (13) the Department of Energy;
- (14) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (15) the Central Intelligence Agency; and
- (16) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas the image and symbolism of the bald eagle has—

- (1) played a significant role in art, music, literature, architecture, commerce, education, and culture in the United States; and
- (2) appeared on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the bald eagle was endangered and facing possible extinction in the lower 48 States but has made a gradual and encouraging comeback to the land, waterways, and skies of the United States;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the national bird of the United States is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example to other environmental, natural resource, and wildlife conservation efforts worldwide;

Whereas, in 1940, noting that the bald eagle was threatened with extinction, Congress passed the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), which prohibited killing, selling, or possessing the species, and a 1962 amendment expanded protection to the golden eagle;

Whereas, by 1963, there were only an estimated 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remaining in the lower 48 States, with loss of habitat, poaching, and the use of pesticides and other environmental contaminants contributing to the near demise of the national bird of the United States;

Whereas, in 1967, the bald eagle was officially declared an endangered species under Public Law 89-669 (80 Stat. 926) (commonly known as the “Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966”) in areas in the United States south of the 40th parallel due to the dramatic decline in the population of the bald eagle in the lower 48 States;

Whereas the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) was enacted in 1973, and in 1978, the bald eagle was listed as an endangered species throughout the lower 48 States, except in the States of Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, in which the bald eagle was listed as a threatened species;

Whereas, in July 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced that in the lower 48 States, the bald eagle had recovered sufficiently to change the status of the species from endangered to threatened;

Whereas, by 2007, bald eagles residing in the lower 48 States had rebounded to approximately 11,000 pairs;

Whereas, on June 28, 2007, the Secretary the Interior and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service removed the bald eagle from protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but the bald eagle continues to be protected under the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the “Lacey Act”),

and the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.);

Whereas Challenger, the trained, educational bald eagle of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee, was invited by the Secretary of the Interior to perform a free-flight demonstration during the official bald eagle delisting ceremony held at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas experts and population growth charts estimate that the bald eagle population could reach 15,000 pairs, even though a physical count has not been conducted by State and Federal wildlife agencies since 2007;

Whereas caring and concerned agencies, corporations, organizations, and people of the United States representing Federal and State governments and the private sector passionately and resourcefully banded together, determined to save and protect the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the recovery of the bald eagle population in the United States was largely accomplished through—

(1) the dedicated and vigilant efforts of Federal and State wildlife agencies and nonprofit organizations, such as the American Eagle Foundation;

(2) public education;

(3) captive breeding and release programs;

(4) hacking and release programs; and

(5) the translocation of bald eagles from places in the United States with dense bald eagle populations to suitable locations in the lower 48 States that had suffered a decrease in bald eagle populations;

Whereas various nonprofit organizations, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, contribute to the continuing recovery of the bald eagle through rehabilitation and educational efforts;

Whereas the bald eagle might have been lost permanently if not for dedicated conservation efforts and strict protection laws such as—

(1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(2) the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);

(3) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(4) section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the “Lacey Act”); and

(5) the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.); and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle population will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs to ensure that the population numbers and habitat of the bald eagle remain healthy and secure for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2017, as “American Eagle Day”;

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury to generate critical funds for the protection of the bald eagle; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 192—CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR THEIR HISTORIC CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY IN THE 2017 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION FINALS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a resolution recognizing and heartily commending the Golden State Warriors for their dazzling season and 2017 World Championship victory.

After going 16 and 1 in the postseason, earning the highest win percentage in NBA playoff history, and defeating the Cleveland Cavaliers 129 to 120 in game five of the NBA Finals, the Warriors have become champions for the second time in just 3 years. The best part: they did something for their fans that had never been done before—they won the title at home, in Oracle Arena. As a bay area native myself, I know how much this means to all of Dub Nation.

Everyone who is a part of the Warriors Organization—the video staff, the trainers, the owners, coaches, players and fans—deserves praise for a hard-fought and historic 2016 to 2017 season. The year was primarily marked by highs. Among my favorites was Klay Thompson's astonishing 29-minute, 60-point performance against the Indiana Pacers. And who could forget Steph Curry's mind-boggling, half-court buzzer-beater against the Clippers?

The Warriors undoubtedly played remarkable basketball this year, but they also overcame their share of obstacles. When Coach Kerr was forced to take a leave of absence, the team rallied behind him and, under Mike Brown's leadership, continued to earn wins in his honor. When starters were sidelined due to injury, bench players stepped in and stepped up, demonstrating the team's depth and heart. When the Warriors were knocked down by the Cavaliers in game four of the finals, they woke up the next morning, flew home, and got straight to work—running hours of drills so they could come back stronger in game five.

The Warriors are a team with resolve and great character. They are highly focused but still manage to have fun together. They take care of each other, and equally as important, they take care of their community. The Warriors recognize that they are in a unique position to give back and effect positive change.

Over the past several years, the Warriors Foundation has awarded \$5 million in grants to support educational initiatives in Alameda and San Francisco Counties. The foundation, along with individual players, has also refurbished over 60 basketball courts throughout the bay area, creating safe and beautiful places for our young people to play.

So, to MVP Kevin Durant, Coach Kerr, Coach Brown, Joe Lacob, Peter Guber, Rick Welts, Bob Myers and all of the players, coaches, staff, family, friends and fans, I say thank you. Thank you for making California proud both on and off the court, and congratulations on a job well done.

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

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

S. RES. 192

Whereas, on June 12, 2017, the Golden State Warriors defeated the Cleveland Cavaliers by a score of 129–120 in an extraordinary game 5 at Oracle Arena in Oakland, California, to win the 2017 National Basketball Association (referred to in the preamble as the “NBA”) Finals;

Whereas the Golden State Warriors captured their second championship in 3 years, and their fifth championship in franchise history;

Whereas the 2017 championship victory marks the first time a Bay Area professional sports team has clinched a championship title at home in 43 years;

Whereas in 2017 the Golden State Warriors had the NBA's best regular-season record with 67 wins, capping an extraordinary 3-year run, during which the Warriors won a record-setting 207 regular season games;

Whereas the Golden State Warriors finished the post-season 16–1, which constitutes the best post-season record in the 71-year history of the NBA;

Whereas every single member of the 2016–2017 Golden State Warriors team contributed to this championship, including Matt Barnes, Ian Clark, Stephen Curry, Kevin Durant, Draymond Green, Andre Iguodala, Damian Jones, Shaun Livingston, Kevon Looney, James Michael McAdoo, Patrick McCaw, JaVale McGee, ZaZa Pachulia, Klay Thompson, and David West;

Whereas Kevin Durant became just the sixth player to score 30 or more points in each game of a championship round, and was named Most Valuable Player of the NBA Finals;

Whereas Steve Kerr, Mike Brown, and the entire team of coaches and staff have been instrumental in developing the Golden State Warriors' dynamic and record-setting style of play, and have fostered a positive, selfless team spirit;

Whereas Joe Lacob and Peter Guber have built one of the most exciting and high-performing franchises in NBA history;

Whereas the dedicated fan base of Golden State Warriors has offered unrelenting, passionate support to the team; and

Whereas, both on and off the court, the Golden State Warriors are an immense source of pride for the Bay Area and the entire Golden State Warrior fan base: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2017 National Basketball Association Finals;

(2) recognizes the historic achievements of all the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the 2016–2017 season; and

(3) celebrates the selfless teamwork and extraordinary character, pride, determination, and hard-work of the Golden State Warriors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—COMMENDING THE BRAVERY OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, AND ALL FIRST RESPONDERS WHO PROTECTED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, THEIR STAFF, AND OTHERS DURING THE SHOOTING ON JUNE 14, 2017, AT EUGENE SIMPSON STADIUM PARK IN THE DEL RAY NEIGHBORHOOD OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 193

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the heroism of United States Capitol Police Special Agents David Bailey and Crystal Griner, both of whom sustained injuries, and Henry Cabrera, after responding to, containing, and ultimately ending the threat to Members of Congress, their staff, and others during the shooting at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in Alexandria, Virginia, on the morning of June 14, 2017;

(2) recognizes the Police Department, the Office of the Sheriff, and the Fire Department of Alexandria, Virginia, who reported to the scene without hesitation, and the first responders who treated the wounded;

(3) recognizes the additional victims who survived the shooting and supports their continued recovery from physical and psychological wounds, including—

(A) Steve Scalise, the Majority Whip of the House of Representatives;

(B) Zachary Barth, a staffer for Representative Roger Williams; and

(C) Matthew Mika, a former legislative staffer;

(4) offers sympathy and support to the families and friends of the survivors;

(5) recognizes that threats to Members of Congress also operate to threaten the foundations of our representative democracy; and

(6) recognizes the United States Capitol Police—

(A) who protect Members of Congress and employees, visitors, and facilities of Congress; and

(B) whose professionalism, vigilance, and self-sacrifice is a daily example of the steadfast patriotism that civil servants should strive for in service to one another and to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 255. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CORKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 722, to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 255. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CORKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 722, to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:
 "An Act to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 10 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., in 328A Russell Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Agricultural Research: Perspectives on Past and Future Successes for the 2018 Farm Bill."

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2018 and the future years defense program.

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 Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 9:45 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Fostering Economic Growth: Midsized, Regional and Large Institution Perspective."

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 10 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 15, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 10:15 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 15, 2017, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 11 a.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing on legislation pending before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 1:30 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed briefing followed by a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled, "Agency Approaches to Reorganization: Examining OMB's Memorandum on the Federal Workforce."

AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 191, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 191) designating June 20, 2017, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reso-

lution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 191) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR THEIR HISTORIC CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY IN THE 2017 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION FINALS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 192, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 192) congratulating the Golden State Warriors for their historic championship victory in the 2017 National Basketball Association Finals.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

COMMENDING THE BRAVERY OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, AND ALL FIRST RESPONDERS WHO PROTECTED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, THEIR STAFF, AND OTHERS DURING THE SHOOTING OF JUNE 14, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 193, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 193) commending the bravery of the United States Capitol Police, the Police Department of Alexandria, Virginia, and all first responders who protected Members of Congress, their staff, and others during the shooting on June 14, 2017, at Eugene Simpson Stadium Park in the Del Ray neighborhood of Alexandria, Virginia.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, June 19; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 5 p.m.; finally, that at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session, as under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. 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 CARPER.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, earlier, just before the leader came to give his closing remarks for the day, I was talking about that Michael Davis is going to be a freshman at Middletown High School about 20 miles south of Newark where 896 intersects with I-95.

I was mentioning that Michael has succeeded in life as an athlete in ways that a lot of people think could just never happen. He has a disease called cystic fibrosis, and it was diagnosed very early in his life, but it is a genetic disease.

I talked with him and his mom Jennifer about that disease and how it affects our bodies. It is a disease that causes persistent lung infection. According to the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the condition is caused apparently by a defective gene that causes a thick buildup of mucus in our lungs and in other organs; and that mucus can clog our airways and trap bacteria that leads to infection, can lead to extensive lung damage and, in worst

cases, to respiratory failure and then possibly maybe even likely death.

This is a disease that 14-year-old Michael Davis lives with. I have heard, for somebody who has cystic fibrosis to run any distance at all, they—I ran this morning, and I felt like I had some kind of disease. It was humid out there. I think it was probably higher levels of ozone than I like to run in.

For folks with cystic fibrosis like Michael, breathing is like they are breathing through a straw. Imagine that, trying to run 5 kilometers or a half marathon, which is 13.1 miles, and to be able to breathe through a straw effectively and still run distances like that is truly, truly remarkable, but that is what he does.

Earlier this year, he completed, as I said, the New York City half marathon, and one of the people who ran with him was my son Christopher, who is a triathlete in his own right. He is 28 years old and a great runner. He, also like Michael, can run me into the ground, and I am proud of them both.

Michael was diagnosed during a screening, I think, just 3 weeks after he was born. He was 3 weeks old, and he was diagnosed with this disease. His mom said she was shocked. To her knowledge, there weren't any members of her family on her side or the father's side who had cystic fibrosis, but this was a diagnosis made 3 weeks into Michael's life—imagine that, 3 weeks.

After the diagnosis, his mom Jennifer faced some scary unknowns as she learned more about his condition, including average life expectancy for those who have cystic fibrosis.

She immediately sought care for Michael at the Children's Hospital that is up the road from us—I live in Wilmington, DE—but it is up the road 25 miles north of Wilmington. For the last 14 years, Michael has been treated at that hospital. Obviously, the fact that he can run a half marathon with cystic fibrosis suggests that he is getting exceptional care there.

Michael sees the doctor about every 8 weeks when he is feeling well. He sees a doctor more often when he is not feeling well, when he is feeling really sick.

He wakes up every morning at 4:30. I get up around 5:30, and he has already been up for an hour when I get up in Wilmington, DE. He does it to use a high-frequency chest wall oscillation device. They call it The Vest. What it does is, it helps break up the mucus in his lungs, and he continues to use The Vest several times throughout the day. He must also take over—are you ready for this—40 medications every day. So that is his regimen.

He gets up every day at 4:30, straps on The Vest, uses it several times throughout the day. The Vest shakes up his lungs and the mucus there so he can live, and he takes all his medications as well.

He told me, when we met with him and his mom a couple weeks ago, that cystic fibrosis is very frustrating, but

he copes by trying to lead a healthy lifestyle. Just last week, Michael received national attention when he was named the Boomer Esiason Co-Athlete of the Year. Boomer was a great football quarterback, if I am not mistaken—I am tempted to say with the Cincinnati Bengals. I am looking for the pages to tell me whether I am right or wrong, but I think I am right. The Boomer Esiason Co-Athlete of the Year is Delaware's own Michael, and we are very proud of Michael, very proud of Michael.

The fact is, access to these treatments and medications are really a matter of life and death for people with cystic fibrosis. If something should happen and Michael and his family would lose healthcare, they would reach out and try to get coverage. Before we had the Affordable Care Act, there was a pretty good likelihood that finding that coverage would be very difficult, and it would be difficult because he has cystic fibrosis. He is not an inexpensive young man to take care of. To keep him alive and well and able to go to school and do the amazing regimen that he does takes money and resources, medicine and medical technology.

The way healthcare used to be provided in this country, when somebody had a preexisting condition like cystic fibrosis and they lost their healthcare—maybe a parent was working, had coverage, and lost the healthcare, lost the job—the person, in this case Michael, would have been out of luck because a lot of the health insurers used to say: Well, we don't want to cover this person because it is going to cost us a boatload of money.

I know there are problems with the Affordable Care Act. There are things I would like to change. What I hope we will do at the end of the day is not get rid of it and not just repeal it, but I hope we will retain that which is good and fix the things that ought to be fixed.

One of the things that needs to be retained is the idea that there should be a prohibition against insurance companies simply saying that if somebody has a preexisting condition and they lose coverage, they can continue to be denied coverage. They can get the coverage they need, and that is one of the very, very good things about the Affordable Care Act.

Our new pages here, you guys are about 2 years older than Michael Davis. Hopefully, you guys will live to be 100 or more. The only reason he is alive today is because he has access to the kind of healthcare we all want for our children and really for our parents.

I am a big believer—our pages hear me. I know they will only be here for 3 weeks, but they will probably hear me, when they come to the floor, talk about the Golden Rule. It is something that was impressed upon me at an early age, about the age of all of you. The Golden Rule goes something like this: Treat other people the way we want to be treated. It is pretty simple.

I grew up in a Protestant Church, but I don't care whether you are Protestant, Catholic, Jew, I don't care if you are Muslim, I don't care if you are Buddhist, Hindu—you name it—all of those religions, every one of them, has something in their Sacred Scriptures something like the Golden Rule: Treat other people the way you want to be treated.

I think we try to do that in the Affordable Care Act, imperfect as it is. I think one of the best examples of the Golden Rule in the legislation, in the law, is the idea that if somebody loses coverage and they have a preexisting condition, we don't just cast them aside and say: Well, that is too bad. We give them another shot to get the coverage they need.

In the case of Michael Davis, the coverage, the access to healthcare, keeps him alive and not just alive to mope around and feel sorry for himself but to go out and run circles around the rest of us. He is an inspiration to me, and I think he is an inspiration to all who know him.

Mr. President, I think I may possibly be the last speaker. I am going to bid you good night and see you next week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JUNE 19, 2017, AT 4 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:41 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 19, 2017, at 4 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LUCIAN NIEMEYER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE SHARON E. BURKE, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JEFFREY GERRISH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (ASIA, EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST, AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE ROBERT W. HOLLEYMAN II.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

LYNN A. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FAMILY SUPPORT, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE CARMEN R. NAZARIO.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KELLY KNIGHT CRAFT, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO CANADA.

SHARON DAY, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA. KATHLEEN TROIA MCFARLAND, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE.

NATHAN ALEXANDER SALES, OF OHIO, TO BE COORDINATOR FOR COUNTERTERRORISM, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, VICE TINA S. K Aidanow, RESIGNED.

ERIC M. UELAND, OF OREGON, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (MANAGEMENT), VICE PATRICK FRANCIS KENNEDY.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ELINORE F. MCCANCE-KATZ, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUB-

STANCE USE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE PAMELA S. HYDE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

D. MICHAEL DUNAVANT, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE EDWARD L. STANTON III, RESIGNED.

LOUIE V. FRANKLIN, SR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE GEORGE L. BECK, JR., RESIGNED.

JUSTIN E. HERDMAN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CAROLE SCHWARTZ RENDON, RESIGNED.

JOHN W. HUBER, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

JESSIE K. LIU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD C. MACHEN, JR., RESIGNED.

RICHARD W. MOORE, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KENYEN RAY BROWN, RESIGNED.

JOHN E. TOWN, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOYCE WHITE VANCE, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR 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., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. LEE K. LEVY II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR 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., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN B. COOPER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN B. DUNLAP III
COL. DONALD R. EMERSON
COL. DAVID FLEMING III
COL. RYAN T. PACE
COL. ANDREW M. ROMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. DEBORAH Y. HOWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN R. LYONS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES W. HOOPER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. EDWARD M. DALY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHELLE M. ROSE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DANIEL W. DWYER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ROSS A. MYERS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN J. BROADMEADOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH F. MCKENZIE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. VINCENT R. STEWART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. HERMAN S. CLARDY III

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

LISA E. DONOVAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KIRT L. STALLINGS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL G. RHODE
SCOTT D. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RICHARD L. ALLEN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JAMES C. BENSON
SHANNON R. KAY
JARED W. KRUGER
JACOB S. LOFTICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

TIMOTHY D. LITKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

SCOTT D. BLACKWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL A. ADAMS
ALICE L. ALVERIO
MATTHEW S. ANGELIDIS
FERDINAND K. BACOMO
DREW C. BAIRD
DARRELL F. BARKER
ELEANE M. BEADLE
ETHAN S. BERGVALL
KATHRYN E. BERRYMAN
AARON M. BETTS
DAVID V. BODE
BRIAN W. BRENNAN
ANGELA R. BRYAN
SUMMER D. BRYANT
JOHN B. CLARK
MICHELLE S. CLARK
GUY T. CLIFTON

SHAWN P. CORCORAN
CHRISTOPHER COWAN
DEBORAH J. CROWLEY
CRISTINA CRUZCRESPO
JUSTIN M. CURLEY
JOSEPH DAI
LEO A. DAMASCO
MATTHEW R. DEBIEC
ANDREW S. DELMAS
JESSE P. DELUCA
SALLY P. DELVECCHIO
RAMONA A. DEVENY
JONATHAN F. DICKENS
MICHAEL M. DICKMAN
MARY DIGIULIO
KIM EDHEGARD
KATHRYN P. EDWARDS
DELNORA L. ERICKSON
RUTH S. FAIRCLOTH
DARRELL J. FERGUSON
COLBY A. FERNELIUS
PHILLIP T. FIVECOAT
RYAN P. PLANAGAN
REBECCA A. FLORES
ANTHONY R. FRATTALONE
VINCENT T. FRY
DENNIS T. FUJII
ANDREW C. GALLO
JOHN J. GARTSIDE
SUZANNE M. GILLERN
ROSCO S. GORE
DAVID W. GRANT
JON R. GRAY
SKY D. GRAYBILL
AMIT K. GUPTA
JEFFREY A. GUTHRIE
MITCHELL T. HAMELE
MELINDA J. HAMER
BRIAN R. HANEY
STEPHEN A. HARPER
JASON N. HARRIS
PAUL W. HENDRIX
TIMOTHY J. HEPLER
JACOB S. HOQUE
MARC H. HOHMAN
SONNY S. HUITRON
PAUL R. HUNT
PAUL F. HWANG
BENJAMIN J. INGRAM
KHALID JABOORI
SEYED A. JALALI
JONATHAN JI
BRYAN M. JOHNSON
ROBERT A. JONES
BENJAMIN KASE
SEAN P. KEARNEY
DAVID M. KELLER
MICHAEL J. KILBOURNE
JEEHUN N. KIM
CHARLES A. KITLEY
RYAN M. KNIGHT
CAROLINE M. KOLB
GREGORY P. KRAUS
MATTHEW D. KUHNLE
MARY L. KWOK
JOSEPH T. LANZI, JR.
NOELLE S. LARSON
GARY LEVY
JAMES E. MACE
ANTHONY L. MARK
ANA E. MARKELZ
NATHAN A. MARSH
TRAVIS MASON
RYAN J. MCDONOUGH
SHANE P. MCENTIRE
BRANDI S. MCLEOD
NATHAN E. MCWHORTER
GARRETT J. MEYERS
MICHAEL R. MOORE
JOHN E. MUSSER
JAMES R. NEISNER
JAMES NICHOLSON
JAMISON S. NIELSEN
FREDERICK P. OBRIEN
MOROHUNRANTI O. OGUNTOYE
BRIAN OREILLY
RASTISLAV OSADSKY
CHRISTOPHER J. OTT
HAINEK K. PAIK
STEPHEN PARADA
ANGELO H. PAREDES
SHIMUL S. PATEL
TANVI D. PATEL
JESSICA J. PECK
KEITH H. PENSKA
PAUL G. PETERSON
SAMUEL C. PHINNEY
JENNI PICKINPAUGHINOCENCIO
TIMOTHY P. PLACKETT
TORIE C. PLOWDEN
GREGORY J. POSTAL
JOHN J. POULIN
DOUGLAS F. POWELL
NADER Z. RABIE
LUIGI K. F. RAO
KURT J. REYES
ROBERT D. RICE
BRADLEY A. RITTENHOUSE
PAUL M. ROBBEN
MATTHEW D. RODGERS
DEREK J. ROGERS
CHRISTOPHER J. ROSEMEYER
FRANCISCO C. RUBIO
JENNY L. RYAN
KATHLEEN C. RYAN
SHARI L. SAMMS
ERIN S. SEFFELDT

JOHN W. SIMMONS
NIKOLAUS T. SNESHKOFF
KEVAN M. SPENCER
DANIELLE A. STACKHOUSE
DANIEL STINNER
ZOE E. SUNDELL
ERIC M. SWANSON
NATHANIEL TEAGUE
JARED M. THELER
DANIEL J. TOLSON
PRISCILLA WEST
KELLY J. WINTER
SEAN R. WISE
VLADIMIR S. YAKOPSON
PAULA YOUNG
D012118

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

TODD R. ANDERSON
MARK E. BEAMAN
ALEXANDER L. BOROWICZ
MARK L. BREWER
MARGIA E. BRITO
JEFFERY M. CURRY
ANDREW J. DANTONI
AARON FANNON
HERSCHEL H. FLOWERS, JR.
ADAM C. FORRESTER
THOMAS J. FREEDMAN
SEAN J. FULLAN
TIANE R. GARNER
MATTHEW S. GLAZENER
BRENTON D. GRIFFITH
JAMES D. HANNIGAN
ANDREA D. JOHNSON
RICHARD L. JONES
MARK D. JUNTUNEN
JAMES R. LEMLEY
MICHAEL S. LOHRENTZ
JOSEPH L. MARSHALL
RAY G. MCCULLOCH
JOSEPH O. OKUNBANJO
JOHN W. PEYERL
KATLYN I. SHAGORY
OROCH K. SISOURA
CHARLES V. SLIDER
GLENN G. THIEL
RYAN J. VANDROVEC
ROBERT A. YAGGI III
JOHN F. YANIKOV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DOUGLAS A. ALLEN
ANDREW W. BALLENGER
GORDON F. BJORMAN
OLEN C. BRIDGES
JAMES E. HESTERBERG
GARY W. D. LEWIS
BRIAN C. MCNEIL
PETER V. MONDELLI
ELISEO NOGUERAS
TIMOTHY J. PALMER
THOMAS K. SARROUF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U. S. C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHARLES E. BANE
CHAD C. BLACK
STEPHEN E. CASSLE
SCOTT C. CHAMBERLIN
PATTI K. GLEN
DAREN C. HARRISON
CHRISTIAN C. HOFER
SHANNON T. MARKO
JEREMIAH L. NELSON
GREGORY T. REPPAS
JOSEPH M. ROYAL
JODI K. SANGSTER
CHRISTOPHER SCHELLHASE
ANGELA M. SCHMILLEN
BRIAN W. SMITH
CARL SOFFLER
SUZANNE R. TODD
MATTHEW D. WEGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

DAREEN A. DOUCHI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ADRIAN L. NELSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRANDON J. BAER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BARRY MURRAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

FRANCIS K. AGYAPONG
ALEXANDER D. ARISTIZABAL
MARTA E. ARTIGA
PETER J. ATTILIO
ANGELIKA R. AVERY
KATHERYN A. BAKER
JULIE A. BANTA
MARK S. BARROWS
AMY R. BEASLEY
MARGARET S. BERRYMAN
OLGA BETANCOURT
TRISHA A. BIELSKI
KRISTINE P. BROGER
MARIA I. BRUTON
DEVIN Y. BRYANT
CYNTHIA BUCHANAN
BRIAN P. CAHILL
ROBERT M. CARTER
BENJAMIN G. CARTWRIGHT
JACQUELYN M. CLINE
RONALD D. COLE
BRIAN M. COOLEY
DENISE L. COOPER
RAMONA I. DECKER
CHARLES W. DENSEVICH
LAKISHA S. DIXON
IDONGESIT EBEUTE
MASHANDRA D. ELAM
LAKISHA N. FLAGG
LAURA D. FOWLE
SHAWN P. GALLAGHER
RICHELLE L. GOODIN
ANITA E. GOULD
RACHEL C. GREVE
JADE M. HAMEL
BENITA L. HARRIS
FELISIA M. HIBBLER
JEFFREY S. HILLIS
ANDREW J. HOVER
MYRNA B. HOWSON
NEIL S. HURD
KYONG S. HYATT
KYNDRA A. JACKSON
LAURA JEFFREY
JOSEPH P. LYNN
JACOB H. MACGREGOR
JASON K. MARQUART
MATTHEW K. MARSH
BARBARA A. MCCOTTRY
MEGAN C. MOAKLER
DANIELLE L. MOLINAR
NORMAN E. MORRIS
ANTOINETTE C. MYLES
MICHAEL J. NEILL
EVAN S. NONAKA
LINDA F. NUNNPRIDGEN
ELIZABETH M. NUTTER
MONICA OFFENBACHERLOONEY
ADRIANA C. ORTIZCOFFIE
SUSAN K. PIERSON
UTE C. POEPSSEL
CINDY L. ROBERTS
DANIELLE K. RODONDI
LUIS R. RODRIGUEZ
JEANETTE B. RODRIGUEZTORRES
ANGELA L. ROSARIO
MATTHEW W. RUEMMLER
PEGGY S. SALINAS
CHRISTINA M. STEIMLE
KYLE T. SUNADA
MESHELLE A. TAYLOR
TOMMY L. THOMPSON
KELLEY C. TOGIOLA
DOLORES P. TONEY
WILLIAM L. VANASSE III
VIRGINIA C. VARDONSMITH
KENORA L. WALKER
TIMOTHY R. WHOOLELY
JOHN E. WILSON, JR.
MICHELLE L. WOLF
DAN M. WOOD
SASHI A. ZICKEFOOSE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH H. AFANADOR
SEAN ALLEN
CASEY ARRIAGA
JEFFREY I. BASS
CLEMENT R. BERMUDEZ
JEFFERY K. BLACKWELL
LISA M. BOHLER
ANTHONY A. BOROWSKI
LONDON R. BRETHOUWER
LEXIE B. BUENAVENTURA
JIMMIE J. BUTCHER
WILLIAM H. CALLAHAN
JONATHAN R. CATALANO
CHANI A. CORDERO
TAMBA DAUDA

JASON T. DEBOER
ERIK F. DEFREITAS
JESSE DELGADO
LISA M. DENNIS
KEVIN M. DOHERTY
GRACE L. Y. DUMAYAS
DEANNA DURAN
STEPHEN M. DURYEA
TRENT J. ELLIOTT
CHRISTOPHER L. EVANS
JOHNATHAN J. EVANS
ROBERT P. FEDERIGAN
SETH T. FRENCH
LAURIE L. GODIN
CHRISTOPHER M. GREENE
MELISSA GUE
CHRISTOPHER J. GUENTHNER
ERIC R. GUZMAN
JOSHUA J. HANDORF
JAYME K. HANSEN
DEEPA HARIPRASAD
LATAYA E. HAWKINS
WALTER L. HAWKINS
HEATH D. HOLT
JASON W. HUGHES
BRYAN J. HUNSAKER
LEIF O. IBSEN
DALMAR A. JACKSON
JACOB D. JOHNSON
RACQUEL O. JUNIO
GERALD G. KELLAR
STEFAN M. KOCHIS
CHARLOTTE A. LANTERI
RANDOLPH A. LEONPIEVE
AUTUMN T. LEVERIDGE
JERED D. LITTLE
LEWIS S. LONG
AARON LOZANO
GORDON J. LYONS
CHANDA M. MANEVAL
JARROD A. MCGEE
MICHELLE G. MEDWICK
BILL D. MICHIE, JR.
DENISE M. MILHORN
CASSANDRA L. MIMS
CHARLES A. MOORE
ELIZABETH C. MOORE
KRISTI M. MORRIS
MARCUS L. MOSS
SCOTT D. MRAS
PATRICK M. MUSISI
CHRISTIAN NELSON
PETER V. NUNN
FELIX A. ORTIZ
RUBEN I. ORTIZCAMPOS
SHERYL E. PEDERSEN
FRANK A. PETRASSI
TONY PIERSON
EDWARD O. PRICE
BENJAMIN QI
EDGARDO RAMIREZ
KIRK A. REED
LUIS A. ROCHA
GREGORY A. RUSHTON
ERIK N. RUSSELL
MARK C. SCHILLING
KEITH H. SCHMIDT
STEPHEN T. SCHMIDT
ALEXANDER S. SHILMAN
NICHOLAS R. SONG
JON C. SONNEMAN
MOISES SOTO
MARTHA A. STANY
GARY STAPOLSKY
SETH O. SWARTZ
SUSAN M. TALLMAN
JOHN W. TAYLOR
FRED B. TERRADO, JR.
CHARLES M. TESSMAN, SR.
JOSHUA C. THOMPSON
BRIAN C. TRIPP
ALYSON M. TUCKER
JERRY D. VANVACTOR
JANET N. VAUGHN
CHAD D. VERMILLION
HILDEHARDO F. VIADO, JR.
SCOTT L. VIAL
RORY K. WALLLEY
LASHONIA R. WHITE
FELICIA L. WILLIAMS
RICHARD E. WOOD
DON H. YAMASHITA
JASON R. YELLMAN
D013069

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

BERT M. BAKER
BETHANY A. BELANGER
AVERY J. CARNEY
SCOTT D. CAROW
MONICA L. CASMAER
NICOLE K. CHARBONNEAU
AARON J. CRONIN
MICHAEL S. CROWELL
TIN Q. DANG
COLLEEN A. DANIELS
CHARLES D. DAY
JOHN T. ELLIOTT
WALTER D. ENGLE
CHAD M. FLICK
CHRISTOPHER J. GEORGIANA
JOSEPH R. KARDOUNI

SCOTT M. KULLA
SHARON L. ROSSER
TANJA C. ROY
JONATHAN L. SAXE
MATTHEW R. SCHERER
ERIN J. STIBRAL
DERIK H. SWEE
CLEVE B. SYLVESTER
LARRY A. WYATT
MARIA R. S. YATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL B. LOVEALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRECK S. BREWER
DANIEL G. CHATTERLEY
PETER N. DROUILLARD
NICKOLI DUBYK
JOSEPH M. DUTNER
NASSER I. FIQIA
BRANDON M. GAGE
ROBERT N. GILLIAM
KAREN E. GONZALEZTORRES
ZACHARY H. HIGHERBERGER
NGHIA N. HO
ANTHONY C. KIGHT
JACOB L. KITSON
AGNIESZKA KUCHARSKA
DAVID H. KWON
SLOAN D. MCCLAUGHLIN
LARRY L. MUNK
ELIZABETH R. OATES
ADAM R. OCHSNER
PIERRE R. PIERCE
SAMUEL E. POINDEXTER
DAVID L. REDMOND
MARC M. SERRA
CHRISTOPHER D. SWAGERTY
SAMIRA F. THOMPSON
JOHN F. UNDERWOOD
ALAN D. WALKER
DIANA W. WEBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DAMIAN R. TONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DANIEL F. ALEMANY
BRITTANY E. MCCROAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WIL B. NEUBAUER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MARK C. GILLESPIE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

TODD M. CHARD

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

CAMERON M. BALMA
KEVIN D. BARNARD
BRIAN M. BARRICK
MATTHEW R. BLANCHETTE
REUBEN BLOFSTEIN
JOSEPH P. BOBROWSKI
PETER N. BOURAS
JACOB B. CATALOGNA
ANDREW J. CLARK
DAVID B. CLARK
CHRISTOPHER F. CLAUSEN
STEPHEN R. DRAPER
NATHAN A. DURKA
DEVRON L. EAKINS
TODD C. EICHORST
GREGORY J. ENGLISH
DANIEL S. FISHER
BRIAN E. HARPUDE
ANGELA L. HUSS
SHANE P. JACOBS
SEAN M. JARVIS
GREGORY R. KIPPE

RENATA A. KLIMA
JENNIFER L. LARISH
CHRISTOPHER M. LEPORE
SIEGFRIED W. MELBOURNE
JOSEPH W. MICHAELS
JASON L. MILLER
DAVID M. MROSEK
CHRISTOPHER D. NELSON
STEPHANIE L. PHILLIPS
PATRICK W. PRAG
JONATHAN C. RAIA
TIMOTHY L. RAYMIE
DANIEL W. ROBISON
SARAH A. SHERWOOD
MARLENE Z. SILVACOLLAZO
MICHELLE L. SIMMONS
JUSTIN M. SPRAGUE
PETER J. TAMMINGA
JESSICA E. D. VANDA
DANIEL P. VARDIMAN
RONALD L. WIENER
SCOTT D. ZIEGENHORN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RICHARD A. ACKERMAN
ROBERT S. BAIR
BRIAN R. BAKER
JAYSON L. BEIER
JASON B. BLACKMON
BLYTHE A. BLAKISTONE
TRISTAN M. BORNE
ANTHONY A. BUMATAY
HENRY L. BUSH
BRIAN A. EVANS
TAYLOR R. FORESTER
AARON C. GEARY
STEPHEN C. GRAY
ERVIN B. HATCHER
MICHAEL R. LARAYA
OMAR J. SANCHEZ
RALPH J. STEPHENS
BRIAN K. TYLER
PATRICIA R. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

SARAH R. BOUTWELL
JEFFERY L. BURKE
CHRISTOPHER G. CARR
CHARLES Y. CHA
TREVOR A. DAY
DAVID E. DWIGGINS, JR.
DEREK J. DYE
ANTONIO J. GARCIA
HENRY T. GILBERT IV
DAVID M. GUTIERREZ
JASON D. HANSER
PETER M. B. HARLEY
JONATHAN M. HAY
PHILLIP L. HICKMAN, JR.
GENE J. JACKSON
ERIC L. KIRK
KARL W. KRAUT
COLIN G. LARKINS
STEVEN C. LAYFIELD
CORNELIUS L. MASON
JORDAN A. MCCALED
MICHAEL K. MEADOR
SEAN R. MULDER
MEREDITH K. SCHLEY
TROY A. SMITH
KENNETH W. STGERMAIN
DURKE A. WRIGHT
ANDREW F. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEREMIAH E. CHAPLIN
DAVID W. DAMRON
CASEY J. GON
ANGELA S. LEFLER
RAMON P. MARTINEZ, JR.
STEPHEN A. MCINTYRE
JEANETTE SHEETS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LINWOOD O. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRIAN A. EVICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KRISTOPHER M. BRAZIL
CHRISTOPHER J. CARMICHAEL
ANDREA M. CASSIDY
JAMES J. CULNEN, JR.
MARY C. DECKER

CHRISTINE L. FLETCHER
 RICHARD G. GLASGOW II
 CHRISTOPHER C. MULLER
 ROGER D. PHELPS, JR.
 CHRISTY N. SIBLEY
 JAY S. VIGNOLA
 DEREK S. WAISANEN
 CLARENCE D. WASHINGTON
 DOUGLAS WILLIAMS
 SHEREE T. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRYCE D. ABBOTT
 JOSEPH H. ADAMS II
 KYLE A. ADUSKEVICH
 JONATHAN V. AHLSTROM
 JASON A. AHMANSON
 ROBERT AHO
 JOSHUA M. ALES
 ROSEN E. ALFONSO
 PATRICK M. ALFONZO
 MARK B. ALLEN
 JOHN L. ALLUMS
 CHRISTOPHER M. AMIS
 ERIC R. ANDREWS
 LARRY J. ARBUCKLE
 ALEXANDER P. ARMATAS
 TODD A. ARNOLD
 DAVID K. ASHBY
 VICTOR H. AVILA
 FRANK J. AZZARELLO
 VERNON C. BACHMANN
 MARK E. BAIR
 JEREMIAH C. BALDWIN
 ROBERT J. BALLARD
 TIMOTHY R. BARKLEY
 ANDREW K. BARNETT
 MEGAN M. BARNETT
 RAYMOND T. BARR, JR.
 NATHAN S. BARTON
 GUY M. BATCHELDER
 KATE S. BATTEN
 MATTHEW H. BEACH
 ANDREW R. BEARD
 KEVIN A. BEATLEY
 JOHN A. BENDA
 DANIEL R. BERGSTROM
 COLIN J. BERNARD
 JASON M. BERWANGER
 DAVID M. BIGAY
 DEREK W. BINTZ
 MEGHAN L. BODNAR
 DUANE S. BOGATKO
 PHILLIP E. BOICE
 BRANDON M. BOOHER
 PATRICK B. BOOKEY
 VICTOR J. BOZA
 BRADLEY E. BOZIN
 CHRISTOPHER J. BRADSHAW
 JERMAINE B. BROOKS
 KURTIS J. BROUWER
 PHILIP L. BROWN
 ZACHARY R. BROWN
 WILLIAM S. BUFORD
 THOMAS W. BULLOCK
 THOMAS R. BUTTS, JR.
 JOHN K. CALDWELL
 ALEXANDER T. CAMPBELL
 RYAN G. CAMPAMOR
 JONATHAN B. CANTOR
 AARON J. CARLSON
 WILLIAM L. CARR
 CHRISTOPHER M. CARREON
 BENJAMIN R. CARTER
 CHRISTOPHER J. CARTER
 LINDSAY A. CARTER
 PHILLIP R. CASHA
 PAUL W. CASSUTTI
 JAMES C. CATALINE
 BRALYN E. CATHEY
 KEVIN M. CHAMBLEY
 ROBERT H. CHANDLER
 GREGORY R. CHAPMAN
 MICHAEL G. CHARNOTA
 ANDREW J. CHAUVIN
 BRYAN J. CHRISTIANSEN
 RICHARD M. CHRISTOFF
 JAMES L. CLARK III
 RYAN F. CLARKE
 TOMMY M. CLARKE
 KEVIN C. CLOPPER
 JUSTIN M. COBB
 STEVEN J. COBOS
 JOHN S. COCCA
 MICHAEL P. CODINGTON
 DOUGLAS E. COLE
 TERENCE A. COLEMAN
 RYAN P. CONOLE
 BENJAMIN J. COOPER
 JUSTIN P. COOPER
 LLOYD L. COORE
 JOSHUA P. CORBIN
 CHARLES C. CORNELLY
 JAMES L. CORREIA
 VICTOR D. COSTELLO
 CALEB T. CRAMER
 GREGORY M. CRESCENZO
 DAVID M. CRESCITELLI
 JOHN G. CULPEPPER
 NICHOLAS F. CUNNINGHAM
 MATTHEW E. CURNEN
 BRYAN S. DAHLQUIST
 ANDREW F. DAMBROSIO, JR.

MARK C. DAVID
 MATTHEW E. DAVIN
 JUSTIN P. DAVIS
 KATHRYN J. DAWLEY
 STEVEN A. DAWLEY
 JARROD D. DAY
 JEREMY A. DEBONS
 LANCE M. DENHAM
 JEFFREY M. DESMOND
 TROY J. DICKEY
 DAVID P. DIZ
 MICHAEL P. DONOVAN
 PAMELA S. DONOVAN
 RONALD A. DRAKE
 TIMOTHY G. DROSINOS
 MICHAEL F. DUEZ
 JEFFREY R. DUNDON, JR.
 KEVIN P. DURKIN
 JAMES P. DUVAL
 WILLIAM T. DVORAK
 BRETT E. ELKO
 DONALD W. EMERSON
 JORDAN D. ENETE
 MATTHEW L. ENOS
 RODNEY C. ERLER, JR.
 CHARLES E. ESCHER
 MICHAEL C. ESCOBAR
 ROGELIO ESPINOZA
 JOHN R. ESPOSITO
 HARRY C. EVANS III
 JAMES L. EVANS
 JOHNPAUL A. FALARDEAU
 PETER R. FANNO
 JONATHAN J. FARACO
 MATTHEW A. FAY
 HARRY R. FEIGEL III
 BLAINE S. FELLONE
 JEFFREY M. FELLOWS
 WILLIAM A. FENSTERER
 BRIAN W. FICHTER
 JAVIER A. FIGUEROA
 MATTHEW G. FISHER
 JOHN E. FITZPATRICK
 SEAN C. FLANAGAN
 ERIN E. FLINT
 SYLVESTER R. FOLEY IV
 DANIEL A. FOLLETT
 MARC E. FOREMAN
 TYLER W. FORREST
 BRIAN A. FORSTER
 BENJAMIN W. FOSTER
 MATTHEW O. FOUNTAIN
 ERICH C. FRANDRUP
 ROBERT L. FRANKLIN III
 CHRISTOPHER A. GAHL
 MARK P. GALLAGHER
 MATTHEW K. GARCIA
 BRYAN E. GEISERT
 THOMAS C. GENEST
 KIMBERLY N. GEORGE
 JUSTIN F. GERLE
 PHILIP D. GIFT
 PRESTON W. GILMORE
 JASON N. GLAB
 CHRISTOPHER D. GLANDON
 MATTHEW D. GLEASON
 JOHN Q. GODDHERE
 JOSEPH P. GORGOL
 LORA M. GORSKY
 BENJAMIN P. GRANT
 RICHARD B. GRANT
 BRENDAN T. GRAY
 SEAN P. GRAY
 ADAM B. GREEN
 NICHOLAS M. GREEN
 DANIEL GROVER II
 MEGAN M. GRUBBS
 WILLIAM M. GUHEEN III
 KEVIN R. HAAKSMA
 JARROD S. HAIR
 DANIEL A. HANCOCK
 STANTON R. HANLEY
 MICHAEL G. HANNER, JR.
 CHARLES A. HARRIS II
 ISAAC A. HARRIS
 CHAD H. HARVEY
 BRIAN J. HASSEY
 RYAN D. HASTINGS
 NATHANIEL M. HATHAWAY
 RUDOLF A. HAWKINS
 JEFFREY E. HEILMAN
 RYAN C. HEINEMAN
 BRANDON J. HEIRONIMUS
 COURTNEY S. HERDT
 TREVOR F. HERMANN
 DIRK H. HERON
 KERRY P. HICKS
 STEPHEN A. HIRS
 BRIAN R. HIGGINS
 EDWARD F. V. HILL
 NICHOLAS S. HILL
 ROBERT B. HINES
 WILBUR R. HINES, JR.
 DEVON M. HOCKADAY
 GREGORY S. HOLLEY
 DAVID C. HOLLON
 KENNETH C. HOLLON
 ROBERT D. HOLT
 JOEL I. HOLWITT
 JASON R. HORNING
 MATTHEW G. HORTON
 LYLE K. HOSKIN
 JOHN J. HOY
 JOSEPH J. HUBLEY
 JENNIFER A. HUCK
 JAMES D. HUDDLESTON
 WILLIAM T. HUEBNER, JR.

ERIC C. HUI
 BRANDON C. HUNTER
 MICHAEL Y. HUNTSMAN
 TIMOTHY P. HURLEY
 JACOB D. HURT
 DOUGLAS J. IVANAC
 KRISTAFER Y. JARBOE
 DEREK C. JASKOWIAK
 BRANDON L. JENKINS
 ERIC H. JEWELL
 THOMAS G. JILLSON
 ERIC R. JOHNSON
 JOSHUA P. JOHNSON
 LUKE R. JOHNSON
 MELISSA E. JOHNSON
 JEREMY M. JOHNSTON
 ANDREW T. JONES
 JOSHUA F. JONES
 CHAD T. KALOCINSKI
 JUSTIN M. KAPER
 EREK A. KASSE
 JAMES W. KAUBER
 DOUGLAS L. KAY
 KENNETH P. KEEPEES
 CHRISTOPHER S. KELLEY
 JONATHAN A. KELLEY
 MARK E. KENNEDY
 ERIK J. KENNY
 CHRISTOPHER P. KENT
 HENRY N. KEYSER IV
 SHAWN P. KIERNAN
 THOMAS Y. KIM
 MICHAEL G. KING
 RORY M. KIPPER
 CHRISTOPHER M. KLUTCH
 BRYAN F. KOEHLER
 ANDREW J. KOPACZ
 STEPHEN C. KRATOVIL, JR.
 MATTHEW I. KRULL
 DANIEL D. KUITU
 GEORGE G. KULCZYCKI
 ROBERT W. KULRLE, JR.
 JOSEPH M. LAHER
 KYLE P. LAMBERT
 STEPHEN V. LAMOURE
 VICTOR M. LANGE
 GREGORY A. LANGSTON
 DAVID J. LATTI
 JASON A. LAUTAR
 JEFFREY B. LIVERY
 JIMMY L. LAWTON
 JONATHAN D. LEEWARNER
 DANIELLE L. LEIBY
 GREGORY F. LEMBO
 MATTHEW K. LEWIS
 WAYNE G. LEWIS, JR.
 MARK T. LICKTEIG
 CASEY K. LIGGETT
 RICHARD B. LITCHEFIELD
 CHARLES C. LITTON
 PETE S. LOGSDON
 JOHNNY R. LYKINS, JR.
 JEREMY N. LYON
 ADAM M. MADSON
 LAWRENCE J. MAHAN
 JAMES M. MALVASIO
 KRISTA R. MANN
 ALAN T. MARDEGIAN
 ROBERT W. MARRS
 SCOTT G. MARSH
 MATTHEW L. MARTIN
 RION W. MARTIN
 CARLOS F. MARTINEZ
 SAMUEL P. MASSON
 ANTHONY S. MASSEY
 RYAN T. MATTEON
 CHRISTOPHER L. MAURER
 RICHARD T. MCCANDLESS
 NEVIN A. MCCHESENEY
 DAVID S. MCCINTOCK
 ANDREW P. MCCUNE
 KEVIN S. MCCORMICK, JR.
 TAMMY S. MCCREARY
 SEAN H. MCCRINK
 ROBERT J. MCDOWELL, JR.
 LOUIS P. MCFADDEN III
 JOHN K. MCGEE
 ROBERT J. MCMILLAN
 DANIEL J. MCNAB
 NICHOLAS A. MEYERS
 COREY L. MILLIS
 JOHNNY L. MINCEY
 MICHAEL V. MINERVINI
 MICHAEL L. MINUKAS
 MATTHEW L. MINZES
 RODRIGO D. MIRANDA
 SEAN D. MOLLAHAN
 DANIEL A. MORREIRA
 JASON B. MORTON
 JARROD L. MOSLEY
 JOHN S. MULLEN
 JEFFERY J. MURAWSKI
 BRIAN T. MURPHY
 PETER J. MUSCHEK
 BRIAN L. MUSFELDT
 KONSTANTINOS T. NAKOS
 KELECHI R. NDUKWE
 ELIZABETH A. NELSON
 PAUL W. NICKELL
 CHRISTOPHER J. NICOLETTI
 ROBERT W. NIEMEYER
 JOHN P. NILLES
 MATTHEW W. NOLAND
 CHRISTOPHER M. NORRIS
 JEREMY L. NUTTALL
 TIMOTHY D. O'BRIEN
 COREY D. ODOM

MATTHEW P. OLSON
PATRICK C. ONEILL
JARED M. OTT
CHRISTOPHER J. OTTO
ELI C. OWRE
ADAM C. PACE
JASON N. PAPADOPOULOS
JOHN W. PARKER
JOSEPH D. PARSONS
LESTER O. PATTERSON
LEWIS J. PATTERSON
BRIAN H. PENNELL
MICHAEL A. PEREZ
JOSHUA J. PETERS
BRENT M. PETERSON
TODD M. PETRIE
CHRISTOPHER W. PETRO
CHARLES W. PHILLIPS
MATTHEW M. PLANETTA
BRYAN S. PINCKNEY
SUSAN M. PINCKNEY
JOSEPH J. PISONI
MICHAEL T. PLAGEMAN
DYLAN G. PORTER
ROBERT A. PRINCE
SCOTT J. PURCELL
JOHN P. QUALTERS
DEREK A. RADER
THOMAS F. RADICH III
JEREMIAH N. RAGADIO
COURTNEY L. RANK
SCOTT D. RATHKE
RANDOLPH W. REED II
ERIC T. REEVES
STEVE C. REIS
BRIAN J. REITTER
JAMES J. REYNOLDS
BRIAN M. RHOADES
QUINN J. RHODES
NOAH S. RICH
DAWN T. RICKETTS
TREVOR J. RITLAND
ANDREW P. RIVAS
COLIN M. ROBERTS
SPENCER A. ROBERTS
MATT W. RODGERS
ARTHUR S. RODRIGUEZ
SCOTT J. ROSE
EMILY Y. ROYSE
ROBERT S. RUBY
RONALD H. RUMFELT
SETH A. RUMLER
JOHN P. RUMMEL IV
EDISON C. RUSH
ROBERT J. RUZICKA II
CRAIG R. SALVESON
JAMES O. SAMMAN
JARED W. SAMUELSON
DAVID C. SANDOMIR
HOUSSAIN T. SAREINI
DANIEL J. SCHLESINGER
BRYAN W. SCHNEIDER
JEFFREY R. SCHWAB
NATHAN A. SCOTT
SAMUEL M. SCOVILL
BRYAN D. SCULLIN
JEFFREY T. SERVELLO
ERIC D. SEVERSON
JAMES S. SHARROW III
KENNETH M. SHEFFIELD
JASON M. SIMON
ANDREW J. SIMONS
MICHAEL J. SIMPSON
PAOLO J. S. SINGH
JEFFREY A. SIZEMORE
JONATHAN J. SLAGER
BRANDON D. SMITH
BRIAN C. SMITH
CHARLES R. SMITH
DENNIS H. SMITH
JAMES L. SMITH
JARED C. SMITH
JASON C. SMITH
NICHOLAS H. SMITH
SCOTT J. SMITH
STEVEN R. SMITH
JOHN W. SOKOL
ADAM C. SOUKUP
KIRK A. SOWERS
ANDREW H. SPARKS
WAYNE O. SPARROW
BARCLEY W. STAMEY
MICHAEL B. STANFIELD
PETER STAVRIDES
JOHN W. STIGI
ROBERT G. STIMIS
GARTH W. STORZ
TIMOTHY S. SULICK
JASON T. SUROWIEC
MATHEW J. SWENSON
MICAH T. SYBOR
CHRISTOPHER M. TABERT

JASON S. TARRANT
DOUGLAS M. TEMPEST
TIMOTHY A. TETI
MATTHEW S. THATCHER
DANIEL J. THOMAS
JEFFREY W. THOMAS
ROBERT M. THOMPSON
JOHN M. THORPE
MARTY D. TIMMONS
RYAN A. TOMKINS
DEXTER J. TRIPLETT
JAMES G. TUTHILL III
THOMAS J. UHL
PHILIP S. UJIE
JAMIE E. VANDYKE
THOMAS H. VANHOOZER III
PATRICK M. VEITH
CLAY S. WADDILL
DAVID WAGENBORG
ROBERT A. WALLS
ROBERT W. WARD
ROBERT C. WATTS IV
CHRISTOPHER D. WEAVER
SEAN M. WELCH
CHARLES R. WEYDERT
CARL E. WHITE
WILLIAM R. WHITE
SEAN E. WHITEMAN
ADAM R. WHITT
STEVEN S. WHITWORTH
NICHOLAS A. WILLET
RYAN S. WILLETTE
WILLIAM L. WILLIAMS, JR.
MICHAEL A. WITHERILL
ROBERT E. WOODARDS
ALEXANDER L. WRIGHT
GRANVILLE C. WRIGHT, JR.
MATTHEW A. WRIGHT
EVAN T. YOUNG
NEAL A. YOUNG
JOSHUA P. ZELFER
SHANE M. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEREMIAH P. ANDERSON
TRAVIS J. ANDERSON
DARRIN E. BARBER
MOLLIE A. BILY
JOHN F. BOSEMAN
NATHANIEL S. COSTELLO
RYAN D. CRISMAN
JOHN E. DALTON
RICHARD L. DULDULAO
MATTHEW C. FRYE
JOHN A. GENTA
WILLIAM A. GIBSON
TIMOTHY J. HOUSEHOLDER
DOUGLAS E. JONART
SUNNY G. LAU
BENSON W. LO
CHRISTOPHER K. MATASSA
PAUL W. MURCH
DANIEL T. NEVEROSKY
ANGELA C. OWENS
THOMAS C. PARKER
ANDREW J. PRIVETTE
JAMES W. ROCHELLE
JONATHAN F. SCHIEL
CHRISTOPHER M. SCHINDLER
DANIEL SORIA
ZACHARIAH H. STILES
HOANG N. TRAN
MICHAEL A. WOHRMAN
JEREMY R. WOODY
AARON L. WOOLSEY
ASHLEY S. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

STACY J. G. ARENSTEIN
MATTHEW P. BLAZEL
CHARLES J. BORGES
DAVID L. CALHOUN
CHRISTOPHER B. DEBONS
GABRIEL J. HOHNER
BRANDON J. HOUSE
COLETTE B. LAZENKA
JEDEDIAH J. MAGDA
ANDREW M. MCKEE
JAMIE H. ROGERS
JASON SAGLIMBENE
JONATHAN S. SCHIFFELBEIN
STEVEN D. SENEY
NICHOLAS A. SINNOCKRAK
TYLER R. TENNILLE
HENRY L. THOMASON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KELLY W. BOWMAN, JR.
DEREK H. BURNS
TOMMIE G. CRAWFORD
WILLIAM J. GRAY
CHRISTOPHER H. GRIMES
JOSEPH M. HOLT
JOSEPH A. KAMARA
ANDREI L. MCARTHUR
MICHAEL D. PHILLIPS
ANDRES V. PICO
DANIEL D. REID
JAMES L. RORER
SHANNON P. THOMPSON
ROBERT H. VOHRER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LARA R. BOLLINGER
NATHAN J. CHRISTENSEN
CATHERINE F. COOK
SARAH M. FLAHERTY
GREGORY L. FLORES
ALANA F. GARAS
PAUL D. MACAFAGAL
STEPHANIE B. MURDOCK
REBECCA L. REBARICH
CANDICE C. TRESCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

PATRICK P. DAVIS
TIMOTHY M. DERBYSHIRE
TOMASZ DMITRUKOWSKI
VON H. FERNANDES
CHAD W. GAGNON
JOSHUA W. HENSLEY
BARBARA E. JONAS
TAEKO E. MCFADDEN
BRANDON M. OBERLING
CHRISTINA E. ORTEGA
JACOB M. PLICHTA
DONALD L. SHRADER
SEAN C. STEVENS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEFFREY A. ALSUP
ROSS M. ANDERSON
MICHAEL J. BALDWIN
ANTHONY C. BARBER
BRAD A. BAUER
BRENT J. BENLIEN
KELLY V. BORDEN
SATONYA A. BROWN
HARRY A. CHENG
JOHN A. COURTIAL
MARCUS A. CREIGHTON
ROBERT P. CROCETTA III
JON R. DAVIS
ALAN V. DUNN
SCOTT M. DURDLE
JOHN S. FAIRWEATHER
SHAUN W. FISCHER
ROBERT C. FRY
PHILIP L. GESAMAN
CHAD M. HAMM
HOMER F. HENSY
ANDREW M. HOFFMAN
DWIGHT A. JEFFERSON
BRANDON L. JOHNSON
FREDDIE B. KOONCE
KURTIS J. KRUG
MICHAEL A. MASONER
KEITH M. MORRIS
LELAND M. MURPHY
DANIEL K. NICHOLS
GREGORY F. NOTARO
DAVID W. PIERCE
BLAINE C. PITKIN
BRIAN R. RATKOVICH
GREGORY K. RING
WAYNE N. SALGADO, JR.
JUSTIN M. SANTOS
BOBBY C. STANCIL
MARK D. STANLEY
ANTOINE D. THORNTON
GARY A. TINCHER
TERRY N. TRAWEEK, JR.