



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2017

No. 101

## Senate

The Senate met at 10:45 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious Father, our shield and defense, we look to You in these challenging times. Lord, the shooting at the congressional baseball practice reminds us of the importance of numbering our days. May we refuse to boast about tomorrow, for we know not what a day may bring.

Lord, surround our lawmakers with the shields of your protection and favor. Fill them with Your Spirit, causing them to walk in Your statutes and keep Your judgments.

Lord, You know better than we what lies ahead for our lives. So lead us like a gentle shepherd.

We claim Your promise in Hebrews 13:5 that You will never leave or forsake us. Guide and inspire us all to follow Your plan for our lives.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. SULLIVAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know the entire Senate will join me in echoing the sentiments of the President this morning. We are deeply saddened. We are all concerned for those injured. We will keep them in our prayers, and we will continue to send them every wish for a quick and full recovery.

We are grateful for all those who stepped in to help—those practicing on the field, the first responders and, of course, the Capitol police officers on the scene. We are deeply indebted for their service. We again salute their continuing and unflinching bravery on behalf of the Capitol community.

The Congressional Baseball Game is a bipartisan charity event. I know the Senate will embrace that spirit today as we come together in expressing both our concern and our gratitude.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader in offering our prayers for those who are injured.

I was absolutely shaken by the news of a shooting early this morning at the baseball field in Alexandria where many of my friends and colleagues were practicing for the annual Congressional Baseball Game, an event that brings us together each year.

It has been reported that Representative SCALISE, the House whip, was shot during the attack, as were two brave members of the Capitol Police Force and others, including a staffer. Let us pray that they and any others who were injured are able to recover quickly.

This morning is the most sobering reminder of how thankful we should be for the service of the Capitol Police Force, who put their lives on the line day in and day out for us to be safe. I could not be more grateful that Capitol Police was there at a time to prevent this attack from being any worse than it was. I was in the gym with Senator PAUL, who had been there, and he had told me that, had these two Capitol police officers, who were part of Congressman SCALISE's detail, not been there, it might have been a massacre because there would have been no one to respond. But their bravery is exemplary of all the Capitol Police Force, and we thank them.

The entire Senate family sends its thoughts and prayers to those who were wounded and our gratitude to the police officers and first responders who were at the scene.

I yield the floor.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3461

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

## COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant 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

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 232, to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation and to combat terrorism and illicit financing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017, which passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month by a vote of 18 to 3.

I would like to thank the members of our committee and the coauthors of this bill for working in a constructive, bipartisan fashion to craft this legislation. I think it is a good example of how the Senate can still work together to tackle complex and difficult issues.

I was in the SCIF recently—it is a place where Senators go to read classified information—reviewing intelligence. It truly is astounding—I know the Acting President pro tempore knows this well—what Iran continues to do around the world. For a people who are capable of so much, their foreign policy is shockingly counter to their own interests. We see destabilizing act after destabilizing act, from missile launches to arms transfers, to terrorist training, to illicit financial activities, to targeting Navy ships and detaining American citizens. The list goes on and on, and it is past time for us to take steps to protect the interests of the United States and our allies.

This bill is the first time Congress has come together since the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal, to do just that. For far too long the agreement—which I strongly opposed, as did our ranking member, as did our Acting President pro tempore—has dictated U.S. policy throughout the Middle East.

It is worth noting that the JCPOA is not unlike the Paris climate accord. I

don't think many people in our country nor many people in this body realize it is a nonbinding political agreement that was entered into by one man using Presidential Executive authority and can easily be undone by one man using Presidential Executive authority. In fact, in many ways it is easier than the Paris accords, considering the President doesn't have to take action to exit this agreement. I don't think most Americans understand that he doesn't even have to take action to exit the agreement. All he has to do is decline to waive sanctions. I think that has been missed. I know the Acting President pro tempore is very aware of that. I know the ranking member is very aware of that. No matter what the President decides, this bill makes it clear that Congress intends to remain involved and will hold Iran accountable for their nonnuclear destabilizing activities.

What the nuclear agreement failed to do was allow us to push back against terrorism, human rights issues, there are violations of U.N. Security Council resolutions relative to ballistic missile testing, and to push back against conventional arms purchases which they are not supposed to be involved in. As many of us predicted at the time, Iran's rogue behavior has only escalated since implementation of the agreement, and this bipartisan bill will give the administration tools for holding Tehran accountable.

Let me say this. I don't think there is anybody in this Chamber who doesn't believe the Trump administration—and I know there has been a lot of disagreements recently about foreign policy issues in the administration—but I don't think there is anybody here who believes they are not going to do everything they can to push back against these destabilizing activities. What we will be doing today and tomorrow with passage of this legislation is standing hand in hand with them as they do that. It also sends an important signal that the United States will no longer look the other way in the face of continued Iran aggression.

I want to recognize the important work of my colleagues in making this legislation possible. Senator MENENDEZ has been a champion for holding Iran accountable in this bill but also in decades of work on this issue. He is truly an asset to the Senate, and I thank him for his commitment to many issues but especially this one. Senators COTTON, RUBIO, and CRUZ all played an important role in crafting this legislation as well.

Finally, let me say this. This would not have been possible without the support and tireless effort of the ranking member, Senator CARDIN, and his great staff. It has truly been a pleasure for me to work with him on the Russia bill that we will be voting on today at 2 p.m. but also this legislation—we have come from two very different places, representing two very different States,

and yet are joined by the fact that we care deeply about making sure the foreign policy of this country is in the national interests of our citizens and that we as a Congress and as U.S. Senators are doing everything we can to help write positive foreign policy. I thank him for that, and I am proud of the strong bipartisan momentum behind this legislation, which his leadership has helped to happen, and I look forward to passage of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me return the compliment to Senator CORKER.

Senator CORKER announced in his opening remarks about the bipartisan vote in our committee on the Iran sanctions bill. In the last Congress, we were able to get a unanimous vote on the Iran bill. We, under the leadership of Senator CORKER, fully recognized that particularly on foreign policy, our country is much stronger when we speak with a united voice, so bringing Democrats and Republicans together is in our national interest.

Senator CORKER has listened to different views. He and I do have different views on many issues concerning foreign policy, but in almost every one of those cases, we have been able to reconcile those differences. That is true and it was very clear on the Iran sanctions and it is also very true on the Russia sanctions amendment that we will be voting on later today.

To Senator CORKER, I just want my colleagues to know we have a leader on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who puts America's national interests first and has respected the rights of every Senator, not only in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but in the U.S. Senate, that can add to the richness of our discussions and debate. I think we are much stronger today because of that. This is a good example of that, and I am very proud to be supportive of all these efforts and supportive of how this came about because I think it is important for our colleagues and the American people to know about that.

## CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, Senator CORKER and I both want to express, before we start our debate on this issue, our concerns for our colleagues who were victimized by the shooting that took place in Virginia—an outrageous event—and for our security people as well as the innocent bystanders who were struck by the gunfire. Our prayers are with those who are recovering. We hope they will have a complete recovery. We are committed to making sure we keep our Senate and congressional family safe, and we will do everything we can to make sure that takes place. We will continue to work to make sure we preserve the democratic ideals of this Nation and the free society we live in. We know there are rifts, and we know we can do service and stand by those democratic commitments but also keep America safe.

I think the work on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had those goals in mind, and Senator CORKER, through the Chair, I thank you for your attention to those details.

Mr. President, let me talk for a few minutes about S. 722, the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act. This bill will impose new sanctions on Iran for its nonnuclear violations. I want to make that clear—nonnuclear violations. Their responsibilities on the nuclear side is now judged by the nuclear agreement that was entered into. We had a great debate about it last year, and we are not going to rehash that debate. I think every Member of this Chamber wants to make sure Iran complies with its nuclear obligations, but that is a separate debate.

The debate we have here is on the nonnuclear activities of Iran that violate international norms and international agreements. We saw, for example, ballistic missile tests that violated their U.N. obligations that took place in January and in March.

We have seen a significant increase in illicit arms shipments being done by Iran, causing destabilizing activities in many parts of the region. We see it in Bahrain. We see it in Yemen. We see it in Iraq. We know they are supporting Hezbollah in Lebanon. We see they are supporting Hamas in Gaza, and we know about their activities in support of the Assad regime in Syria. This all violates international norms.

Iran today has violated, in an incredible way, human rights issues that violate international norms. Yesterday we saw a part of the impact of that as we had a debate on the Saudi arms sale, and we can argue the Saudi's culpability with what is going on in Yemen, but there is no question about Iran's activities supporting the Houthis in Yemen causing atrocities in that country. They are clearly very actively engaged in violating internationally recognized human rights. We also see cyber attacks on the United States that have come from Iran, and they are detaining at least five U.S. citizens today illegally.

There are increased activities in Iran in relation to the nonnuclear side of their activities. For that reason, S. 722 looks at strengthening the sanctions regime so we can make it clear, yes, we will comply with the JCPOA, the nuclear agreement, but we need to have better activities—improvement on the nonnuclear side.

Basically, the bill increases the sanctions menus that are available for ballistic missile violations, for support of terrorism, for human rights violations, and for violating the arms embargo. Those who knowingly do those violations or materially assist will be subject to additional sanctions by the United States.

We codify the IRGC, that was done by Executive order, and we codify some of these other Executive orders as it relates to Iran. We coordinate. This is done in a way that it coordinates with

what Europe is doing and making sure it is a consistent approach that we have taken in the past.

We ask the administration to develop a regional strategy so the Congress and the American people know our policies in the Middle East. That provision was drafted before the Trump administration. This is a desire by Congress to have a better articulated regional strategy, recognizing the dangers in that region. Iran is a major player in the region against U.S. interests, and we need to know what our strategy is in confronting those challenges. Quite frankly, with the Trump administration, we haven't heard that coordinated strategy, and this legislation will require that report be given not just to Congress on a regular basis but to the American people.

I want to underscore how this agreement is totally consistent with the nuclear agreement that was entered into 2 years ago—the JCPOA, as it is referred to. I want to go through quickly how this came about. Senator CORKER talked a little bit about it.

Senator CORKER is absolutely correct. Senator MENENDEZ has been a leader on Iran sanctions way before this Congress. He was very much involved in the original sanctions legislation passed by Congress. That led to putting enough pressure on the international community to join us, which ultimately led to Iran having no choice but to negotiate. Senator CORKER and Senator MENENDEZ had introduced legislation that was out there, and we had a chance to review it, which is how the process should work. As a result of that review, both Senator CORKER, Senator MENENDEZ, and I—all three of us—reached out to interested groups to understand what the Congress has done. Many of the people we talked to were involved in the negotiations with Iran who had different views than we did on the final outcome of that agreement, but we wanted to make sure we weren't violating any of the provisions of the JCPOA so we sought their input. As a result, there was revised legislation that was offered known as Corker-Menendez-Cardin, which incorporated the ideas of all three of us, but really the outside groups working with us, to make sure it was totally consistent with the JCPOA and consistent with the intent of the original bill. I think that bill was well scrubbed. I think it did not violate the JCPOA, but we went through another process, another review, another opportunity for those who could perhaps see things we don't see quite as clearly when it comes to Iran and our European allies. We went through a second scrubbing, and we had a managers' amendment that was offered in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that tightened the bill up even more dealing with those issues.

I think I can state very confidently that there is nothing in the underlying bill that violates the U.S. commitment under the JCPOA nuclear agreement. It is my intent, and I think the intent

of almost every member of this committee that the United States should comply with the JCPOA. Even though I didn't support it, I think it is important we comply with it today.

The other aspect I wanted to go through is that—and I don't want to give the wrong impression. There are people who are involved in the negotiations of the nuclear agreement who would state—some would say they oppose the bill, some might say it is not helpful, some might say Iran might take it the wrong way. Any one of those arguments aside, I do not think you will find anyone who says that it violates the JCPOA.

I want to give a little bit of history here because this was anticipated, that we would need this bill, when we acted on the JCPOA, by those of us who supported and opposed the nuclear agreement.

As the chairman will recall, shortly after the failure to reject the JCPOA—that action—I filed additional legislation that I thought was necessary, along with many of my colleagues, who voted for and voted against the JCPOA. I voted against it. Those who voted for it thought it was necessary. It included the regional strategy so that we would know what the administration was doing. We expedited procedures to deal with nonnuclear violations if Iran used the sanction relief they got under the nuclear agreement to increase their terrorist activities or ballistic missile activities or human rights violations. In fact, they have done that, and that is why we filed the bill right after the action on the nuclear agreement.

This is consistent with what we thought would be necessary. Yes, we had hoped Iran would change its activities, but we were not naive about it. We knew that this was going to be a long road. We knew that Iran did not respond to niceties and that we were going to have to keep the pressure up for them to be able to take the action that was needed.

I know many of us were encouraged when we saw the votes a couple of weeks ago in Iran whereby the Iranians voted for a more open society, a more transparent society. I must say that Iran has a wonderful history of very talented people who want democratic principles, and I am sure that is true among many of the people in Iran today. It is their leaders with whom we have an objection, not with the people of Iran. The people of Iran want a more open, democratic society. This legislation will help get to that point by making it clear to the leaders in Iran that they must change their behavior as it relates to terrorism, as it relates to human rights violations, as it relates to their other international obligations. That is the reason this bill has become so important.

Let me give one more example on the consistency.

There are many provisions that we have changed. One is that we all acknowledge that the United States and

our partners are fully at liberty to take action against Iran for terrorist activities, which is not part of the nuclear agreement, but there is some confusion as to how that is done in relationship to the sanctions relief that is provided under the JCPOA. In listening to their concerns, we will set up an independent review process within the next 5 years that will resolve that issue before we hit the 8-year mark so that we are not jeopardizing thwarting a crisis in the future that might occur. I really just want to point that out because this bill is totally consistent with the obligations of the United States under the Iran nuclear agreement.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

I talked briefly yesterday about the amendment that is pending. I want to spend just a moment, if I might, in underscoring some of the details of the amendment that is passing.

I am for S. 722, and I am for the amendment that was crafted in the same spirit as was the underlying bill—in a bipartisan agreement. It involved not just the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee because the jurisdictions on sanctions do overlap between the two committees.

As I said yesterday, I thank Senators CRAPO and BROWN—and Chairman CORKER has already mentioned this—as they were extremely helpful in making sure that we tailored the financial sanctions in a way that is workable and consistent with that of our European partners so that we can make sure we have collective strength.

I am sure the Presiding Officer has been in meetings with our European friends and knows how they feel about Russia. He knows how they feel—that they are the direct bull's-eye with regard to what Russia is doing. They want the United States to be strong, and they want the United States to provide leadership, but we need to provide it in a manner that is consistent with their security interests. With regard to the way this bill has evolved, I think we have a better bill that is consistent with those concerns.

With Russia, we know their activities. We know their cyber activities against our democratic institutions. As we have said frequently, all countries collect cyber information, but the use of that cyber information to attack our democratic institutions is an attack on our country. That cannot go unchallenged. We have to protect ourselves and take action when we have been attacked. This bill does that.

We also know, not just recently but historically, that Russia has been very aggressive in its interfering with the sovereignty of other countries. Today, in Moldova and Georgia, you see the consequences of Russia's aggression. Of course, in Ukraine, with the annexation by Russia of Crimea and its continued activities in eastern Ukraine, Russia has violated every single com-

mitment of the OSE's Helsinki Accords and has violated the sovereignty of other countries.

We also know about Russia's activities in support of the Assad regime in Syria and, by the way, in other countries in that region. It has assisted in horrible human rights violations—just terrible. We have seen some of the videos of the tragedies of innocent children as a result of Mr. Putin's support of the Assad regime.

In January of this year, Senator MCCAIN and I introduced legislation that would have imposed new sanctions on Russia because of these activities. We wanted to make sure that this was bipartisan, so we had 18 Senators cosponsor the bill with us—10 Democrats, 10 Republicans—to make it clear that this was not an attack on one administration but that this was America and that we had to be together in a strong message against the Putin regime. That bill included sanctions on cyber activities. It included sanctions on their Ukrainian activities. It included sanctions in regard to their Syrian activities. The legislation also incorporated what has been known as the Democracy Initiative, which provides ways in which we can provide a more unified front with our European allies in defending against the cyber attacks we have seen coming from Russia.

At the same time, Senator GRAHAM filed a bill, with my cosponsorship, that would require congressional review before the President could give sanction relief to Russia. The review was patterned very similarly to the review we had under the Iran nuclear agreement.

So those two bills were pending, and there has been a lot of debate about them.

We then received a draft bill from Senators CRAPO and BROWN as it related to the sanctions. It was focused—I would not say exclusively but primarily—on the financial and energy sectors in order to make sure those sanctions were drafted in the proper way, and we went through considerable negotiations. Senator CORKER, as I pointed out before, brought additional text to the discussion in an effort to try to bring this together.

Although I am mentioning Senators' names, we know it is the staff. Our staffs have been working around the clock to try to make sure we get this done right. So I thank the majority and minority staffs on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee and on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There are many parts to the amendment that will be voted on at 2 p.m. One part codifies additional sanctions against Russia. I have already mentioned Senator MENENDEZ's role in Iran. He was very instrumental as it relates to Russia. Senator DURBIN has been very active. I must tell you that there has been no Member on the Democratic side who has been more vocal than Senator SHAHEEN on the

need to take action against Russia. There are many Members on our side who were active on this. I thank my colleagues for their contribution.

We do codify the Executive orders that were issued that were related to both Ukraine and cyber attacks. With the adoption of this amendment, we would be codifying—giving congressional support for what took place by President Obama.

It expands the list of where sanctions can apply to the energy projects and foreign financial institutions that facilitate such projects. For actors who try to undermine cyber security, it provides for their being subject to sanctions, and it provides secondary sanctions for those who materially assist those actors in undermining our cyber security. It provides sanctions against suppliers of Russian arms to Syria. It goes after the actors who are involved in the corrupt privatization of Russia's governmental assets. We do not support those who are supporting Mr. Putin's corrupt regime. It deals with sanctions against Russia's activities on pipelines, the Russia railway, metals, mining, and shipping. So it is comprehensive, and most of these sanctions are mandatory. It is not “may”; rather, it is that the President “shall” in most of these circumstances.

As is the tradition, the President also has the ability, if there is a significant national security issue, to weigh whether that sanction should be applied. Yet we use a different standard in most of these sanctions that requires the President to certify before he issues those waivers that there has been, basically, significant progress made by Russia in removing these sanctionable activities. So we have a pretty strong hand that we are giving President Trump in his negotiations with Mr. Putin.

In addition, this bill provides for congressional review. We talked about that—a bill that was originally introduced by Senator GRAHAM and me. As I indicated, it is very similar to the Iran Review Act. I think this is very important in that it puts a lot of transparency into the negotiations between the Trump administration and the Putin administration.

As Senator CORKER was talking about earlier as to how one President can do something by himself—and I hope that the amendment is adopted and that the bill passes the House and becomes law—the President cannot by himself remove a sanction until he has given Congress notice and an opportunity to review that. We can have congressional hearings. We can put a spotlight on it. Then we will have an expedited process whereby we could reject the President's decision to give relief, and all during that process the sanctions will remain in place.

It is a very strong congressional review, and it is our responsibility to do that, but it also brings in the American people and brings in a more transparent process. What we have found is

that, with that transparency, it is a much stronger hand than President Trump has in his negotiations, knowing that he has to go through this process at the end of the day in his negotiations with Russia.

Sometimes we call it the strength of our independent branches of government. The executive branch can say "Look, we would like to move faster, but we have to do this with the legislative branch" or "We would like to do this, but we cannot get it through Congress." Use the independence of the Congress. We are certainly very strongly against what Russia is doing. Use that to increase the pressure on Russia to do the right thing. That is what this bill does. This is why it is helpful to the President of the United States to have this congressional review.

It would reply to anything from cyber sanctions that had been imposed under the Obama executive order to the attempt to return the compounds that are located in Maryland and New York. All of that would be subject to a congressional review before the action by the President could become effective.

I mentioned earlier that the bill does include the authorization of democracy funds, as I call it, that assist our allies in their fight against Russia's aggression, particularly in cyber. It authorizes \$250 million, and it applies to our work with the EU member states, the NATO member States, as well as with candidate nations. It is a pretty strong opportunity for us to work together.

I have had many meetings with our European colleagues and friends. Yes, every country recognizes that it is vulnerable against Russia's attacks—believe me, they do—and they are doing everything they can to protect themselves. What I find disappointing is that there is not enough coordination. We know how they acted in the United States and how they acted in France and now how they are likely to act in Germany and what they did in Moldova. We know how they are likely to proceed, but do we have a common strategy to prevent this type of manipulation by Russia of our democratic institutions?

This authorization and the funding—I thank Senator GRAHAM and Senator LEAHY for putting money into the fiscal year 2017 budget to start this process going forward. We have approved that, and that is now in the budget. It allows us to coordinate those efforts among the United States and our European friends to protect against what we know is going to be continued activity by Russia.

There are obviously investigations going on. Part of the investigation is to understand what Russia is doing, quite frankly, so that we can protect ourselves. I think that will be very helpful, this information, and the role of the United States in working with our European allies to protect against certain continued malicious activities by the Russian Federation.

There is a provision in this bill that deals with Ukraine. We make it clear that we will not recognize Crimea's annexation of Ukraine, that we will continue to stand with the people of Ukraine in regard to their sovereignty, and we ask for a plan to reduce Ukraine's dependence on Russia energy imports.

We know that Ukraine is vulnerable because of energy, and we know that we have to develop a plan to deal with that. There are many Members involved in that, and I wish to acknowledge my friend from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, for his work in regard to the Ukraine provisions.

There are new counterterrorism financing provisions, which are pretty comprehensive, so that we make sure that we have all the tools we need in order to track the financing of terrorism activities. That is in there.

So let me just tell my colleague how proud I am to be associated with the underlying bill as well as the amendment that we are going to vote on at 2 o'clock. Both the underlying bill and the amendment were developed in the best of the bipartisan manners of the U.S. Senate.

I wish to thank, again, all of those who were involved to give us this opportunity to speak with a strong, united voice against the activities that Iran is doing globally and that are destabilizing so many countries through their terrorism and ballistic missiles and human rights violations and arms embargo violations, and to make it clear to the Russian Federation that we are not going to let them attack our country, that we are going to stand up to that and work to be sure to keep our allies safe.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was in Maine over the weekend, and people said: How do you feel about healthcare? What do you think we ought to be doing? I said: I like the President's plan. I think President Trump has it just right. He says we need healthcare that will cover everyone, low premiums and low deductibles, no preexisting conditions. That is the right formulation, and I hope that is what we can work toward, and that is what we should be working toward.

He also said yesterday that the bill that passed the House was mean. Well, a couple of weeks ago I said it was cruel, but I will accept mean; both mean the same thing. It is a terrible blow to literally millions of people across this country and thousands in my State of Maine.

By the way, the problem with the House bill is that it is so bad that some kind of compromise has developed here that is halfway, and it is still mean or cruel. Now people are talking about a "soft landing." That is a euphemism for stretching out the crash. It is not a soft landing. Whether we take Medicaid and healthcare coverage away from people in 2 years, 4 years, or 7 years, it is still going to happen, and it is a crash. It is not a soft landing. That is just stretching it out into beyond the next couple of elections, but it doesn't really get to the core of the issue, which is taking healthcare and health insurance away from millions of people.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. President, before I began, I meant to acknowledge what happened this morning to our colleagues across the way at the baseball practice—tragic, inexplicable, horrible, and just inexcusable. My heart goes out to the Capitol Police who, I understand, were incredibly brave and met their responsibilities admirably to Representative SCALISE and to any others who were injured—a terrible incident and one that we hope we never see the likes of again.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Going back to healthcare, I think it is important for people to understand the big picture of what is going on with this issue that is now before both the House and the Senate.

What we are really talking about is a massive tax increase on middle-class and lower middle-class people and a massive tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. It is as simple as that. It is a gigantic transfer of wealth—probably one of the greatest in a short time in recent American history—where we have millions of people across the country who have health insurance under the Affordable Care Act and are protected under Medicaid and Medicaid expansion, and we are taking that away. The Affordable Care Act exchange policies are a tax credit. So when you take that away, you are increasing people's taxes; you are increasing the taxes of people who are making between \$15,000 and \$45,000, \$60,000, \$70,000 a year, and you are decreasing taxes in a huge way only for people who make more than \$200,000 a year.

The 400 highest taxpayers in the country will get a tax cut of \$7 million apiece. That makes no sense. We are taking resources away from the people who need it—the middle class—and we are giving it to the people who don't need it. It is Robin Hood in reverse.

That is the fundamental point of this legislation. It is all about that big tax cut for the rich—for the really rich—and I just don't understand why we are even thinking about that, because the American people need help with the cost of healthcare. If you divide the total healthcare bill in this country by the number of people, you come up with about \$8,500 a year per person, on average, or \$35,000 a year for a family

of four. That is the cost of healthcare. That cost has to be paid, and I would argue that people who are in the middle income can't afford it. They can't afford to pay those costs, and they need some help, and that is what the Affordable Care Act does. But, instead, we are talking about repealing it—knocking those millions of people off.

In Maine we have 75,000 people on the exchanges. And then, of course, we have hundreds of thousands on Medicaid. We are talking about severely constricting their access to healthcare. That is just wrong, ethically, morally, and in any other way. We are taking healthcare away from people so we can give a massive tax cut to the people who don't really need it.

In Maine, if the House had taken a blank sheet of paper and said "How can we design a healthcare plan that would really hammer the people of Maine?" it would have been the AHCA—misnamed the American Healthcare Act; it ought to be the anti-healthcare act because that is what it is all about—taking healthcare away from people. It could not be more tailored to harm people in Maine.

We are the oldest State in the country. We have more people in the older age brackets—50 and up—than any other State in the United States as a percentage of our population. We also are a relatively low-income State. You put those things together, and you really get hurt. Also, in Maine, as in the Presiding Officer's home State, we have a lot of hazardous occupations—logging, agriculture, fishing, the iconic Maine lobsterman.

This is a guy named David Osgood from Vinalhaven, an incredibly beautiful island off the coast of Maine. Lobstering is an essential part of the Maine economy. It is a part of our way of life. Vinalhaven, where Dave lives, has a population of about 1,200. It is really hard work. It is all-weather, and it is dangerous. You have to haul tracks, repair them, be out on the water in the wintertime, which is no fun. David Osgood has been lobstering since he was 13, like his father and grandfather before him.

As of this spring, all three of David's and Elaine's children have finished college. That is amazing. That is a real achievement for any family, but fishing is challenging and tough.

The Osgoods are really thankful for the fact that they can get affordable health insurance through the Affordable Care Act. Once, they weren't covered, and David had a back problem that required surgery. Like a lot of people in Maine, he paid it off, month by month by month. But the ACA, according to Elaine, has given them some comfort and peace of mind.

I don't think those of us who have pretty much had health insurance all of our lives realize the importance of that peace of mind, of not being anxious about a health problem that could wipe you out, make you lose your house—an illness or an injury. Elaine said: We will be OK.

The deductibles are a problem. They are too high. I agree. What we ought to be working on is how to get the deductibles down, how to work on the premiums, how to work on the cost of healthcare.

All of this debate about the Affordable Care Act and Medicare and Medicaid and a public option and single payer—all of that is about who pays, when a big part of the problem is how much we are all paying. We pay roughly twice as much per person for healthcare than anyone else in the industrialized world. That is a real problem that we have to start debating. We have to start talking about that because, whoever pays, whatever the insurance plan is, if the underlying cost is something that people just can't afford, then we are going to be arguing about who pays, how much, and what part. We have to get at that \$8,500 per person.

People say: Yes, but we have the best healthcare system in the world. Yes, we do, for the people who can afford it. But for the millions of people who don't have health insurance, who get treated only in emergency rooms or more often don't want to get treated at all because they don't want to go in because they know they can't pay for it, the healthcare system does not deliver for them.

By all objective measures—longevity, infant mortality—we are not first in the world. We are like 20th in the world. We are way below our colleagues, and yet we are paying much more. We have to address high deductibles, high premiums, and high costs, but also, in the meantime, we have to keep people covered.

Another couple in Maine, Jonathan Edwards and Jennifer Schroth, live in Hancock County. It is another coastal county. They are farmers, and they raise vegetables.

Here is a great Maine story. I have known Jen's mother for about 40 years. I just met Jen at a healthcare forum in Bangor a few weeks ago, but I knew her mother way back. Everybody in Maine knows everybody else. I suspect it is like in Alaska. We are a big small town with very long roads.

Jonathan and Jennifer own and operate a farm. By the way, this farm is in a town called Brooklin, but this is the real Brooklin—Brooklin, ME. They grow potatoes, vegetables, strawberries, raspberries, and asparagus. They make maple syrup. They could never afford healthcare until the ACA came along because they were essentially a small business, but they were not a big enough business to have a group plan. They didn't have employer-based health insurance. They just didn't have it.

They are both in their fifties, and one of the changes made under the Affordable Care Act was that the ratio between the premiums for younger people and older people can't be more than three times. It reflects the reality that older people have more healthcare

needs and cost the system more. So there is a reflection. It is allowed to be a three-times basis. The House bill changes that to five times. That is a huge shift directly toward people in their fifties and early sixties.

When Jen was pregnant with each of their two boys, they had no insurance. They paid the hospital. Just like my friend David Osgood, they paid the hospital. That is what Maine people do. But what if there had been complications? They were pretty straightforward births, but what if there had been complications? They would have been wiped out because they had no health insurance. Jen says she doesn't feel it is responsible to go without health insurance, especially when you have a family.

It is critical to them that the ACA is affordable, and it is because of the tax credits. They also appreciate that they have real insurance that really covers things. There are no exclusions. People say: Well, I have this really cheap insurance policy, but it doesn't cover anything. It may not even cover hospitalization or it doesn't cover doctor visits or it doesn't cover drugs. It doesn't cover what you really need. That is not insurance. That is illusory. But now, Jen says, they have peace of mind because they have coverage. She told me that face-to-face not long ago.

Running a small business is tough. It is tough because you generally can't get group policies. Sometimes you can join a small business association, but generally you can't. This is a way to have coverage that people can afford.

Imagine if somebody came to this body and said: I have a great idea for a bill. I am going to raise taxes on the middle class and give a great big break to hedge fund managers. We wouldn't even think about it. It wouldn't even get out of committee. Yet that is essentially what this is all about.

How much of a tax increase is it on somebody? Well, in Hancock County, where these folks live, for a 60-year-old making \$40,000 a year—these are real numbers from the Kaiser Family Foundation—under the Affordable Care Act the premium is \$4,080 a year, about 10 percent of your income. That is still substantial. But under the bill passed by the House, that would go to \$17,090 on a \$40,000 gross income. It is ridiculous to go from \$4,000 to \$17,000.

Where does that difference come from? It is going back to the people who don't need it. It is going back to the people who make \$200,000, \$400,000, \$800,000, \$1 million, \$5 million a year—a 300-percent increase in out-of-pocket costs for healthcare. In Knox County—I think David is younger than 60, but if he were 60—his premium goes from \$4,080 to \$10,590, more than doubled.

This just doesn't make sense to me. This whole discussion doesn't make sense to me. I agree that we need to talk about healthcare, and I agree that we need to do something about it, but we are doing the wrong thing. We are making it worse.

There are two problems with healthcare in this country. We can boil it down to two issues—cost and access. The Affordable Care Act, although it dealt somewhat with cost, was mostly about access—allowing people who don't have health insurance to get it, whether through Medicaid expansion or through the exchanges.

Cost is a bigger issue, and it is one that we also have to deal with. But that is not what is on the floor now, or will be soon, and it is not what is being considered in Congress. But I would argue that we really have to pay attention to that issue as well.

So all of this and taking coverage away from my friend David or Jen and John and thousands—we know the number from the House bill, 23 million people in America—to give a massive tax break so a guy making a couple million dollars a year can buy an extra Maserati just doesn't pass the straight-face test for good public policy.

I am the first to agree that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. I think there are things about it that need to be fixed and adjusted, and we need to work on how we do the deductibles, how we improve that, and how we broaden the coverage and maybe make it more of a sliding scale. All of those things are things we can discuss and work on, and I am absolutely willing to do it—but the idea of repealing it just to check a box to meet a campaign promise and to be so divergent from what the President has said over and over in the campaign and since that time—that he wants coverage for everyone, no preexisting conditions, and lower premiums and deductibles. I am for it. But what we are doing is the exact opposite—the exact 180-degree opposite.

So let's take a breath. There is no deadline here of next week or the July 4th recess. Let's take a break and back off and start talking about it as Senators and Representatives from all over the country and all parties. I think we ought to be able to come to some agreement here.

Now, if there are people who are just hell-bent to provide a tax cut to multimillionaires, then, there isn't an agreement to be had. If that has to be part of the deal, include me out. But if we can start talking reasonably about how we can improve the Affordable Care Act—I don't care if we improve it, change it, tinker with it, and call it TrumpCare or McConnellCare or RyanCare. Call it what you want, but let's provide health insurance, which is so important to the American people.

I have told this story a couple of times, but I am going to conclude with why I am so passionate about this. Forty years ago, I worked here. I was a staff member, and I had insurance. For the first time in my young life, I think, I had health insurance. Part of the health insurance was a provision for preventive care, which is also required under the Affordable Care Act. So you could have a free physical. I was 28, 29

years old and immortal. We all were at that age. But I said: What the heck; it is free. I guess I will have a physical.

So I went in and had a physical. The doctor looked me over, looked at my eyes, and down my throat. But he happened to notice that on my black I had a black mole. He said: I don't like the looks of that. That ought to be taken off.

I didn't even notice it. I didn't even know it was there. He took it off, and it turned out to be something called malignant melanoma, which is one of the most virulent and serious forms of cancer. The thing about malignant melanoma is that, if you catch it in time, you are good. Here I am, 40 years later. If you don't, you are gone. I have had friends in Maine and in other parts of the country who have died of melanoma. It has always haunted me to this day that the only reason I caught it and my life was saved was because I had health insurance, and somewhere in this country there was a young man who also had a mole on his back or on his arm or on his neck and who didn't have health insurance, didn't have preventive care, didn't go to the doctor, and he is gone. That is not fair. That is not right. In a country as advanced and wealthy as this is, it is not right that that guy died and I am here.

So don't ever tell me that health insurance doesn't save lives because it does. There is no doubt that it does. That is why it is so important for us to get this right and not just cavalierly and blithely rip health insurance away from people—many of whom have gotten it for the first time, many of whom are small business people—the very people we all talk about wanting to help.

We can't do it. It is a dereliction of our duty to serve the American people.

We need to figure out how to do it right. We need to figure out how to do it effectively and efficiently. In the end, we are here to help our fellow citizens. I am here for Maine, and I can't let my people suffer under a law that would take something away which they have come to depend upon and that has saved lives and means so much to them. We can do better. I am sure of it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I have just been informed that the alleged shooter at the Republican baseball practice this morning is someone who apparently volunteered on my Presidential campaign. I am sickened by this despicable act.

Let me be as clear as I can be. Violence of any kind is unacceptable in

our society, and I condemn this action in the strongest possible terms. Real change can only come about through nonviolent action, and anything else runs counter to our most deeply held American values.

I know I speak for the entire country in saying that my hopes and prayers are that Representative SCALISE, congressional staff, and the Capitol police officers who were wounded make a quick and full recovery. I also want to thank the Capitol Police for their heroic actions to prevent further harm.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I understand Senator MCCAIN has come to the floor. I will yield to him as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I rise in support of the Countering Russian Aggression and Cyber Attacks Act, an amendment to the Iran sanctions bill currently under consideration.

In just the last 3 years under Vladimir Putin, Russia has invaded Ukraine, annexed Crimea, threatened NATO allies, and intervened militarily in Syria, leaving a trail of death, destruction, and broken promises in his wake. And of course, last year, Russia attacked the foundations of American democracy with a cyber and information campaign to interfere in America's 2016 election.

It has been 8 months now since the U.S. intelligence community publicly concluded that the Russian Government had attempted to interfere in our last Presidential election. Since then, the intelligence community has concluded that it is confident that the Russian Government directed a campaign to compromise emails, American individuals, and political organizations; that Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign to undermine public faith in the democratic process; and that Moscow will apply lessons learned from this campaign to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes.

Months of congressional hearings, testimony, and investigative work have reinforced these conclusions that Russia deliberately interfered in our recent election with cyber attacks and a disinformation campaign designed to weaken America and undermine faith in our democracy and our values. Vladimir Putin's brazen attack on our democracy is a flagrant demonstration of his disdain and disrespect for our Nation. This should not just outrage every American; it should, at long last, compel us to action.

In the last 8 months, what price has Russia paid for attacking American democracy? Hardly any at all: Modest sanctions against a few Russian individuals and entities, some Russian diplomats and spies sent home to Russia,



two spy compounds closed, at least for now—and all of this is reversible at the discretion of the President.

We must take our own side in this fight, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. It is time to respond to Russia's attack on American democracy with strength, with resolve, with common purpose and with action. So I am proud to support this amendment, which would begin to do just that.

This legislation incorporates some of the best ideas from different pieces of legislation already introduced in the Senate, ideas that have broad bipartisan support. The amendment would impose mandatory sanctions on transactions with the Russian defense or intelligence sectors, including the FSB and the GRU, the Russian military intelligence agency that was primarily responsible for Russia's attack on our election.

The amendment would impose mandatory visa bans and asset freezes on any individual who undermines the cyber security of public or private infrastructure and democratic institutions, and it would impose mandatory sanctions on those who assist or support such activities.

The amendment would codify existing sanctions on Russia by placing into law Executive orders signed by President Obama in response to both Russian interference in the 2016 election and its illegal actions in Ukraine, and it would take new steps to tighten those sanctions.

The amendment would target the Russian energy sector, which is controlled by Vladimir Putin's cronies, with sanctions on investments in Russian petroleum and natural gas development, as well as Russian energy pipelines.

We also need to put additional pressure on the ability of Putin and his cronies to move money they have looted from the Russian state. So this amendment would mandate that the Secretary of the Treasury establish a high-level task force within the Department's financial crimes and enforcement network that would focus on tracing, mapping, and prosecuting illicit financial flows linked to Russia, if such flows interact with the U.S. financial system. The task force would also work with liaison officers in key U.S. embassies, especially in Europe, to work with local authorities to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for the illicit Russian financial flows.

Finally, recognizing that Russia seeks to undermine not just American democracy but Western democracy altogether, this amendment would provide support to the State Department, Global Engagement Center, and USAID to help build the resilience of democratic institutions in Europe against Russian aggression exerted through corruption, propaganda, and other forms of political interference.

Importantly, the legislation also mandates congressional oversight of

any decision to provide any relief from these sanctions. Administrations cannot waive or lift these sanctions without certifying that Russia is making concrete steps toward changing its behavior on the international stage. In particular, Russia needs to begin adhering to the Minsk Protocol, roll back its occupation of Crimea and destabilizing efforts in Ukraine, and cease its cyber operations aimed at undermining democracy in the United States and Europe.

We need a strong Russia sanctions amendment, we need it now, and we need it on this piece of legislation. We need this amendment because we have no time to waste. The United States of America needs to send a strong message to Vladimir Putin and any other aggressor that we will not tolerate attacks on our democracy. There is no greater threat to our freedoms than attacks on our ability to choose our own leaders, free from foreign interference, and so we must act accordingly and we must act now.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle—one of the really great remaining members of the Communist Party—who has allowed me to speak and give this statement.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Rhode Island.

**MR. WHITEHOUSE.** Madam President, I appreciate my colleague's sense of humor.

#### TRANSPARENCY IN BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

Madam President, the United States of America has suffered an unprecedented intrusion into our American Presidential elections. In January, our intelligence agencies disclosed that agents of Russia, on the orders of President Vladimir Putin, engaged in a massive election influence campaign throughout 2016.

This effort strikes at the very heart of our representative democracy. All Americans should take this attack deadly seriously. Congress had to act against such interference decisively. By strengthening economic sanctions against the Russian gangster state, we hit them where it hurts, right in the oligarch. I am glad to see that Republican and Democratic Senators came together to do this.

Now the question will shift to the White House. Last July, as evidence of Russian election meddling began to emerge, then-candidate for Vice President **MIKE PENCE** said: "If it is Russia and they are interfering in our elections, I can assure you both parties in the United States government will ensure there are serious consequences."

Well, it is Russia, and they were interfering, but there has been little sign of consequences so far from the Trump White House.

Michael Flynn, as adviser to the President-elect, had illicit communications with the Russian Ambassador, about which he then lied. Trump appointees at the State Department

alarmed career officials with their rush to craft a pro-Russia program. President Trump held an unprecedented, cozy meeting with Russian envoys—all smiles in the Oval Office—a meeting for which Putin says he has a transcript. In Europe, Trump, dropping the assurances about article 5 protections from his NATO speech, gave the Russians joy.

The Trump administration has been reportedly trying to return two compounds used by Russian intelligence to Russian control—compounds here in the United States. Former FBI Director James Comey told the Senate last week that President Trump never spoke to him, not even once, about defending against Russia's acts of aggression.

Well, the threat from Russia is severe. Chairman **GRAHAM** and I held hearings in our Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, exploring the Russian toolbox for interference in democracies across the globe—how Russia exploits the dark shadows of other countries' political and economic systems.

One tool is campaign money. Russia is reported to have funneled money to French far-right party Presidential candidate, Marine Le Pen, for instance, as part of a reward for her support of Russia's actions in Crimea. Ken Wainstein, Homeland Security Advisor to George W. Bush, cited Russia as a threat of that kind of foreign financial infiltration here in the United States. "It is critical that we effectively enforce the campaign finance laws that would prevent this type of financial influence by foreign actors," Wainstein told our subcommittee. But that task proves difficult in a system like ours that permits the free flow of dark money.

Since the Citizens United decision, we have seen unprecedented dark money flow into our elections from anonymous dark money organizations, groups that we allow to hide the identities of their big donors. We don't know who is behind that dark money or what they are demanding in return. Despite this risk, Congress has been unwilling to push back against the tide of dark money. Too many are too in tow to the big American dark money emperors, like the Koch brothers, but once you permit big money to flow through dark money channels, cash from Vladimir Putin is no more traceable than cash from Charles and David Koch.

"The Kremlin's Trojan Horses" is a study of Russian influence in Western Europe done by the Atlantic Council. Russia takes advantage of nontransparency in campaign financing and financial transactions, the report says, to build political alliances with ideologically friendly political groups and individuals, as well as to establish pro-Russian organizations in civil society, creating a shadowy web of political networks which help to propagate the regime's point of view.

Corruption is the grid on which the electrons of Russian influence flow. In



the foreword to the “Kremlin’s Trojan Horses” report, Radoslaw Sikorski, former Foreign Minister of Poland, who has seen a lot of this up close, described what he called “the financial networks that allow authoritarian regimes to export corruption to the West.” He warns:

Electoral rules should be amended, so that publically funded political groups, primarily political parties, should at the very least be required to report the sources of their funding.

He continues:

The Kremlin’s blatant attempts to influence and disrupt the U.S. Presidential election should serve as an inspiration for a democratic push back.

Well, we should certainly push back by requiring political entities in this country to report their sources of funding.

Another of our witnesses, Heather Conley at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, wrote about “The Kremlin Playbook.” The CSIS report, “The Kremlin Playbook,” calls corruption “the common thread” among these various drivers of Russian influence. It is, the authors write, “the lubricant on which this system operates.” She testified just today in the Helsinki Commission that “corruption is a systemic weakness within a country that is exploited and influenced by adversaries and from which no country is immune, including the United States.”

Where Russia can work in darkness, Russian agents systemically exploit democratic institutions to acquire influence over politicians and political systems using corruption. Russia has done this in the former Soviet Union and in Europe for decades, and we should be prepared in the United States, Ms. Conley says, for them to keep doing it here.

“The Kremlin Playbook” warns that to fight the corruption that gives Russia this channel of influence, “enhancing transparency and the effectiveness of the Western democratic tools, instruments, and institutions is critical to resilience against Russian influence.”

Ms. Conley echoed the widespread warnings that the United States is particularly susceptible to Russian influence via dark money channels in our politics. That is widely agreed.

She and others have warned of a second vulnerability: lax incorporation laws that hide the true owners of shell corporations. In the same way that dark money channels can hide the hand of foreign influence, so can shell corporations, which obscure the hand of the entity behind the corporate screen. Interestingly, USA TODAY just reported: “Since President Trump won the Republican nomination, the majority of his companies’ real estate sales are to secretive shell companies that obscure the buyers’ identities.”

Our lax incorporation laws have made the United States a destination for drug traffickers, terrorists, corrupt

foreign officials, tax cheats, and other criminals from around the world. Former FBI Director Comey testified before the Judiciary Committee that the United States is becoming the last big haven for shell corporations—sickening but true. These crooks come here to America to form shell companies to hide assets and obscure illegal activities. For added safety, a foreign gangster or a crooked despot or an agent of Putin could put a shell corporation behind a shell corporation with another shell corporation behind that.

There are few safeguards in place to prevent foreign actors from funneling money into our elections through faceless shell companies. We actually already see shell companies used to hide the identities behind big political spending. This is not a potential. This is happening now. We just don’t know whether foreign influence is behind it. Nothing prevents agents of Putin from being behind those hidden entities.

Part of the Kremlin’s playbook is to use shell corporations and other devices to establish illicit financial relationships with prominent local figures. The shell entities allow Russian money to flow anonymously into crooked deals. The crooked deals give rise to corrupt relationships, and these corrupt relationships give Russia leverage, either through the carrot of continued bribery of the prominent local figure or the stick of threatened disclosure of the crooked deal imperiling the prominent local figure. The prominent local figure in the crooked deal is well and truly on the Russian hook. For what it is worth, Donald Trump is the very model of the Russian mark in this sort of scheme.

To close this avenue of foreign political influence, Ms. Conley told us: “Building and strengthening financial transparency requirements and beneficial ownership will go an extraordinary way to prevent these corrupt practices to further Russia’s influence.”

We really ought to be able to agree that we need to prevent these corrupt practices to further Russia’s influence.

The answer to the problem of shell corporations is simple: Have each state track the actual owners of companies they charter and make that information available to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies through proper process. That is what Ms. Conley means by that phrase she used, “beneficial ownership.” It is the term of art for a simple concept, knowing who the real owner is.

The True Incorporation Transparency for Law Enforcement, or TITLE, Act, which Chairman GRASSLEY and I will reintroduce soon, would require States to identify the actual human beings who own the company they incorporate. The bill would provide funding to support the maintenance and retrieval of this information, which would be available to law enforcement officers who present valid, court-ordered subpoenas or search war-

rants. The bill has bipartisan support and has received strong endorsement from the law enforcement community, banks, and anti-trafficking organizations.

Transparency in business ownership is ever more vital around the world. The European Union understands very well the shadow of Russian influence that has been cast over it, and every member of the European Union has committed to ensuring incorporation transparency. The United Kingdom, Spain, Germany, Italy, and France have already enacted incorporation transparency laws. The light of corporate transparency is about to shine throughout Europe to help defend them from Russian influence. This means that money from those shell companies and schemes committed through those shell companies will be looking for new, dark homes, likely in American shell corporations. Again, we are supposed to be an example to the world. We are supposed to be the “City upon a Hill,” not the place where the world’s most corrupt and criminal evildoers come to hide their cash and their assets.

We know the Russian playbook for election interference exploits opaque incorporation laws. We know criminals and even terrorists view the United States as a haven to hide illegal activity and its proceeds. We even know, weirdly, that lax incorporation laws are affecting our real estate market. Some American cities are so loaded with real estate held by shell corporations that it is actually driving up the prices for real American home buyers. Of course, there are not a lot of people in the corner store when the property is held for a foreign owner as the safeguard for his illicit gains.

We must take commonsense steps to stop these activities and bring wrongdoers into the light. The measures that we will take against Russia are welcome and, as Senator MCCAIN has said, even overdue, but we must remember that this is an ongoing battle and we have systemic weaknesses that have already been clearly identified to us over and over by bipartisan experts in this field and renowned think tanks and study groups here in Washington. To quote Ms. Conley again, “the battle of Western democracies to defeat corruption” must be seen as “a matter of national security.”

Testifying before our Crime and Terrorism Subcommittee, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper agreed and urged Congress to act. He said:

I believe [the Russians] are now emboldened to continue such activities in the future both here and around the world, and to do so even more intensely. If there has ever been a clarion call for vigilance and action against a threat to the very foundation of our democratic political system, this episode is it.

I hope the American people recognize the severity of this threat and that we collectively counter it before it further erodes the fabric of our democracy.

This week the Senate takes strong steps to punish Russia for its disruptive meddling in the past, but we must do more. Dark money and the shell corporations that allow Russian influence are identified known vulnerabilities in the future. Every warning is that the Russians are not going away and that future elections will be marked by Russian mischief. We have to close both avenues of foreign influence and corruption: dark money and shell corporations. They are no good in any event. They are no good in any event, and now they bring the added contamination of Russian election manipulation. I hope we can work together to remedy that contamination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, there are some days that are noisy in DC and in the Nation. It seems as if the disagreements and the discourse have paused for just a moment, and we remember again that we are all Americans and that there are issues we are facing as a nation.

Earlier this morning a group of baseball players who are also Members of Congress were getting together to practice for a congressional baseball game happening tomorrow night. It is a friendly game, a great competition for charity, and a few Members, Republicans and Democrats, from both the House and the Senate get together and practice and then play the game.

This morning at the Republican practice, a man walked onto the field and opened fire on guys just practicing baseball.

STEVE SCALISE, who is the majority whip, was hit, two members of his detail, Capitol Hill police, were injured, and other individuals who were there were injured as well. The Capitol Police saved many lives this morning. They were prepared and they returned fire and were able to stop the person who was shooting over and over again at everybody he could see on that baseball field.

What has been interesting today—since I have come out this morning, as I have walked through the hallways heading back and forth to different meetings, I have been interested to see many doors that I have walked by, and when those doors were open, I could hear people inside praying. There have been at least three organized prayer meetings on the Hill today, specifically related just to that, and others spontaneously occurring. Just for a moment we have the opportunity to be able to reflect and say to God: Thank You so much for protecting the people on that field.

Thank you again to the Capitol Police, who literally put their lives on the line to protect the guests and the Members and staff here every single day.

Once again, we remember that we are a nation that solves things by conversation. We disagree, and that is OK.

We have said for two centuries that we can disagree. We don't solve it this way, and we cannot.

I would like to be able to join what is happening all over this Hill for just a moment in this room—for us to be able to pray for a moment, as well, for the people who were there and for the people who are going through surgery right now and for their families. For every single staff member who is here, every single Member who is here, every member of the Capitol Hill police, their families are calling them and texting them and saying: Are you OK? These families are scattered all over the country, and they are worried.

We can help lead. We can set a tone to tell the Nation that we should disagree on things, but we don't ever do this. So I would like to ask for us to be able to take a moment of privilege and just be able to pray.

Father, thank You for the way that You have protected—for those individuals who are in surgery now and recovering now, for the Capitol Hill police, STEVE SCALISE, and for other individuals who were affected today, God, we pray that You would bring them healing.

We pray that You would take care of families who are worried and the Nation that is worried. We pray that You would cause something good to come out of something that is very evil. Help us to know how we respond as a nation.

I ask this in the Name of Jesus. Amen.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Madam President, we have a lot of issues that are moving right now and a lot of issues that we are discussing. Currently we are discussing sanctions. The sanctions for Russia are entirely appropriate.

I have no question in my mind that Russia has tried to interfere with our elections. I have no question in my mind that Russia did work to interfere with the elections across Europe, especially Eastern Europe. There are individuals in Russia that mean to do our Nation economic harm, political harm, and to cause turmoil. For whatever reason, they believe they can strengthen their nation by trying to cause chaos everywhere else.

As Americans, we believe we strengthen our Nation by helping others to succeed. For whatever reason, the Russians believe they can strengthen their nation by trying to cause others to fall. It reminds me a lot of bullies on playgrounds and in middle schools. For whatever reason, they do not advance to the level that they find great joy in helping others; they find their pleasure in trying to diminish others. There is an appropriate response we can make back to that as a Nation; that is, to continue sanctions and to be able to press that.

With the sanctions conversation we have about Russia, we also have an ongoing conversation about sanctions on Iran, and that is one of the reasons I want to visit with this body today to

put this word out. For whatever reason, the way sanctions are being organized right now against Russia and Iran, there are two different platforms for how to unwind those sanctions. The way this bill is currently offered, the sanctions against Russia cannot be unwound except by congressional action, but it is not so against Iran, and I am trying to figure out why.

This Congress came to this floor just about a year and a half ago with a bill called the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which passed 98 to 1 in this body. It was to be able to take authority back so that Congress should be able to vote on sanctions being lifted, in case there is ever a time that any President wants to be able to lift sanctions. Obviously, that debate was circling around the Iran nuclear negotiation at that time, and this body voted 98 to 1 that there should be accountability on any President, regardless of who it is, on the lifting of sanctions against the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world, which is Iran. So we added in those sanctions, but for whatever reason on this particular vote, those aren't there, and I have an issue with that.

I would say to this body: Can we learn our lesson? When Congress creates sanctions on nation-states and on individuals, we should also have the authority to determine whether they are lifted or not lifted. Because of that, I have filed simple language to be able to take the bill we have currently and to be able to add in simple language that says something very straightforward: The President can, for national security reasons, lift sanctions on the nation or on individuals for 120 days but cannot renew that until it comes back to Congress. If it is truly for national security reasons, there will not be any problem convincing this Congress, either body, that it is essential to be able to do that. But if you can't convince this body that it is for national security reasons, you certainly are not convincing the American people of that.

It is simple, straightforward language that I believe we should have in all of our sanctions bills. Whether it is North Korea, Iran, Russia, or whatever it may be, we should simply say that the American people, through their elected Representatives, say that this group of individuals should be sanctioned, and no individual can pull that back unilaterally without it coming back to the American people again to be able to turn it off. That is how we work as a Nation. I believe that is how we should work in the days ahead.

This is not a hostile amendment. This is an amendment saying that we have learned our lesson as a body. We should actually apply this. This is not a partisan issue. Whether it is a Republican or Democrat President is irrelevant in this issue. If Congress creates sanctions, Congress should not release the authority to make decisions on and off. What we turned on, we should be

able to turn off. That is the way our system works.

I look forward to the open debate on this simple issue, and I look forward to our determining as a body how we handle sanctions for any nation or any group in the days ahead.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Missouri.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor today, along with my colleague the Senator from Missouri, as the cochair of the bipartisan Law Enforcement Caucus. We have come to express our concern and our gratitude.

This morning our colleagues and our friends, including Congressman STEVE SCALISE from Louisiana, were senselessly attacked while at a practice in Alexandria for tomorrow's annual bipartisan congressional baseball game.

Our deepest thoughts and prayers are with the members of the Capitol Police and Congressman SCALISE and everyone who was injured, as well as their families.

While we still don't know all of the details of this morning's event, one fact is true. Were it not for the skill, bravery, prompt response, and professionalism of the Capitol Police and Alexandria police, this tragic event would have been much, much worse.

For those of us who serve and work every day in Congress at the Capitol, we see the men and women of the Capitol Police. They protect the Members of Congress, our staffs, and the Capitol itself, but that doesn't begin to describe the vital and noble work they do, because the Capitol Police don't simply protect the people in the buildings on the Capitol campus. They protect, they serve, and they honor our Capitol, our country, and our democracy itself. They sacrifice and they risk their lives each and every day to ensure that this Capitol is a Capitol for the people, a Capitol for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is the Capitol Police, in close and important partnership with local police, who ensure that everyone and anyone can come to this place to make their voices heard and to take part in our democracy.

They make these sacrifices and take these risks every day, and this morning's events are a sobering reminder of what the men and women of law enforcement all across the country—and yes, today, here among the Capitol Police—take on each and every day.

I urge everyone who works and serves here in the Capitol to take a moment to pray for and be grateful for the men and women of the Capitol Police, the men and women of the Alexandria police, and the men and women of law enforcement all across the Nation.

With that, I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I thank my colleague for yielding.

When Senator COONS and I came to the Senate about 6 years ago, it was about the time we formed the Law Enforcement Caucus. Over that 6 years, we have been continually reminded of how those who run toward danger when others run away protect us. They don't know on any given day what they may be dealing with that day, and their family doesn't know either. They are here to protect those who might be the victims of crime.

What we saw today was a horrific and cowardly attack at baseball practice—someone who takes a weapon and decides they are going to harm people they don't know for whatever cowardly reason that person had.

Of course, we continue to pray for the swift recovery of those who were injured and for the caregivers who are helping them right now.

Every day, when I come to the Capitol grounds, the first person I see is almost always a member of the Capitol Police. No matter how late it is when I leave at night, the last person I see is almost always a member of the Capitol Police. They have a hard job to do. They do it with the highest level of professionalism and dedication. Their families see them leave for work at whatever time of the day their assignments have them leaving for work and are hopeful that those they love will come home. That accounts for all of our law enforcement officers all over the country—the law enforcement officers and other first responders—who rush into dangerous situations not knowing what could be there.

We were very fortunate today. Our Members of Congress were there—Members of the House, Members of the Senate—and the people who were volunteering to make that game work the way it needs to work in order to have a bipartisan annual event to look forward to and to use that event to raise money for charity. There were staff who were there, supporting. Fortunately for all of them, STEVE SCALISE, who is the majority whip in the House, was there, which meant that there were Capitol Police and security people there with him. It is hard to imagine what might have happened if they had not been there. The Alexandria police would have done a great job and gotten there as quickly as they could, but we have these people who are committed to providing for the safety of Members of Congress, people who are visiting the Capitol, and people who are in the area of the Capitol when anything might happen. Over and over again, Senator COONS and I and others have seen the Capitol Police have to step forward.

I hope we will all remember to not only be grateful every day for those who are willing to serve but will also continue to pray today for the families of the people who were impacted today—the families who sent their sons

and daughters here to be Members of Congress as well as to be staffers in the Congress. The first news they heard this morning was of some senseless attack that appeared to be an attack because people were Members of Congress.

No act of violence, no matter how evil or senseless, will ever come close to shaking the foundations of our democracy, but in moments like this, we are always brought back to the important recognition that we are Americans first. That is why our country will always be a beacon of freedom.

The things we debate every day are not nearly as big or powerful as the things that unite us every day, and moments like this bring that sense of unity and concern and commitment of maintaining a society that is free and secure and bring a greater appreciation for those who spend all day, every working day, with that as their principal obligation. We owe them a great debt of gratitude.

Today, we owe the Capitol Police, followed up by the Alexandria police, because of the countless lives that might have been taken if the Capitol Police had not been there at the instance this cowardly attack started.

Once again, Senator COONS and I are reminded of how important it is that the Law Enforcement Caucus really, truly respect those who serve and the families of those who serve.

Senator. I am glad to yield back to you for a final comment.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for the chance to work together to lift up in a bipartisan way the men and women of law enforcement and to express our prayers and our gratitude for the men and women of law enforcement—for the Alexandria police and everyone who serves in our entire Nation to help keep it safe and secure.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, this side of the Capitol is obviously sending our thoughts and prayers to colleagues in the House of Representatives—particularly, to Congressman SCALISE—and to the other wounded law enforcement individuals and staff. Certainly, our hearts and prayers go out to those individuals too.

These men and women who protect us every day here in the Capitol do an outstanding job. We really want to make sure they understand how important it is and how much we appreciate their protection of us and the security they provide to everyone here in the Capitol.

(The remarks of Ms. CANTWELL and Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1352 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to express the sentiments of all of us who were stunned and saddened to learn first thing this morning of the attack on our colleagues and their staff on the House side as they practiced for the Republican team for the annual Congressional Baseball Game.

Senator RAND PAUL, who was present, told us at lunch about what happened. He emphasized time and again the absolutely heroic behavior, the extraordinary bravery of the Capitol police officers who were part of Representative SCALISE's detail. He said that, without these two police officers, he has no doubt that many more people would have been injured and likely killed.

So I think it is important for us to pause and express our gratitude to the men and women of the Capitol Police Force, and, indeed, to the first responders and law enforcement officers everywhere, who, day after day, put their lives on the line for our country. Without their help today, the terrible attack would have been far, far worse. So I thank them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am here this afternoon to speak about the amendment to address sanctions on Russia, but I want to preface my remarks by saying, like all of us here in the Capitol today, that my thoughts are with Congressman SCALISE and with the staff member, the two Capitol police officers, and others who were part of the terrible tragedy this morning. In particular, I want to salute the officers involved, whose courage and professionalism undoubtedly saved many lives, and I join with the entire Senate family in hoping for a full recovery for everyone involved.

AMENDMENT NO. 232, AS MODIFIED

Mr. President, in a few minutes, we will vote on a bipartisan amendment to strengthen sanctions on Russia and to mandate rigorous congressional review of any effort to loosen the sanctions regime. I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment, which has real teeth, including provisions that I advocated for to prevent sanctioned individuals from using family members to circumvent sanctions.

I am also pleased that the amendment includes congressional review of any decision to restore Russia's access to non-Embassy compounds that were seized at the end of last year in the United States. I think this is not the time to grant Russia such privileges, especially given that it would bolster their intelligence-gathering capabilities.

I am pleased that this is a bipartisan amendment, thanks to the leadership

of the chair and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, on which I serve, Chair CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN, as well as the chair and ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senator CRAPO, who is here, and Ranking Member BROWN. They worked very hard to come up with a bipartisan agreement.

I also want to recognize Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM, whose work on the underlying bill gave us a foundation to come up with this amendment.

Again, on a personal level, I want to especially thank the chair and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator CORKER had made a commitment to get this bill done after we got back from the break. He has been good on his word, and we have a bipartisan agreement.

I think these measures are necessary because the United States has been attacked by a hostile foreign power. As a result, we have a responsibility to respond in a way that punishes the attacker and that strives to prevent a recurrence in the future.

In January, the Director of National Intelligence released a declassified report on Russia's interference in our election. I think it is important to reiterate what that report said. It states:

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine faith in the US democratic process.

While recently we have learned more about the scope of their interference, a classified National Security Agency report, prepared prior to the November election, concluded that Russian military intelligence executed a cyber attack on at least one U.S. voting software supplier and sent spear-fishing emails to more than 100 local election officials. Yesterday, Bloomberg reported that Russia's cyber attack on the U.S. electoral system included incursions into voter databases and software systems in as many as 39 States.

We are learning more and more about the extent to which Russia attacked our voting system and tried to undermine our elections. That is exactly why the Senate stands united behind this bipartisan amendment to stiffen sanctions. We must not allow this kind of interference in our elections to become a normal process.

What we have heard from experts in the intelligence community—they have warned us that if Russia gets a pass on this, that it will interfere in future U.S. elections. We have seen it in Europe and other Western democracies.

In testimony last month before the Judiciary Committee, the former Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, said:

I believe [the Russians] are now emboldened to continue such activities in the future both here and around the world, and to do so even more intensely.

He goes on to say:

I hope the American people recognize the severity of this threat and that we collec-

tively counter it before it further erodes the fabric of our democracy.

Russia's interference in our electoral process should outrage every patriotic American. We need a bolder, more aggressive strategy for deterring Russia. This bipartisan agreement to stiffen sanctions is a critical step forward.

In concert with this legislation, we need to be focused on bolstering NATO and our European allies, and we need to demonstrate more vigorous support for Ukraine's efforts to strengthen its democracy and independence.

We need to be more aggressive in countering the Russia propaganda and disinformation campaign, including the Russia Today empire.

Finally, I want to again applaud the leadership of all of our committees who were involved in coming up with this bipartisan agreement. Also, I applaud the bipartisan leadership of Majority Leader MCCONNELL and Minority Leader SCHUMER because without their negotiations, we would not be here today.

I certainly urge all of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress to promptly approve this legislation, and I hope the President will sign it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio speak next for 2 minutes, the Senator from Idaho speak after that for 5, and I will conclude with 5 minutes. The vote will be held thereafter.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic leader. I thank my friend, the chairman of the Banking Committee, and also Senator SHAHEEN.

Hardly a week goes by that we don't learn more about the efforts of the Russian Government to sow the seeds of dissent around the world. Apart from oil and gas, this seems to be Russia's primary export. One administration after another has tried to reason with President Putin, but appeals to reason clearly don't work.

Vladimir Putin needs to know he will pay an increasing price for his hostile actions. He needs to know we will stand up for our allies in Ukraine and throughout Europe. He needs to know we will not tolerate his interference in our democratic process, whether in the last election or the next election.

Instead of providing a firm, clear message that we will not tolerate Russia's bad behavior, this administration has been all over the diplomatic map—and that is just in its public pronouncements. Frankly, we don't know exactly what the Trump administration is doing privately with the oligarchs, the oilmen, the Kremlin, or even with President Putin himself.

This amendment sends a firm, clear message we need right now: The United States of America will not accept continued Russian aggression. We will put tough measures in place to punish past

actions and to deter future aggressions. We will stand by our allies.

I commend Senators GRAHAM and BLUMENTHAL for their amendments. I thank Chairman CRAPO for his leadership. I thank Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN and all the Senators who have put time and effort into this issue.

On behalf of the Ukrainian community in my State, on behalf of fair play, and on behalf of the integrity of the American election system, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President. I rise to speak on behalf of the Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin Countering Russian Aggression and Cyber Attacks Act of 2017. This is filed as amendment No. 232 to the pending Iran sanctions bill, and as has been indicated, we will vote on it in just a few minutes. This amendment is the result of a partnership between the Senate Banking Committee and Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Amendment 232 ratchets up pressure against the Russian Federation for its illegal invasion and annexation of Crimea, its continuing escalation of violence in eastern Ukraine, and its malign cyber activities against businesses and citizens of the United States. It also provides Congress with strong oversight over almost any termination or suspension of these sanctions.

I spoke yesterday about the hard work of Senators CORKER, BROWN, CARDIN, and their staffs. I thank them again for their leadership. I also thank Senators MCCAIN, GRAHAM, and SHAHEEN, who contributed to these efforts. I recognize our latest cosponsors, Senators PERDUE, MENENDEZ, WARREN, RUBIO, SCOTT, HEITKAMP, REED, and TOOMEY. I appreciate their cosponsorship and support as well. We appreciate the leadership of Majority Leader MCCONNELL and Democratic Leader SCHUMER, who helped ensure we could move a good Russia sanctions package. The need for this legislation is underlined by the fact that many Americans have deep concerns about Russia's behavior over the past few years.

Since coming to power, Russian President Putin has become increasingly belligerent, nationalistic, and autocratic. Americans are concerned about Russia's behavior in Ukraine and Syria, and they are concerned about Russia's increased cyber intrusions.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle feel the United States needs to be much stronger in its response to Russia. Americans want to see the United States stand firm in defense of our long-held values, which include respect for territorial integrity, human rights, and liberty.

The Crapo-Brown-Corker-Cardin amendment signals to the world that the United States has unflagging commitment to the sanctity of territorial integrity, human rights, and good governance. Our amendment also dem-

onstrates our resolve in responding to cyber attacks against American citizens and entities and against our allies.

In summary, the Crapo-Brown-Corker amendment does the following things: It escalates and expands the current sanctions regime against Russia, it creates new sanctions against Russia, it engages Congress at a higher level than before by providing a mechanism for Congress to vote before lifting any sanctions on Russia, and it increases the Treasury Department's ability to track illicit finance, including illicit flows linked to Russia.

The amendment will result in some very powerful and new sanctions. Amendment No. 232 includes Congressional Review Act language to ensure Congress exerts proper oversight over the use of these powerful sanctions. It also requires the creation of a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related forms of illicit finance. This strategy ensures that the United States pursues a coordinated and effective fight against illicit finance at all levels of the Russian Government.

As we move forward with this amendment, we must engage all of our allies and our trading partners. It is important that we work together to minimize collateral damage and unintended consequences.

This is a strong bipartisan measure that, in important respects, represents the next step forward. Even though unilateral actions are not the best option, America must lead on the issue now and encourage others to follow. The times call for clarity of purpose and a correct amount of pressure. We have that in this amendment.

Again, thank you to Senators CORKER, BROWN, and CARDIN for your hard work and support, and all of the other Senators I have mentioned. Thank you to our cosponsors, and especially to Leader MCCONNELL and Democratic Leader SCHUMER for all of your help and your support. I look forward to passing this measure in short order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we will vote on an amendment that consists of a package of Russia sanctions. I would like to endorse the amendment in the strongest possible terms and hope we can get all of our colleagues to vote for it.

It was negotiated by a bipartisan group of Senators who did a great job: Senators CORKER and CARDIN, CRAPO and BROWN, with a great deal of help from Senators SHAHEEN, DURBIN, MENENDEZ. Leader MCCONNELL and I worked extremely well on this issue together, which I hope portends future things we can do together in a bipartisan way. This amendment is as bipartisan as it gets, and rightly so because this is an issue that should unite Members of both parties and concern Americans of all political stripes.

Over the past several years, President Putin and his allies and the Rus-

sian oligarchy have committed several sanctionable offenses. President Putin has violated the sovereignty of its neighbor, Ukraine, by annexing Crimea. He is guilty of human rights abuses, including propping up the brutal Assad regime in Syria, and stifling political dissent and the human rights of his own people. In Mr. Putin's Russia, elections are neither fair nor free. The media is controlled by the state, and the political opposition is hardly tolerated.

This is a regime that has routinely flouted international norms and agreements; that severely and brutishly pursues its own self-interest without regard to legitimate rights of other nations and peoples. For that, the U.S. Congress passed a series of economic sanctions to squeeze Putin and his allies and show them that the United States strongly condemns these actions, and that was before Russia conducted a high-level campaign to interfere in the American election.

The Russia sanctions legislation we are about to vote on would address these two critical issues. By codifying existing sanctions and creating a process for congressional review of any decision to weaken or lift them, we are ensuring that the United States continues to punish Putin for his reckless and destabilizing actions. It is particularly significant that a bipartisan coalition is seeking to reestablish Congress, not the President, as the final arbiter of sanctions relief, considering that this administration has been too eager—far too eager in my mind—to put sanctions relief on the table. These additional sanctions will send a powerful bipartisan statement that Russia and any other nation that might try to interfere with our elections will be punished.

There is no process more sacred in our democracy than the guarantee of free and fair elections, no principle more enshrined in our system of government than the people participating in our noble democratic experiment at the ballot box. That bedrock principle, the fundamental right was attacked by Mr. Putin. If we did nothing—or we reduce sanctions, as the President sometimes has talked about—we would eat at the wellspring of our democracy. Foreign powers influencing whom we elect is something the Founding Fathers feared, and we are doing everything we can in this body to try and stop.

With the upcoming vote, the U.S. Senate is saying to President Putin: You will be held accountable for your actions. Foreign interference in our democracy has been a concern since the founding of the Republic. It is the origin of the emoluments clause in the Constitution. In Federalist 68, Alexander Hamilton writes that “these most deadly adversaries of the republican government [come] chiefly from the desire in foreign powers to gain improper ascendancy in our councils.” Every “practical obstacle,” Hamilton

said, “should be opposed to [such] cabal, intrigue, and corruption.”

We cannot let Russia's meddling in our elections go unpunished, lest they ever consider such interference again, nor any other nation in the world. They must know that if any future attempts are made to degrade our democracy, the retribution of the U.S. Congress will be sure and will be swift.

I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 232, as modified, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL.

The yeas and nays have previously been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Leg.]

#### YEAS—97

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

#### NAYS—2

Lee Paul

#### NOT VOTING—1

Van Hollen

The amendment (No. 232), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CORKER], for Mr. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 240.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: 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)

At the end, add the following:

#### SEC. 13. 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 character 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.

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

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

#### CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to express my deepest sympathy for the victims of this morning's shooting, including for my good friend, Representative STEVE SCALISE. I pray that he, the congressional staff, and police officers who were injured in this horrific event can recover quickly.

Today is not a day to reflect on our differences but on our common commitment to upholding the Constitution and doing the work of the American people. This Chamber is often divided on matters of policy, but in the face of tragedy, we are united as one. Today, we are together, and together we recognize the local law enforcement officials who responded quickly and professionally to this morning's attack.

Each and every day, police officers across this great Nation risk their own well-being to ensure the safety of others, and they do so with little fanfare or recognition. In light of today's events, I recognize, in particular, the special sacrifice of our U.S. Capitol police officers—the selfless men and women—who, each and every day, assume significant risk to keep all of us safe.

I shudder to think of what may have happened this morning had it not been for the quick action taken by Representative SCALISE's security detail. These courageous special agents returned fire to apprehend the perpetrator of this senseless and appalling act of violence. Through their heroic actions, they prevented a massacre and saved the lives of dozens of elected Members of Congress and congressional staff. Today I wish to pay special tribute to these humble heroes.

As far as I am concerned, our Capitol Police officers are the finest professionals this Nation has to offer. We wave to them each morning as we walk in to work, we say goodbye to them each night as we leave, and we interact with them each day. Yet how often do we thank them for their service? How often do we reflect on the weight of their work? How often do we recognize them for their sacrifices? In my opinion, not often enough. Because these police officers are such a common presence here on Capitol Hill, I worry that all too often we take them for granted, but we should never take for granted the men and women who would willingly give up their lives to protect ours.

This morning's attack reminds us all of the thin line between peace and violence, and our Capitol police officers are the first to respond when that line is crossed. Today and every day, these selfless men and women deserve our heartfelt thanks and appreciation.

In paying tribute to our Capitol Police, I would be remiss if I were to fail to recognize the 23 members of my own



security detail who work around the clock to keep Elaine and me safe. These men and women are like family to me. Over the past 2½ years, I have built a special bond with each of them.

Today I would like to recognize each of them individually:

Supervisory Special Agent David Rib, who leads the detail with assistance from team leaders Jason Marcello and Shane Powell; in addition, Special Agents Eric Boggs, John Britto, Jacqueline French, Eric Holzer, Eric Love, Paul Martin, Ronald Munar, Benjamin Odell, Richard Philius, Luis Pimentel, Ryan Rayball, Austin Reinshuttle, Henry Smith, John Whittle, Micah Harrison, Muhammed Khan, Gideon Maran, Arnold Pierre, Robert Schultz, and Charles Snead.

In all of my years of public service, these are among the most honorable men and women I have ever worked with. “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”

The fact that these special agents are willing to put their lives on the line to protect all of us speaks to their selflessness, their bravery, and their love of this institution and of country. Elaine and I love each of these special agents deeply, and we love their families too.

In these photos, you can see one of the team leaders, Jason, hard at work. Jason hates this photo, which is why I blew it up for national TV. The other photo is of the trip I took to all five of Utah’s national parks last year. During this trip, my security detail was with me every step of the way. These men and women never leave my side.

Today I wish to thank them with all of my heart for their service and their sacrifice. These are really great people, and we have enjoyed being together. At least, I have enjoyed being with them. I will put it that way.

As Members of Congress, we stand united in the aftermath of today’s attack. Thanks to our brave Capitol Police officers, we also stand protected from those who would do us harm. Because of them, we can confidently carry on the work of the American people.

These are really great human beings—men and women—who literally sacrifice a lot to serve us, back us up, strengthen us, and help us in times of need. They are people whom I really, really admire. All I can say is, I admire those who stood up this morning for Congressman SCALISE and the others who were there and especially for those who were wounded.

This is a wonderful institution, and we have wonderful people working with us—heroic people, people who care for this body, people who care for our country, people who care for us. I think we ought to all thank God every day that we have these good people around us and that we ought to all take the time to be kind to them, to show them how much we care, and to show them the friendship we truly have for them.

I am grateful that I know a number of these people—quite a number. I am grateful for them and for what they do for all of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, let me join my friend, the senior Senator from Utah and President pro tempore of the Senate, in his remarks about the U.S. Capitol Police.

All of us who work on Capitol Hill, all of our visitors who come here—our constituents from around the country—are in their debt because they literally do keep us safe and secure here on Capitol Hill. I do think the events this morning give rise to some additional concerns of what happens off the Hill, when ordinarily there might not be the sort of security measures in place that are necessary.

I think this is another wake-up call to all of us to be vigilant, to be aware of our situations, and to exercise concern for our own safety. Of course, we do need to continue to look at what the needs are of the Capitol Police, in terms of training and equipment and staffing, to make sure they can continue to do the outstanding job they have done here, yet again, this morning.

It is safe to say that without the Capitol Police being present, as a result of Congressman SCALISE’s location there at the Congressional Baseball Game practice, the results of this might have been much more serious—much more tragic—than they already were.

Of course, we are continuing to keep Congressman SCALISE in our prayers. I was looking at the TV screen on the way out. It looks like he is out of surgery but is still in critical condition. Of course, we continue to think about him and his family and offer them our support and our prayers.

While there is a lot we do not know about this morning’s incident, it is clear that this is a new environment we are living in, and we need to do everything we can to keep our constituents safe when they visit us on Capitol Hill as well as to keep safe all of the staff and everybody involved.

Mr. President, at a time when people do not believe anything bipartisan happens here in Washington, DC, I know we have seen a remarkable vote on these Iran-Russia sanctions with the vote of 97 to 2. Virtually every Republican Senator and virtually every Democratic Senator voted in favor of these sanctions which target two of the most aggressive regimes in the world.

The first is the Iranian regime, the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism. The second is the Russian regime, which, as we all know now, was so aggressively involved in trying to sow discord and chaos in the days leading up to the 2016 election.

It is staggering, really, to see the extent to which Russia has raised its game when it comes to disrupting core, democratic undertakings like elec-

tions. We know they are doing that in the United States, and we know they have attempted to do that in France. This is the way they operate. This is part of their tradecraft. Through a combination of cyber espionage, propaganda, the use of social media, and then unfortunately sometimes too glibly a mainstream media, we know false stories have somehow been elevated to a level at which people actually begin to believe them and cause them to distrust their own government. This is a real threat to the United States and to our democratic institutions.

The talk of the Russian collusion that led up to the election is fading because, as so many people have said, including distinguished Democratic leaders like Senator FEINSTEIN, who served with distinction as chair of the Intelligence Committee and who serves on the Judiciary Committee and Intelligence Committee now, there is no evidence of there having been collusion in the election. What we need to turn to now is how we can countermeasure what Russia tried to do when it came to the so-called active measures, which was a combination of cyber espionage, the use of social media, and propaganda right here in our homeland.

We are a country that believes in freedom of speech and the First Amendment, and sometimes that makes us more vulnerable than perhaps others who have state-owned media because we let anybody who has a point of view express it freely. That is part of our DNA. It also means that aggressive, hostile regimes like Russia can take advantage of our open society and our freedoms to try to sow discord and distrust in our own country.

I hope, now that the allegations about collusion are fading, we will take a serious look at how to respond appropriately with countermeasures to this sort of aggressive action on the part of Russia. I am really pleased that with a vote of 97 to 2, we have voted to impose sanctions on the rogue nation of Iran and the rogue nation of Russia.

#### PROTECT OUR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. President, in turning to another topic, earlier this year, with the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Nevada—Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator HELLER—I introduced a bill that was called the PROTECT Our Children Act. I am proud to see it is moving through the Senate this week.

This is an important piece of legislation that most people will not hear or read much about because it is not particularly controversial, but that does not mean it is not important, which is why I want to talk about it briefly. This bill helps to stop the exploitation of children across the country and over the internet by reauthorizing the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program.

Years ago, when I was attorney general of Texas—from 1999 until the time I came to the Senate—we created in the Texas attorney general’s office



something we called, quaintly, the Texas Internet Bureau, which was cutting edge for the time. Now it is more of a cyber crimes unit that deals with, frankly, a lot of the same subject matter—child exploitation, child pornography, and other crimes—which are committed using the medium of the internet. I had a chance to see, sadly, how vulnerable children can quickly become victimized at the hands of some truly despicable individuals as well as the resources it takes to stop and to prosecute these predators.

One of the things we did at the Texas Internet Bureau back in the 1999 to 2000 timeframe was to link up, of course, with local law enforcement officials, but what we learned is that every municipal police department or county sheriff's department has the kind of expertise and has the sort of equipment they need in order to combat this new type of crime.

Through a national network of 61 coordinated task forces that represent 3,500 Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, we have now been able to comprehensively investigate and prosecute child predators. These task forces develop victim support programs, and they provide training and technical assistance and advanced forensic methods, which are very important when trying to track the online fingerprints or footsteps of these predators who operate online.

Through this legislation, these task forces will also help continue to facilitate community education, for example, by helping to inform parents and legal guardians what they can do to help protect their own children or the people for whom they are responsible.

Tragically, in this day and age, the internet's vast scope provides a dark, deep harbor for predators. Without the proper training and equipment, it can be difficult for our law enforcement officials to track down these child predators. This legislation ensures that they will have the resources they need to fight cyber crime and keep our communities safe by reauthorizing these important programs until the year 2022.

Last week's passage through the Judiciary Committee was the first key step. I am thankful for the work of my colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and one of our principal cosponsors, Senator HELLER from Nevada. I am hopeful we can keep moving forward with this legislation so we can get these essential programs reauthorized by passing this in the Senate and then moving it on through the House and swiftly to the President's desk for signature and enactment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today we are shaken and encouraged. My prayers remain with my friend STEVE SCALISE and his family; as well as with Zach Barth, the congressional staffer; Matt Mika, who was volunteering at the

baseball field; and the two brave police officers, Crystal Griner and David Bailey.

I have played on the Republican baseball team. I have practiced on that field. I am sure that no one woke up this morning imagining this tragedy was possible, not a single player who woke up this morning and who wanted to make sure they invested their time and their energy in such a way to help nonprofits around the area benefit from drawing a crowd together to watch Republicans and Democrats play baseball for the express and specific benefit of helping those who cannot help themselves.

I am also encouraged today. I am encouraged specifically by law enforcement and, more specifically, the Capitol Police who, because of their swift action, saved lives this morning at the baseball field. Thank you to the men and women who put on the uniform to keep others safe and, as we can tell by the injuries of Crystal and David, put themselves in harm's way.

I am also encouraged that in the midst of this crisis, we have seen our country come together. We have seen this body come together. At noon today, we had a prayer vigil led by Senator COONS, a Democrat, and Senator LANKFORD, a Republican. We are no longer in the midst of a crisis—Black Americans and White Americans or liberal Americans or conservative Americans, Republicans or Democrats. We are not even swayed by the current environment of sensationalism. No, sir. We are simply Americans, blessed by God to be a part of the American family.

The polarization that pulls on the fabric of this great country is very, very dangerous. Too often, we find ourselves splitting into smaller factions. We stop listening to others' points of view. We react immediately with hostility, doubting the very intentions of folks who do not agree with our perspective. This is very dangerous for our future. We seem to have forgotten how to disagree without being disagreeable, and today's shooting is one of the manifestations of that.

This weekend marks 2 years since the massacre at Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, SC—my home—where a racist who wanted to start a race war decided that he could take advantage of the cracks in our foundation, that he could drive to Charleston, SC, and take advantage of those cracks. But the families of the victims, understanding and appreciating the notion of Matthew 5:44—loving those who seem to be our enemies—did not allow their grief and their anger to overpower their senses. They believed in the power of love. They believed that love is more powerful than hate. They believed in each other. And because of their conviction, my city and my State stood together, Black South Carolinians and White South Carolinians, and said to the world: Not in my place, not in my city, not in my State, and not in my

houses of worship. We stood together. We did not allow this spirit of oppression and division to separate us. We allowed the power of love to unite us.

So whether it is race or politics, whether it is gender or any other number of ways that we could be divided, we have to—I implore all of us—remember that we are first Americans.

As I think back to the funerals, to the vigils, I think of my good friend from Hawaii. She is not a Christian; she is of another faith. She is not a Republican; she is a Democrat. But she flew down to South Carolina only a couple of days after the massacre because two of her friends—myself and TREY GOWDY—were attending the funerals, attending the first major events. She wanted to worship with us. She wanted to be there with us. This is a classic example of when and how our Nation pulls together, setting aside our differences.

We must work together, ensuring opportunity for all, not profiting from the division in this Nation, not looking for ways to get more clicks on our pages. And why is that? It is simple—because America is stronger than this. America is better than this. We are the American family, and we must let love be the light to show us the way.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have some remarks to make with respect to healthcare that I will offer in a moment.

First, I want to address the events of this morning. The shooting that took place in Alexandria today was a horrendous, despicable act of violence. The victims—including Congressman SCALISE, two Capitol police officers, and two others—are still undergoing treatment. There is much that is still not known about what happened.

There are a few things that are known. First, it is thanks to the extraordinary heroics of the Capitol Police and first responders on the scene that this shooting did not become a massacre. Each and every one of us who comes to work in these buildings every day is profoundly grateful for our Capitol Police, our first responders, and the incredible service and protection they provide.

Second, I think all of us know that this violence has visited too many of our communities. It has cost and ruined too many lives.

Finally, we know that the game our colleagues were practicing for—a charity game between rival parties that is held to benefit disadvantaged kids—is going to go on as planned. The game is

a show of friendship. It is a show of bipartisanship. It is an indication that, as there are strong differences of opinion on the policies that we debate on the floor of the Senate, we still come together at urgent times like this. The game, which shows our commitment to friendship and bipartisanship, has never been needed more than it will be tomorrow.

Our thoughts are now with those who are injured. It seems that everyone you run into at the Capitol has said they are praying and they are rooting for a full and speedy recovery. It is one of those moments when people understand that there is legislation here—their bills, their amendments. Sometimes there is a lot of process—an amendment to the amendment to the amendment, as my wife calls it. Then there are other times like this morning, which are life and death.

As we reflect on those who did so much to keep it from being even worse—a massacre—we have our prayers for those who are injured. Once again, it puts into perspective what is so very important.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, to the topic at hand, there have, obviously, been dramatic headlines in the news pertaining to ties of the President with Russia. I want to be sure that what is happening here in the Senate with respect to healthcare doesn't get drowned out.

The fact is that here in the Senate, behind closed doors, 13 Senators—all from the same party, all of them men—are updating the Republican healthcare plan. The House passed its TrumpCare bill by the slimmest of margins just a few weeks ago.

The public has seen it, and, based on everything I can tell, it has gone over about as well as a prolonged root canal surgery. I have heard about every imaginable concern about that House bill from Oregonians. I have had 46 townhall meetings thus far this year, including 4 over this past weekend.

When the bill came to the Senate, my colleagues on the other side got out in the press, tamped down expectations, and claimed that everything would be starting over. They are starting from scratch. Now the public knows, because it is what Members of the majority party have said, that the Senate version isn't going to be all that different from what barely made it from the House this spring.

When the bill is finalized, we know it is going to be rushed to the floor, and it will not be long before debate is cut off and final votes are cast. It is a plan that relies on speed, forcing a devastating blow to American healthcare through the Senate before our citizens can actually catch on to what is happening.

This political process on this bill makes what the House has been up to look positively transparent. The basic framework of the Republican healthcare plan isn't going to change. Millions and millions of Americans will

lose their health coverage. It is not my view. It is the view of the independent Congressional Budget Office. Costs are going to go up, especially for those who are elderly and sicker, and those who are the fortunate few are going to get an enormous tax break.

The basic framework isn't changing, and what that means is that the social safety net—led by Medicaid, which is a lifeline for kids and seniors and the disabled—is going to be under attack. The public health system in America has stood on two twin pillars since 1965. Those pillars are Medicare and Medicaid. The Republican majority has a plan to knock one of them out beginning this year.

Today, Medicaid comes with a guarantee that if you are sick, if you are injured or if you spend every day walking an economic tightrope, you are going to be able to get care when you need it. You will not be denied benefits. But TrumpCare ends that guarantee.

The plan Republicans have on offer would dismantle Medicaid as it is known today, putting hard dollar limits on the program. That puts caps on care. That is what it means—that there will be caps on care. It is a scheme that puts Medicaid in a vise, squeezing its funding year after year. The plan makes budget targets a bigger priority than real-world healthcare needs for some of the most vulnerable people in our country.

Seventy-four million Americans have health coverage through Medicaid. That includes 37 million children. It provides comprehensive care to millions of pregnant women. It is a leader in the fight against the opioid epidemic, and there is treatment for those who are dealing with mental health and substance abuse disorders.

Medicaid is a lifeline when it comes to helping kids and adults with disabilities. Then there is the nursing home benefit, something I know from my years as codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers. This is a benefit that is a bedrock protection, built into Medicaid to help pick up the tab for two out of three nursing home beds in America. If you roll that benefit back, I don't see how seniors across this country are going to avoid living in squalor. Maybe their kids can take them in, but the kids of the parents I am talking about have told me they are working on an economic tightrope, trying to balance food against the fuel cost, the fuel cost against the rent cost.

So my guess is, if you squeeze the Medicaid Program tighter and tighter and States are forced to cut benefits and access to care, as will be inevitable under TrumpCare, I just don't see where you can ensure that seniors in nursing homes are going to be protected.

My own view—and this goes back to the days when I worked with seniors—the challenges with older people have evolved over the years. Back then, you had Part A. That was hospitals. Part B was doctors. That is not Medicare any

more. Today, more than 90 percent of the spending deals with chronic illness—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, strokes. It is a very different program, but we are still going to need nursing home care for so many of our older people who have done everything right in life. They are our mothers, our fathers, our grandparents, our friends. They fought our wars. They started families. They built careers. They raised kids. They scrimped. They saved. They never went on that special vacation. They never bought the boat they would have loved to have, and they did it because they always wanted to pay for essentials and see if maybe they could set aside what they could for schooling for their kids and retirement for themselves.

But, as I have said, what I have seen over the years since those Gray Panther days is that growing old in America just keeps getting more expensive for so many older people. The bills don't stop coming when you retire. And most older people still live on a limited, fixed income. I saw that with my full-time work at the legal aid office for older people and the Gray Panthers, and I saw those seniors having to stretch every last penny, and even then, it was a struggle to cover the basics. So what happens—and I am afraid we are going to see a lot more of it—is seniors eventually spend down their savings. When they face challenges, they spend down their funds.

Today, when it comes time to pay for long-term care like nursing homes and home-based care, Medicaid steps up. It is the backstop, a guaranteed backstop to protect our senior citizens. I don't want to undersell how much that means to people in my State and across the land. Medicaid is the barrier that keeps millions of seniors from falling into isolation and utter destitution.

There was a time in our country when seniors were cast aside. They were sent to poor farms, what were called almshouses. The wealthiest Nation on Earth said goodbye to those poor farms with the creation of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Under the Republican healthcare plan, unfortunately, Medicaid would be slashed so deeply, States are going to be forced into cutting benefits. Seniors could be nickel-and-dimed for basic everyday services. Nursing homes could be shuttered. Home-based care that allows seniors to live independently could be no more. I think you are going to have lots of seniors living in squalor, and some could be out on the street.

So in my view, the people of our country are owed answers to key questions about this Republican plan.

First, how are families supposed to support their loved ones if they lose the guarantee of Medicaid?

One year in a nursing home costs more than \$90,000 on average. That is two or three times the cost of a year of college tuition. Are families going to be forced into choosing between educating their kids and supporting their

elderly parents? Is it going to be a fact of life for working Americans that they have to cram two or three or four generations of one family into the same house simply because they can't afford nursing home care?

Second, what is the backup plan for vulnerable, isolated seniors, particularly those who live in rural areas?

I recently held a series of eight healthcare roundtables in rural communities across Oregon just over the last few days, in Pendleton and Condon. The message I heard from healthcare providers again this past weekend throughout rural Oregon was that TrumpCare cuts could hit seniors in rural America especially hard.

Seniors in rural communities have higher rates of chronic illness, like heart disease and diabetes. The healthcare they need requires more attention and more services. They count on getting top-notch care in nursing homes and from home-based providers. Losing these benefits could mean being alone in a home that is unsafe, cut off from the care and the connections they need.

Colleagues, in the last few weeks of this debate, I heard Members flatly deny that gutting Medicaid by more than \$800 billion will mean anybody loses access to healthcare services. That is just untrue. Anybody who says that they can slash our healthcare programs by close to \$1 trillion without having a negative impact on access to healthcare services is just plain wrong.

Furthermore, I think it is time to recognize what the end goal of this debate appears to be. My Republican colleagues haven't put forward a proposal to protect seniors who can't get the Medicaid nursing home care they need or kids with disabilities who lose the services they depend on. What Republicans have on offer is not a plan that swaps one vision of healthcare for another.

These massive cuts to Medicaid and other health programs are going to pay for equally massive tax breaks for the fortunate few. Members of this body are going to have to decide whether it is worth gutting Medicaid and endangering essential care, like nursing home care and important home-based services, to pay for these big tax breaks for the fortunate. In my view, it should be an easy choice.

My colleagues on the other side ought to drop this partisan approach—what is called reconciliation—that it seems the Senate is headed toward. At a minimum, the majority party ought to bring this process out from behind closed doors and give it a little bit of sunlight. There ought to be hearings convened in the Finance Committee and the other committees of jurisdiction, as there were again and again in 2008 and 2009.

When you are talking about one-sixth of the American economy and what is the premier issue and always will be, which is people and their loved ones having their health, I don't see

how you make an argument for not having a debate out in the open. There has to be a public debate. The legislation ought to be written in the light of day, and then our people ought to have ample time to review it before it goes up for a single vote, either in committee or here on the floor.

I am going to close with something that I think about especially today—the big challenges of our time. You have to deal with them in a bipartisan fashion in order to, one, get them right, and two, make them sustainable. The Presiding Officer of the Senate knows this. He and I spent many months working on key economic issues and recently put together a bipartisan bill on infrastructure. Healthcare is particularly important because when you are talking about providing care for over 300 million Americans, you have to really think through what the consequences are. Often, when you take a step over here, it ripples over there. That is why it seems to me that it is so important that the Republican majority set aside this partisan “our way or the highway” approach and get back to working together to find common ground.

I had a piece of legislation when we were debating healthcare in 2008 and 2009—eight Democratic Senators and eight Republican Senators. That was the first time in the history of this body that we had that. There are Republicans and Democrats who continue to serve in this body who are cosponsors of that legislation. It is called the Healthy Americans Act.

We got some of what we thought was important into the Affordable Care Act—in particular, a provision that I think the American people really want to think about in the days ahead, and that is, in our bill with the 16 Senators, we had airtight, loophole-free protection for those with preexisting conditions. There wasn't any way to hit them with extra costs or discriminate against them because they had a preexisting condition. We said that we wouldn't stand for that because if you allow discrimination against those with preexisting conditions, you take America back to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy. If you are healthy, you don't have a preexisting condition, and if you are wealthy, you can pay for care. We can't go back there. But the House bill basically allows States to get waivers so they can start unraveling that and punch big holes into that guarantee of airtight protection for those with preexisting conditions.

If the majority will set aside this partisan-only, “we are doing it our way” kind of approach, what you heard from colleagues on my side is that there is very significant interest in working together to deal with the key challenges. One of them, obviously, is more competition in the insurance markets, particularly as it relates to individual insurance. You do that, and you will take the insurers off this roll-

er coaster so they have some certainty and predictability. You can stabilize the private insurance market.

We ought to work together on bringing down prescription drug prices. Our people tell us every time we are home that these prescription drug price increases are hitting them like a wrecking ball. I have introduced approaches that I think can get bipartisan support, and there are others who have as well. But that is how to do it right. That is how you find common ground: You take time to take each other's good ideas.

Bipartisanship isn't about taking each other's lousy ideas. Bipartisanship is about taking each other's good ideas, and there are good ideas on both sides of the aisle to stabilize the private insurance market, to hold down prescription drug prices. But this idea of reconciliation, where we are all just going to do it our way—that is the Republican approach, the partisan approach, and featured in that approach are devastating cuts to Medicaid. That is a nonstarter.

So I come to the floor this afternoon, particularly given years of interest in trying to find bipartisan common ground on healthcare, to urge my colleagues to abandon this approach that is being pursued behind closed doors, that nobody knows anything about, and that really seems unprecedented in terms of dealing with one-sixth of the economy. I urge my colleagues to abandon the partisan approach of reconciliation and work with colleagues on this side on a bipartisan basis.

I will close simply by way of saying that I wanted to come to the floor today, and I will try to be back tomorrow to outline other challenges ahead in healthcare. I urge the American people across this country, in every corner of our Nation, to make their voices heard.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am here today to urge support for the act that counters Iran's devastating and destabilizing activities. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill. This bill would expand sanctions on individuals who are contributing to Iran's ballistic missile program, supporting international terrorism, or violating the arms embargo against Iran.

Iran is one of the key principal state sponsors of terrorism in the world. In fact, the Obama administration said it was the No. 1 sponsor of state terrorism in the world. It is a destabilizing force for its neighbors, and it is

a destabilizing force for a more peaceful world. The Iranians provide financial and material support to groups such as Hamas, Hezbollah, militias in Iraq, and a host of other terrorist groups. They have threatened to wipe out our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel. They said they would wipe them “off the map.” They continue to violate international restrictions by advancing their ballistic missile program.

Former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, when he testified in front of the Senate Armed Services Committee in February of 2016, said: “Iran’s ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East.”

By one estimate, Iran may have conducted as many as 14 missile tests since the Obama administration’s nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, went into effect. Apparently, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action meant that Iran could take any action it wanted, if you look at what Iran is doing today. They have violated multiple legally binding arms embargoes established by the U.N. Security Council.

On a trip to Saudi Arabia in April, Defense Secretary James Mattis noted that Iran continues to violate multiple arms embargoes, saying: “We see Iranian-supplied missiles being fired by the Houthis into Saudi Arabia.” I think that, at one point, Secretary Mattis said that anywhere you look in the disrupted Middle East, Iran is there. This action and others directly violate what Iran agreed not to do when they agreed to the behavior that they said would be their future behavior.

As to their ongoing support of international terrorist organizations, the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, testified in front of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in an open hearing on May 11, 2017. Just to double down on what his predecessor said, Director Coats said: “Iran continues to be the foremost state sponsor of terrorism.”

If Iran is the principal state sponsor of terrorism—the foremost sponsor of state terrorism—certainly, we should take some action. This bill does that. Whether it is action supporting the rebels in Yemen or the brutal dictator Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Iran is clearly there and clearly a force for bad, not good.

The legislation the Senate is considering this week would go a long way toward holding Iran accountable. The Countering Iran’s Destabilizing Activities Act codifies sanctions that are directed at all three categories of illicit activities and behavior that we should condemn from Iran—ballistic missile tests, arms embargo violations, and support of terrorism, as well as Iran’s own systemic abuse of human rights in

its own country. There is no way to criticize that government without fear of abuse or worse.

Specifically, the bill directs the President to impose sanctions on any person who knowingly engages in any activity that materially contributes to the Iranian ballistic missile program activities or to any other program for which a system to deliver weapons of mass destruction is involved or any person who contributes to the transfer of certain arms to or from Iran. The bill also directs the Secretary of State to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of people the State Department has determined to be responsible for gross human rights violations against individuals who seek to promote human rights. The bill further provides that the President may block any property these human rights abusers have in the United States.

This measure also addresses Iran’s continued support for terrorism. Executive order 13224, issued soon after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, sanctions entities determined to be supporting international terrorism.

Let me remind the Presiding Officer that the last two Directors of National Intelligence have both said that the No. 1 supporter of international terrorism is Iran. Several Iran-related entities have already been sanctioned under that order, but not, surprisingly, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. This bill makes a finding that that corps is responsible for supporting terrorism and requires that the sanctions of the Executive order that I mentioned be applied.

This bill does not violate the nuclear agreement with Iran. As the Obama administration said repeatedly, the nuclear agreement was about providing Iran “relief from nuclear-related sanctions.” I may come back to that later, but this nuclear agreement does not require the United States to look the other way as Iran continues to violate international norms on ballistic missile testing and violates the arms embargo.

Let me also say that the Iran nuclear agreement was just an agreement between the leaders of the two governments. It isn’t a treaty. The President never tried to defend it as a treaty. The Congress didn’t approve it as a treaty. It is no more of a binding treaty than anything else that the President on his own would decide they would enter into, hoping that the next President would also agree with their decision.

Secretary of State John Kerry, in the final days of his service as Secretary of State said: “We still have serious differences with the Government of Iran, and will continue to push back on its support of terrorism, disregard for human rights, and destabilizing regional activities.”

This bill delivers the pushback that Secretary of State John Kerry called for.

Despite the hopes that the previous administration had for moderation—re-

member that debate about how, once we entered into this agreement, it would strengthen the forces of moderation in Iran?—Iran has increased its destructive activities since the 2015 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Strengthening sanctions on Iran is an appropriate response in Iran’s continued aggression. Again, because these sanctions are directed only at actions outside of the nuclear sphere, the legislation in no way violates the letter or spirit of that agreement. The Iran sanctions regime is the best tool we have to hold Iran accountable and one that we should continue to keep at the forefront of our policy.

In April, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson sent to Congress, as required by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, the latest certification that Iran is implementing the nuclear agreement. In his message, Secretary Tillerson pointed out that “Iran remains a leading state sponsor of terror.”

How could we ever have put a leading state sponsor of terror on a path to having a nuclear weapon? All the things we are concerned about in North Korea we have guaranteed in Iran, unless some future President—President Trump or some future President—decides that this is not the direction in which we can continue.

Secretary Tillerson also said that President Trump has ordered an inter-agency review to evaluate whether suspension of sanctions related to Iran, pursuant to the JCPOA agreement, is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

He concluded by saying that, when this review is complete, “the administration looks forward to working with Congress on this issue.”

This is a positive step. That review need not constrain the use of sanctions to hold Iran accountable for its other bad behavior.

I would just like to remind everyone that under President Obama’s nuclear agreement, Iran has already gained access to more than \$100 billion in sanctions relief, some of which is likely to be fueled to terrorists aligned with Iran. Remember the delivery of cash to Iran and where our government said that some of that cash would likely go—what an outrageous thing for us to be a part of.

The No. 1 sponsor of terrorism in the world deserves to be sanctioned. Individuals who are part of those activities deserve to be specifically sanctioned. This bill will do that. I urge my colleagues to support the bill and the amendment that was voted on today, and look forward to that action being taken later this week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been more than 6 months since a major foreign adversary undertook a cyber act of war against our election.

The Russian attack sought to undermine faith in our democratic system and favor one candidate over another—

in this case, one seen as more favorable to the Kremlin's interests.

This was truly a historic event—one that requires a response of equal magnitude—not only to deter any such attacks on our future elections and those of our Western allies, but to make sure our election infrastructure is secure from any future cyber threats.

Unfortunately, President Trump has refused to even acknowledge the Russian act of cyber war and the Republican-controlled Congress has similarly refused to act to retaliate against Russia or strengthen our cyber defenses.

All the while, Russia has predictably continued its belligerent military and cyber actions against our NATO allies and Ukraine, as well as ongoing cyber attacks on the election of our democratic allies, most recently in France.

This should come as no surprise. We were warned by our own experts and our allies about the danger of American inaction.

For example, last month, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper warned, “An American citizen should be very concerned about a foreign government, particularly our primary adversary, interfering with the most important foundational process that we have in this country, which is free and fair elections.” And former FBI Director James Comey also recently warned about the Russians “They’re coming after America . . . They will be back.”

I heard the same warnings in Eastern Europe, where our allies starkly warned that Russia would feel emboldened to continue its attacks if the United States did not even respond to the attack on its own election. So I am understandably pleased that, at least this week, we are taking action to maintain and toughen sanctions against Russia.

This bill takes a number of long overdue steps, including codifying existing sanctions against Russia put in place by the Obama administration, adding new sanctions on Russia, and making it harder for President Trump to lift any sanctions on Russia without congressional review.

I think these are important steps we must take to respond to Russia and to protect our democracy, but they are not nearly enough.

We must also pass legislation to help protect against any such future attacks on our election and to safeguard our electoral infrastructure.

We must get to the bottom of questions regarding possible collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians.

We must be prepared for President Trump to use the waivers and designation authority granted to him in this bill to ultimately do little to nothing to toughen sanctions against Russia.

You see, the way we usually write sanctions language is to instruct that the “President shall” take such action as described and then provide a national security waiver.

Well, this President has spent more time trying to endear himself to the Russians than warning them to never attack our Nation again. In fact, this President continues to deny that there was a Russian attack on our election. What can we expect this President to do with the discretion given in this bill dealing with these exact issues?

I hope he does the right thing to protect our national security and democratic system from foreign attack, but I and others will be watching to make sure he does and ready with additional measures if he does not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, Republicans continue to come to the floor to talk about the urgent need that we have to reform America's healthcare system. The reason we continue to do this is because the pain of ObamaCare is getting worse.

We are seeing it all across the country. The healthcare system in this country has been devastated by a law known as ObamaCare. Every weekend, at home, I hear, as Republicans all around the country hear, about the costs that have been spiraling out of control—double on the ObamaCare exchange, we hear across the country, but in many States even more than that.

In Wyoming it has gone up 107 percent over the past 4 years. We also hear from people at home about their specific premiums on the exchange and how they are worried about them going up even higher next year. Not only have they doubled, but they are worried about them going up again. Just this past week, we have heard stories about numbers that have been requested for increases in New Hampshire, New York, and Maine. We are hearing it all across the country. I hear it every weekend in Wyoming.

People are very concerned about the impact that ObamaCare has had on their lives personally. Many will tell you that they believe that the insurance they bought under ObamaCare has been of less value than they would have liked, and many people are not buying because they see that the value is not there.

When we hear about these increasing rates and we hear about the fact that it is going to only get worse, people are saying: The cost has gone up; maybe we ought to try to shop around, and maybe we can find more choices.

The problem is the choices are going down as well. Insurance companies are continuing to drop out of the ObamaCare plan. So people around the country are having fewer and fewer choices under ObamaCare.

Last Friday, a headline in the Wall Street Journal read: “Another Area Loses Last ACA Insurer.” It is not just that they have fewer choices. Now we are looking at places in the country where there are no choices.

In Wyoming we had two. One of the companies went out of business. We are

down to one. That company has lost money. The question is, How long will they stay? How much higher will they have to raise rates under ObamaCare? Will we be at a point where the counties in our State, instead of having one, have none?

This article in the Wall Street Journal last week says: “Washington state has no insurer willing to offer Affordable Care Act plans next year,” in some of its 39 counties.

A few days earlier, we heard the news from people in a similar situation in Ohio. There are 18 counties in Ohio next year with no plans offered. So with ObamaCare you are going to get a subsidy, but there is no place to use the subsidy. You have no choices. But we warned from the beginning about the ObamaCare death spiral, and we are seeing it happen here. For those people living in those counties in Ohio and those counties in Washington, the insurance death spiral is complete. There is no insurance market. There is no one offering to sell insurance because of the damage done by ObamaCare to the insurance market in the United States.

We have millions of people across the country who have been harmed by the higher costs and the fewer and fewer choices available under ObamaCare. They have lost the coverage they had. Care is not available to them in the sense that their insurance is not available to them. The options are shrinking all across the country and have completely gone away in certain places.

Now, someone who is living with a preexisting condition is so much of the debate, and I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who come to the floor, talk about preexisting conditions. If you are someone in any of these counties and you have a preexisting condition and the company you buy your insurance from goes out of business and there is no one to sell you insurance in the county in which you live and you have a preexisting condition, under ObamaCare, you are out of luck. You may get a subsidy, but you cannot buy a policy. Under ObamaCare, preexisting conditions are not covered if there is no one available to sell a policy, and we are seeing more and more counties falling into that situation.

There was almost a full-page map in the New York Times earlier this week of the number of counties across the country in which there are only two insurance companies selling or one or none at all. That is the problem we have all across the country.

We predicted this. This disaster of ObamaCare was entirely predictable. Republicans came to the floor as it was being debated, as it was being discussed, as Democrats were voting on it, and we continued to point out that we would be in a situation of free fall, and we are now in that situation with ObamaCare.

Republicans know what we need to do. We are trying to stabilize the market. We want to protect people with preexisting conditions. We want to lower the cost of premiums. We do not want the rug to be pulled out from anyone, and we are trying to reform Medicaid in a way that provides long-term stability to that program.

Finally, after all of these years of talking about the problems with ObamaCare and with so many Democrats having blinders on, wanting to just apply a blank check to the problem and say: "More money. More ObamaCare," finally, now some Democrats are saying, yes, that there are problems with ObamaCare. The problem is that their solution is the wrong solution.

What they want to do is make the problem even bigger, and we have seen it in California this past year. Actually, just a week ago, the California State Senate—and it is a Democratic-controlled Senate—after calls from people throughout their political party and at their political convention a couple of weeks ago, said that we know what to do—single-payer healthcare. That is what they proposed, and it passed along party lines.

Who is that single payer? It is the American taxpayer. The Democratic-controlled Senate in California passed a single-payer healthcare bill. From cradle to grave, everyone is covered. Anything you need, you have it, says California.

I served in the Wyoming State Legislature—and I served at the Presiding Officer's level in the legislature—where we did something called a fiscal note. What is something like this going to cost? They did the same thing in California. The fiscal note was \$400 billion a year. Put it in perspective. How does that fit into the State budget? The general fund for the State of California for a year, when they have just passed a bill for \$400 billion, is only \$190 billion. The total cost of what the State Senate of California passed is twice the entire general fund for the State of California. In other places, when they have said that they have needed a single-payer plan, as they have done in Canada and England, what has happened is that it has led to longer lines, waiting periods, and the rationing of care. That is not what the American people want, but it is what the Democratic Party is proposing and actually voted for in the State of California.

This was a headline in the New York Times just the other day, "The Single-Payer Party? Democrats Shift Left on Health Care."

The article goes on to read in terms of the Democrats:

Cast out of power in Washington and most State capitals, Democrats and activist leaders seeking political redemption have embraced an unlikely-seeming cause: an actual government takeover of health care.

This was from the New York Times about what has passed in California and what Democrats around the country are proposing.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, which is right down the hall of this building, a majority of the Democrats has cosponsored legislation to go to a single-payer healthcare plan—for the majority of the Democrats in the House, a single-payer healthcare plan.

That is not what hard-working Americans want. That is not what struggling small business owners want. That is not what the people of Wyoming want. The people at home already cannot afford to pay for the insurance that has been mandated that they buy under the Obama healthcare law. They cannot afford the penalties. They cannot afford the insurance, and they want healthcare—care they need from doctors they choose at lower costs.

How in the world is this country going to afford higher taxes to pay for the Democrats' single-payer fantasy? Yet that is what they are looking at in California. To double the cost of the State's general fund, you are talking about raising taxes as well as, probably, eliminating some services. Would you have to eliminate teachers, firefighters, public safety workers? Those are the things that you have to wonder about when they make such an irresponsible decision in the California State Senate.

Ronald Reagan, I think, said it best when he said that you cannot be for big government and big taxes and a big bureaucracy and still be for the little guy. Ronald Reagan had it right. Now Washington Democrats want to ignore that.

Small business owners know what Democrats in Washington, DC, and in California refuse to acknowledge right now. The small business owners know it, and the Democrats will not acknowledge it. People around the country realize ObamaCare is not working. It is why they elected a Republican House, a Republican Senate, a Republican President—because of the pain caused to the American people under the Obama healthcare law, which mandated that everybody buy a government-approved product. The costs have gone up, and the choices have gone down. People have been left in a state in which this is not what works for them.

So here we are. We are on the cusp of coming out with a Republican plan. We are trying to do it with our legislation. We are writing a reform plan to reduce healthcare costs and improve access to insurance without the mandates and the restrictions we have seen under the Obama healthcare law.

I think Democrats should join us in finding the best solutions for the American people. The time to act is now because we see that, from week to week, more of those who sell insurance are pulling out. People with preexisting conditions who lose their coverage will have nowhere to turn under ObamaCare. We continue to fight for our patients. As a doctor, I know what patients need, and it is the care they need from doctors they choose at lower costs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL PRACTICE SHOOTING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like all of us here on Capitol Hill, I am still reeling from the attack on our colleagues this morning. My thoughts and prayers are with everyone who was injured, and with their families.

My friend and colleague STEVE SCALISE remains in critical condition right now, and I am praying for a full and swift recovery.

I am grateful to hear that the young congressional staffer who was shot—a legislative correspondent for Representative ROGER WILLIAMS—is expected to make a complete recovery.

Legislative correspondents and the other young staffers who work in our offices don't get a lot of media attention, but not one of us could do our jobs serving our constituents without them. We are grateful for their work and dedication.

In the Gospel of John, Jesus says: "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Most of us have never been in a situation where we have a need to consider such a great sacrifice. But, every day, the men and women of the United States Capitol Police, and every police force in this country, get up and go about their jobs, knowing that they may have to lay down their lives, and they do so willingly. When others run from danger, they run into it. When bullets fly, they advance.

Today, violence threatened, and officers of the Capitol Police stepped up to meet it. Had it not been for the efforts of the heroic officers who were on site, today's attack could have been much, much worse. As it is, their actions have brought many safely home to their families tonight.

Events like today remind us that there is evil in the world, but they also remind us that there is good. Around every act of evil and violence, 100 acts of good spring up. The officers who risked their lives to defend those at the scene, the colleagues who hurried to provide medical care to STEVE SCALISE, the Alexandria police officers who came running to help, the Democratic congressional baseball team who united in prayer for their colleagues, the injured officer who went to check on the Member he was protecting before he thought of seeking treatment for himself—these are the things that endure.

Good endures. Sacrifice endures. Heroism endures. Long after the names of evildoers are forgotten, these things remain.



Again, my thoughts and prayers are with the injured and with their families. And, as always, my gratitude is with the Capitol police officers who defend us every single day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, this morning, an unbalanced individual carried out a cowardly attack, not only against Members and staff of this Congress but against democratic institutions. This terrorist—and he is a terrorist—desired to destroy our democratic institutions. We as a country cannot allow this to happen. If anything, this must strengthen our resolve to do what is right for our country and for each other. We cannot let this shooter defeat good.

I have known STEVE SCALISE for decades. I served with STEVE in the Louisiana Senate, then in the U.S. House of Representatives. I called his wife Jennifer and will be available to help his family in any way I can.

STEVE is a man of good character. He loves the United States and Louisiana, loves the LSU Tigers, which, of course, is our mutual affection as well. It is a privilege to serve with someone who cares so deeply about the people whom we are both honored to represent. My prayers are with STEVE, Jennifer, and their children.

We also think of Zack Barth, Matt Mika, Agent David Bailey, and Agent Crystal Griner. We think of them, are gratified that they were able to receive medical treatment quickly, and ask that everyone join in keeping them and their families in our prayers as well. To all of them—we want them to know that we in the United States and in Louisiana support them.

I specifically commend the Capitol Police for all they do, and, again, Agents Bailey and Griner for their bravery and quick actions to protect those in danger. We are blessed by the service of the Capitol Police and fortunate they were there to prevent this attack from being even more tragic.

Where do we go from here? Frankly, we as a country need to come together to try and reinject civility into our political rhetoric. We can disagree on policy. It is that disagreement and our ability to discuss and debate these differences that makes democracies successful.

The key word here is “debate.” There is a difference between debate and attacking the motives and good faith of another. Debates are healthy, productive, and you respect those in opposition. You discuss ideas, not perceived intentions. When respect and good faith in the intentions of the other are lost, though, perhaps it does more to hurt than to heal.

We as individuals need to look at how we use rhetoric—rhetoric that can cause someone who is unbalanced to

commit an act of violence, as we saw this morning. Anyone saying things to vilify another or portray them as evil, we have to recognize that can drive some, again, to acts of violence. Let's do what we can to move this country to the era of respectful debate.

Now let me end where I began. We cannot let political terrorism win. We must stand firm in support of our democracy and democratic institutions. We must carry on, not letting evil triumph. We do that by recognizing that we are all, first, children of God, then all Americans. We come together, stand united, doing that which is best for our country and for each other.

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. KENNEDY. 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. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Congressman STEVE SCALISE; Special Agent Crystal Griner; Special Agent David Bailey; Zack Barth, a legislative aide to Congressman ROGER WILLIAMS; Matt Mika, who works for Tyson Foods—those five individuals were shot today, and I am asking and saying to every American who happens to be listening to the Senate at this time: If you believe in God, please pray for them as I have and as I do. If you don't believe in God, this is America, and that is your right. Send positive thoughts their way.

Like most Americans, I feel awful, I feel sad, and I feel mad.

I have known STEVE SCALISE a long time, I don't know, 20, 25 years. He is a political friend, but he is also a personal friend. STEVE works all the time. He loves his family. He will do anything for his constituents. I know that is what we always say about each other, but it is true with STEVE. He loves this place. I have never seen him in a bad mood. I know he must be; he is human. But I don't think I have ever seen STEVE in a bad mood. He is positive; he is can-do. Every time I go to a function, STEVE is there. I don't think he ever sleeps. He does an extraordinarily good job of representing the First Congressional District of Louisiana, and this is so unfair. I wish I understood why bad things happen to good people.

My thoughts and prayers, as all of our thoughts and prayers should be, are with Jennifer, STEVE's lovely wife. STEVE and Jennifer have two great kids, Madison and Harrison. I can't imagine what his family is going through right now. I am just so sorry.

We are also praying and hoping for a quick recovery for Matt and for Zack.

I thank Special Agent Griner and Special Agent Bailey. There were 30, 40, 50 Congressmen and Senators out there today. It was an open field. But for the

bravery of these two special agents and other members of the Capitol Police, it would have been a turkey shoot: no cover. You have a person—that is as charitable as I can be right now—a person armed with an assault rifle and a handgun. I just want to tell those two agents and all the other law enforcement officials who support them and who keep us safe every day: Thank you so much for doing your job.

We have heard—and I hope it is not true—that this was a political shooting; that this person who decided to commit these despicable acts did it because he didn't like the political persuasion of the people at whom he decided to shoot. I hope that is not true. I hope members of the media come back tonight after the Secret Service investigates and tell us that is not true. Because if it is true, this represents a new low for America.

Reasonable people disagree, and you have the right under our Constitution to disagree. This is America. You can believe what you want. Within reason, you can say what you want. And most of us—I dare say, all of us in Congress—would do anything we could to protect that right.

I guess you have a constitutional right to hate, if you want to. But I don't understand people who hate other people just because they don't agree with them politically. It is not only nonsensical, it is un-American. If the reports are true, it breaks my heart that this is what we have come to. I think many of us have probably seen that attitude. It has not become prevalent in America, but it certainly has become more than just a mere occurrence. I will put it that way.

The internet has been an extraordinary thing for commerce and for the quality of life of all of us, but sometimes I read what people write on Facebook and I read comments. The worst are the ones where people can comment anonymously on newspaper articles. The vitriol, the hatred—I would hate to live with that much hate in my heart.

Our thoughts and prayers are with STEVE, Jennifer, Madison, and Harrison, and they are with Special Agent Griner, Special Agent Bailey, Zack Barth, and Matt Mika. My personal thoughts and prayers are with every American today who feels as I do, that this is just a sad, sad day for this great country.

I don't know if there is any good that can come out of this, but if there is, I hope the good that does come out of this is that we will all stop and think about the things that divide us and understand it is OK to disagree. I will say it again: Reasonable people do. But you can disagree with somebody without hate.

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. COTTON. 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. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to add to the voice of so many Senators today who expressed their prayers and concerns for the five Americans who were wounded today in a terrible shooting in Alexandria, VA: STEVE SCALISE, a friend of mine from the House of Representatives, someone who took a bet on me early in my first campaign, as a neighboring State, aspiring young candidate, and with whom I served for 2 years; Matt Mika, who represents the Tyson Foods, a great Arkansas institution, and whom I have known since the beginning of my days of politics; Zack Barth, a young House staffer; and Crystal Griner and David Bailey, two brave Capitol police officers who were on the scene.

We don't yet know all of the details of what happened this morning. Here is what we do know: If it weren't for the bravery of those Capitol police officers—not just Crystal and David but the others present—there might have been many more killed.

We all sit here safely engaged in the great debates of American democracy—whether we are a Senator or whether we are Americans watching it—because there are brave men and women literally standing guard at our doors with guns, willing to put their lives on the line to defend all of us.

I want to join so many other Senators today to express my gratitude to the Capitol Police, not just for protecting us—535 elected Members of Congress—but also for protecting all of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who come here every single day of the year to see their Congress and their Representatives doing the people's business.

#### HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS LARRY ROBERTS

Mr. President, speaking of men who guard us with guns, I want to turn our attention to Arlington National Cemetery. After 74 years, an American patriot has finally come home.

PFC Larry Roberts, of Damascus, AK, was only 18 years old at the time of his final mission. It was November 1943—the height of World War II. Private Roberts had been assigned to the Special Weapons Group, 2nd Defense Battalion, Fleet Marine Force. U.S. forces were making their way across the Pacific, island by island. That month, those marines landed on tiny Betio in the Tarawa Atoll of the Gilbert Islands. The mission? Take the island and advance on to Tokyo and victory. Private Roberts and his battle buddies performed brilliantly, but the fighting was fierce. One thousand marines and sailors were killed and 2,000 were wounded. The Japanese fought to the last man standing. In the end we won but at steep cost.

Private Roberts, like so many others, was killed on November 25, 1943. In the

2 years after the war, the 604th Quartermaster Graves Registration Company tried to recover all of the remains on the battlefield, but they never found any sign of Private Roberts. In 1949, a military review board declared his remains nonrecoverable.

Just 2 years ago, the nonprofit History Flight discovered an until-then unknown burial site on the island and recovered remains of 35 marines who had died there. It took 2 years, but thanks to the amazing work of the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, we were able to identify the remains of Private First Class Roberts. It was heartening news, especially to the Roberts family.

I am happy to say he has been laid to rest on American soil on our most hallowed ground—Arlington National Cemetery. I had the honor of attending his funeral earlier today. Now he rests amid the rolling green hills and the ghostly white crosses of that cemetery. I think it is more than fitting because his burial there is a symbol of what this one person, this young man so far away from home, did for our country. He gave his all-too-brief life in service to something greater than himself. He gave his life and service to his country. He gave all his tomorrows so you could have today and tomorrow.

I wanted to recognize him and his service on the Senate floor tonight. Standing here, I think of the words of the great British Parliamentarian William Gladstone: “Show me the manner in which a nation cares for its dead and I will measure with mathematical exactness the tender mercies of its people, their respect for the laws of the land, and their loyalty to high ideals.”

To the men and women of our Armed Forces, I want you to know that if you are ever separated, captured, missing, or killed in action, our country will spare no expense and will suffer any burden to bring you back too.

PFC Larry Roberts died fighting for that highest ideal, that of freedom. He would have been 92 years old this year. It is because of him and his bravery and millions of Americans like him that our country is still here, still standing, still free, as it has been for 241 years.

Mr. President, 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. SULLIVAN. 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. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, we are on the Senate floor today, yesterday, and tomorrow, and we will be continuing the debate on the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017. This is actually a very important bill, and I want to commend Senator CARDIN, Senator CORKER, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee,

and many others on working hard to put this bill together in the Foreign Relations Committee.

There is a lot of interest in this. I am a cosponsor of the bill, and I think it is an important bill.

Let me just give a quick overview of what its core purpose is. There was a lot of discussion last year about the JCPOA—what it was going to do and what it wasn't going to do. I think a lot of us, even those who supported it—and I certainly did not support it. As a matter of fact, I thought it was a very misbegotten agreement that was going to undermine American interests and the interests of our allies in the region. But a number of us were concerned about what it didn't cover. The bill we are debating today does close some of those loopholes. For example, the core purpose of S. 722 is to impose sanctions on Iran for its ballistic missile program, which continues to violate U.N. Security Council resolutions, and its support of terrorism.

It is still listed by our State Department as the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world. As to its transfer of illicit weapons, which it is not supposed to do under U.N. Security Council resolutions, it continues to do that, and, of course, there is its continuing and widespread abuse of human rights. That is all still happening with regard to this Iranian regime, which the previous administration spent so much time negotiating with to get this nuclear deal that, I think, undermines our interests.

The bill we are focused on is very bipartisan. It sets to close some of these loopholes and impose sanctions for these kinds of violations. It does not violate the JCPOA. I think Senators CORKER and CARDIN worked hard to make sure that would not be the case in order to get bipartisan buy-in. I think it is an important bill, but it could have been stronger. Unfortunately, a number of us had provisions and amendments that were meant to strengthen it. Some of us don't sit on the Foreign Relations Committee, but we have a lot of interest and experience with these issues. What we could have done was to actually make this bill stronger by looking at some of the other amendments that Members of the Senate brought to the floor on this very bill.

Let me give you one example. I had an amendment that was a very simple amendment. It essentially stated that Iranian banks and financial institutions would not be able to use the U.S. financial system—our banking system, which is critical to global commerce to conduct any business around the world—until Iran was taken off the list of countries that sponsor state terrorism—very simple: not using the American financial system until you are not a terrorist designated by our State Department. This is important. These kinds of sanctions are important because Iran and other rogue nations—you see it all the time—want access to

our financial institutions and the dollar, the world's currency. Roughly 43 percent of international financial transactions and more than 60 percent of total allocated global floor exchange reserves are denominated in U.S. dollars.

We have tremendous leverage over other countries, even if we are acting just as the United States, with regard to accessing the U.S. financial system. When you have these kinds of sanctions, when other countries are not allowed to access our financial system, it puts a real strong bite on their economy.

We wanted to bring this down to the floor. Again, there is bipartisan support for this amendment. Unfortunately, not many but just a few of my colleagues wouldn't want to accept this. They didn't even want to vote on the amendment. They believed, incorrectly, that somehow this would undermine the JCPOA. Well, it wouldn't. As a matter of fact, former Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew stated that under the JCPOA, the Treasury Department was still going to prohibit Iranian banks from being able to use U.S. dollars through New York or to hold correspondent account relationships with U.S. financial institutions. He testified that the JCPOA would continue to bar Iranian financial institutions from using our financial system. So that is happening right now.

What we wanted to do with this amendment was to say that we are going to make that legislation; we are going to make that a statutory prohibition, and the biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world shouldn't be able to use our financial system until they are no longer a sponsor of terrorism—very simple. But we couldn't get that through the Senate. If we voted on it, I believe there would be a strong bipartisan majority of Senators who would agree with us, but there are a few who don't.

The JCPOA was sold in many ways as helping to ensure that Iran would moderate its behavior, that Iran would become part of the "community of nations" again.

Well, of course, despite claims by the former President and the former Secretary of State that this is what the agreement would do, that hasn't happened. To the contrary, the opposite has happened. Iran has undertaken activities to undermine U.S. interests, the interests of Israel—our sacred ally in the Middle East—and the interests of our gulf Arab allies in the Middle East on almost a daily basis.

Look at what has happened since that agreement was signed. Moderating behavior did not happen; much more aggressive behavior did. It is really important for people to remember that this isn't just the largest state sponsor of terrorism. This is a country whose activities have led to the deaths and wounding of thousands of American soldiers and marines. The Iranian regime was supplying very sophisticated

IEDs to Iraqi Shia militias that were killing, maiming, and wounding our troops in Iraq. That is a fact. This is a regime with the blood of U.S. soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen on its hands. This is not a regime we should trust. This is a regime about which we should do everything we have in our power to use our leverage to help undermine their nefarious activities around the world that they have been conducting for decades.

So again, my congratulations and I am going to vote for the bill. My congratulations go to Senators Corker and Cardin for this important bill, but it could be stronger. We need to look at ways to make this stronger. This was a missed opportunity, simply bringing an amendment like this to the floor for a vote. Let's see where people stand. It would be strongly supported by the American people, strongly supported by our allies, strongly supported by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

Unfortunately, there are a few in the Senate who seem more interested in protecting the legacy of the JCPOA than in really putting the screws to Iran and really limiting their ability to fund terrorism or their illicit businesses around the world. That is disappointing. These Senators will not say they are doing that, but that is what is going on here. The legacy of the JCPOA is not worth safeguarding if it means missing the opportunity to further leverage and undermine Iranian terrorist activities around the world. So that is a disappointment we have seen today.

I am going to continue to keep pushing to do more to make sure we take every action, every bit of leverage that the United States of America has to push back against the nefarious activities of the biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world—the Iranian regime and its leadership. I know that most of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—are interested in doing so today. We made a good start with this bill that hopefully is going to pass the Senate floor, but we can do much more. We need to do much more. I am going to continue to press my colleagues to do so.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. DAINES assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding rule XXII, to withdraw the cloture motions on the committee-reported substitute and S. 722; that the only further amendment in order be the Gardner amendment No. 250, as modified with the changes at the desk; further, that following leader remarks on Thursday, June 15, the time until 11 a.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that at 11 a.m. the Senate vote in relation to the Gardner amendment No. 250, then vote in relation to the amendment No. 240; finally, following disposition of that

amendment, the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 250, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 250, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. GARDNER] proposes an amendment numbered 250, as modified.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide an exception for activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration)

In Section 236, at the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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.

**VOTE EXPLANATION**

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 144 on Senate amendment No. 232 to S. 722. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

**VA ACCOUNTABILITY AND VACANCIES**

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, but this legislation does nothing to address one of the most critical problems at the VA. To improve the healthcare our returning heroes receive, we need a VA that is fully staffed with the best healthcare professionals we can find, and in many VA facilities throughout the Nation, including in Ohio, that is far from the case.

Across the U.S., there are more than 49,000 VA vacancies that this administration has yet to fill. In Ohio, as of

April of this year, there were more than 1,700 VA vacancies, and more than 1,500 of those positions were considered critical to public health and safety.

That is a massive problem that needs immediate attention by the administration. These vacancies are not just numbers; they have serious consequences for our veterans who need care.

When the VA is understaffed, it means longer wait times. It means veterans unable to see the specialists they need. It means overstretched doctors.

Overworked doctors means mistakes are more likely and veterans are not getting the quality care they deserve.

Imagine a doctor tells an Ohio veteran she needs an MRI. Well, if there is no MRI tech at that facility because they have not hired one, she has to wait longer for the test and diagnosis. She might have to find someone to drive her to another town.

The last thing we ought to be doing is making it harder for these men and women who have sacrificed so much for our country to get the care they need. We owe all of our veterans—and the families who support them—our gratitude, our respect, and the best healthcare in the world. That means recruiting talented doctors, nurses, and other staff members has to be a priority for the VA.

The agency must improve outreach to prospective employees to show that it is a desirable place to work. It needs to demonstrate that employee's voices, including those of whistleblowers, will be heard and protected when necessary. Future VA employees need to know that all efforts by VA workers to improve the quality of services provided to our veterans will be encouraged, appreciated, and acted on.

We absolutely need to ensure that we are holding the workers who care for our veterans and servicemembers to the highest standards—but that is not enough.

We can improve the quality of care by the VA by making sure it is properly and fully staffed. That is currently not the case, and I will continue to press the VA to provide answers as to why more than 1,700 positions in Ohio—positions that should be filled by Americans dedicated to serving our veterans—are vacant.

When our servicemembers return home, they should be able to focus on spending time with loved ones and rejoining their communities, not worrying about whether they will be able to get the quality healthcare they deserve.

#### TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN SCHLEY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, for centuries, families and communities throughout Maine were sustained by healthy working forests. During his 32 years with Pingree Associates, including 28 as president, Stephen Schley has exemplified the stewardship that defines Maine's forest products industry.

His retirement provides an opportunity to celebrate his many contributions to the economy, environment, and the communities that make up the great State of Maine.

It can truly be said that Steve's commitment to Maine and our forests is in his DNA. In 1820, the year Maine became a State, Massachusetts shipping businessman David Pingree began investing in Maine forestlands. Nearly two centuries later, as a descendant of that visionary leader, Steve has helped to make Pingree Associates a model of sustainable forestry, environmental responsibility, economic development, and public access.

Today Pingree Associates' lands in Maine approach 1 million acres. Steve has always recognized that with those great holdings comes great responsibility, and he has always measured every initiative by its benefit to the communities and people of Maine. He has devoted time and effort to engaging with organizations statewide that seek to provide support for these communities and their development, both inside and outside his role in forest management.

Just a few examples from a long career demonstrate his commitment. In the 1990s, under Steve's leadership, the Pingree lands in Maine became the largest forest in North America to earn certification for sustainable forestry practices. In 2001, he guided the agreement that established a 750,000-acre conservation easement, also the largest on our continent, to ensure continued public recreational access to undeveloped woodlands. In recent years, as the industry has sought to address the challenges of a changing economy, Steve has been a leader in supporting research into forest bioproducts and developing new economic opportunities for the entire forest products industry. He has always recognized the value in engaging with all stakeholders and has worked in cooperation with the University of Maine to foster the next generation of foresters. Indeed, he worked to establish the endowment of the University's Forestry School, recognizing the unique perspective and unparalleled training that comes with working in the forests of Maine.

The people of Maine have always been faithful stewards of our forests because we appreciate their tremendous value to our way of life. As president of Pingree Associates, Steve Schley has honored our heritage and helped to shape the economic, environmental, and recreational future of our entire State. I commend him for his dedication to Maine's natural treasures and our way of life and thank him for his years of stewardship.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Steve Schley who is stepping down as president of Pingree Associates after nearly three decades of leadership later this month. Eight generations after his descendant initiated this effort, Steve Schley has, in his 32 years of service both to Pingree

Associates, of which he was president for 28 years, and to the State of Maine, continued a tradition of leadership in the development and fiscal health of Maine's forest products industry as well as the sustainability of Maine's forests. Steve's retirement provides an opportunity to honor his wide array of accomplishments and contributions to the State of Maine—all achieved in the spirit and essence of his lineage.

In the year 1820, Maine, as included in the the Missouri Compromise, was ushered into the Union as a new State. That same year, a prominent Massachusetts shipping merchant named David Pingree initiated what would become a historic and indispensable string of investments in Maine forestlands. Over the next nearly 200 years, sudden growth and advancement of Maine's forest product industry, and thus statewide economic development, blossomed from the easement agreements signed and purchases made of Maine forest land by the Pingree family.

Today Pingree Associates is in possession of close to 1 million acres of Maine forest land, bringing a great burden of responsibility upon the president of the association. In every respect, Steve has thrived under this burden. During his tenure as president, he has undertaken initiatives to revitalize Maine's struggling wood-products industry by collaborating with the University of Maine's Forest Bio-products Research Institute to help nurture the next generation of innovators and leaders in the bioproducts industry, setting the stage for the development and integration of sustainable, forward-thinking forest products. By "paying it forward" through the youth of Maine, he is ensuring that his integrity and hard work will continue to live on through these kids for generations to come. Steve's sustainability and conservation efforts were not limited to just ensuring a bright future. Back in 2001, when I was Governor, I announced Steve's success in closing the largest forestland conservation easement in the history of the United States between Pingree Associates and the New England Forestry Foundation, which independently protected 762,192 acres from development and opened up the land to recreation for Mainers and all U.S. citizens for time immemorial.

Because of Steve's hard work and leadership as president of Pingree Associates, Mainers of all ages will continue to benefit from his successes in Maine's forest industry, as well as in conserving land for their recreation. Steve has honored our collective heritage as well as his own, and I thank him for his friendship and his many contributions towards bettering our State.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT  
GENERAL KAREN E. DYSON

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to honor an exceptional officer in the U.S. Army. LTG Karen E. Dyson will retire in July after more than 37 years of distinguished service to the Army and our great Nation. General Dyson's long and distinguished career admirably culminates as military deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller. This is the highest military position within that office.

For nearly four decades, General Dyson has personified the Army values of duty, integrity, and selfless service to our Nation's defense. She comes from a legacy of selfless service, as her father served as a special forces officer in Germany. Lieutenant General Dyson began her own legacy upon graduation and commissioning as a second lieutenant into the regular Army, Finance Branch, from the ROTC program at Southwest Missouri State University. Her extraordinary career is a testament to her hard work and dedication; she is an exemplary role model and mentor who made Army history as the first female finance officer to obtain the rank of lieutenant general.

Lieutenant General Dyson has commanded soldiers at all levels through brigade, leading soldiers in peacetime, stability operations, and war. During her command of the European-based 266th Finance Command, she deployed with her troops in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq. Her command funded each and every Army mission within the contingency operation, the infrastructure of all military operating bases, and critical equipment that ensured warfighters were ready to fight. She also commanded the 208th Finance Battalion during Operation Joint Guard and Operation Joint Forge in Bosnia; and the 66th Finance Detachment in the 101st Airborne Division during Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia.

Lieutenant General Dyson was an integral part of the of the White House team during her time serving as the chief of staff and comptroller, White House Military Office. She is also a familiar and respected presence in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill. During her time as the military deputy for budget and the director of the Army budget under the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, she dedicated herself to engaging Congress on important financial issues for the Army, answering questions that ensured transparency and understanding of the Army's funding requirements. She served in numerous positions within the Pentagon to include the chief of the Army Coalition Provisional Authority Support Team, the director of Business Operations Office of Business Transformation, the director of oper-

ations and support Army Budget Office and the executive officer to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, and to the Under Secretary of the Army. She influenced the way the Army viewed auditability and was the driving force behind numerous initiatives to make every dollar count, ensuring accountability to Congress and our Nation's taxpayers.

Together with her husband James Chamberlain, a retired Air Force officer, she will undoubtedly continue her service to our Nation in some capacity following her retirement. On behalf of the State of West Virginia and the U.S. Senate and a grateful nation, I congratulate LTG Karen E. Dyson on her retirement from the U.S. Army. I wish Karen and Jim the best in their future endeavors and the next chapter of their lives.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT  
COLONEL REBECCA B. McELWAIN

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to an exceptional officer in the U.S. Army. LTC Rebecca B. McElwain has served admirably as a senior budget integrator for the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, for the past year.

Lieutenant Colonel McElwain began her career in North Dakota where she spent time as a medic in the Army Reserves, later transferring to the Minnesota National Guard. After graduating with a bachelor's of science in business administration from North Dakota State University in 1997, she received a commission into the Finance Corps.

LTC Rebecca McElwain's earliest Active-Duty assignment was with the 125th Finance Battalion in Hawaii, where she assumed her first company-grade command and participated in Asia-Pacific training exercises such as Cobra Gold in Thailand. After her time in Hawaii, she transitioned to Schweinfurt, Germany, where she assumed detachment command in the 106th Finance Battalion and deployed her unit to Kosovo in support of Task Force Falcon. She also served as a military mentor in support of the U.S. Ambassador's efforts to encourage Kosovar women to assume leadership positions in Kosovo's developing government.

After her return from Kosovo, she moved across Germany to support U.S. Army Europe transformation initiatives as the 266th Finance Command executive officer. Shortly after, she was selected for graduate school and attended Hawaii Pacific University, where she earned a master's degree in business administration with an international finance focus. After graduation, she returned to Germany, activated and assumed command of the 106th Financial Management Company, deploying her unit in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom to establish a new headquarters in southern Iraq.

While in Germany, Lieutenant Colonel McElwain was selected to attend the Australian Command and Staff College, a joint military school.

During her time in Australia, she earned an additional master's degree in strategy and management from the University of New South Wales and attended classes with 182 students from 22 different nations, to include China, India, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates.

Next, Lieutenant Colonel McElwain served as the chief of financial management security assistance in the CENTCOM J8, supporting the fiscal requirements of 17 security cooperation offices throughout CENTCOM. She also served as a primary member of the CENTCOM operational planning team for Afghanistan transition. As the division G8 comptroller for the 25th Infantry Division, she managed funding for five rapidly deployable brigades and received broad exposure to the ongoing Pacific partnership efforts within the PACOM footprint, as well as joint force engagements.

Lieutenant Colonel McElwain's husband, James, has deep family roots in West Virginia and served as an Army ordnance officer. Since leaving the military, he spends his time as a health and fitness consultant and independent chef. Together they have a 13-year-old son, Andrew, who enjoys Boy Scouts, loves all types of sports, and keeps them on their toes.

Throughout her career, Lieutenant Colonel McElwain has positively impacted her soldiers, peers, and superiors. Her extraordinary career is a testament to her hard work and dedication. Our Nation has been enriched by her leadership, thoughtful judgment, and exemplary work. On behalf of the State of West Virginia and the U.S. Senate and a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Rebecca on her service to our Nation. We wish Rebecca, James, and Andrew all the best as they continue their journey in the Army.●

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:48 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2581. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2581. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 213. A bill to designate the wilderness within the Lake Clark National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska as the Jay S. Hammond Wilderness Area (Rept. No. 115-108).

S. 217. A bill to amend the Denali National Park Improvement Act to clarify certain provisions relating to the natural gas pipeline authorized in the Denali National Park and Preserve (Rept. No. 115-109).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 46. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York (Rept. No. 115-110).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 381. A bill to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as "Sky Point" (Rept. No. 115-111).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

\*Pamela Hughes Patenaude, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

\*Kevin Allen Hassett, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

\*David Malpass, of New York, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

\*Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

\*Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

\*Andrew K. Maloney, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. ENZI for the Committee on the Budget.

Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

\*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 Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1349. A bill to provide that the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisors to the commanders of the combatant commands shall be equivalent to the

rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. THUNE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1350. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect 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; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1351. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the designation of general surgery shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1352. A bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1353. A bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. NELSON, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1354. A bill to establish an Individual Market Reinsurance fund to provide funding for State individual market stabilization reinsurance programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1355. A bill to combat the heroin epidemic and drug sample backlogs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1356. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to pursue independent study programs at certain educational institutions that are not institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1357. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic family care services in Medicaid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain direct primary care service arrangements and periodic provider fees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1359. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1360. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish an Insurance Policy Advisory Committee on International Capital Standards and Other Insurance Issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. GRAMHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 65

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to address financial conflicts of interest of the President and Vice President.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 247

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 247, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 300

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 300, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that return information from tax-exempt organizations be made available in a searchable format and to provide the disclosure of the identity of contributors to certain tax-exempt organizations.

S. 324

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 324, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

S. 383

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 383, a bill to coordinate the provision of energy retrofitting assistance to schools.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth for individuals with stroke.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 548

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 548, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 721

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 721, a bill to require the disclosure of certain visitor access records.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill 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.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to amend the

Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes.

S. 921

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 921, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 100 year anniversary of the 1st Infantry Division.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to transition away from fossil fuel sources of energy to 100 percent clean and renewable energy by 2050, and for other purposes.

S. 989

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 989, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes.

S. 999

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 999, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf in the Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, North Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors 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. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) 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. 1091

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from West Vir-

ginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1091, a bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students.

S. 1172

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care.

S. 1285

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1285, a bill to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands.

S. 1296

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

S. 1341

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1341, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor.



S. RES. 185

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 185, a resolution recognizing and expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month.

## AMENDMENT NO. 230

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 230 intended to be proposed to S. 722, a bill 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 232

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 232 proposed to S. 722, a bill 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.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1352. A bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon with my colleague from Maine to talk about an important issue, as well, something we had long planned to introduce today and did so this morning—the reintroduction of a Senate bill focusing on apprenticeship programs.

My colleague Senator COLLINS and I, in the past Congress, wanted to make sure people understood how important we thought the apprentice program was, and we introduced legislation then to create a Federal incentive for apprentice programs. We are coming back now in this Congress and reintroducing this legislation.

I know there has been a lot of talk about apprentices this week. We just had a roundtable discussion this morning with some of our business and labor leaders talking about the skills gap and the need for more apprentice investing as it relates to manufacturing. I know the President is doing some discussion of the apprentice program too. Obviously, it is no surprise to anybody in America that the President knows—

or at least has used—the word “apprentice” in a pretty aggressive way throughout his career. So I hope he will tune in and listen to what my colleague from Maine and I have to say about this.

We are saying that it is time in America to have a Federal priority on apprentices; that is, the first-ever tax incentive for hiring an apprentice. Why do we want a Federal priority? Because we know that in America we need to skill and train a workforce for tomorrow, and so many people in America aren't training and aren't skilling for those jobs.

In the downturn of our economy, a lot of people lost faith. What should they invest their time and money in? There was so much transition in the economy that people weren't sure where they should skill themselves. As we see a transitioning economy now in various sectors, as they continue to modernize, and as technology continues to change, people also say to themselves: What should I skill myself in? What should I get trained in? Because they are not sure that, at the end of that period, they will be right there with what the job market wants. That is why apprenticeship is so important today.

By giving a Federal incentive for the apprentice program, we are saying: Hire and train. We are actually saying: The apprentice program is earning while you learn, and it will help so many Americans take that issue off the table where they weren't sure whether or how they should skill themselves. They actually are hired and trained on the job.

This is something we have known as a country for a long time. We know the apprentice program has worked. We have seen it across many sectors, in building trades and construction. We have seen it in other areas. In aviation, for example, in the Pacific Northwest, the Boeing Company has taken great advantage of the apprentice program. There are so many other sectors. The maritime sector has taken advantage of the apprentice programs. What we are saying today is that we need to make this a national priority in a more aggressive way. The Department of Labor and registered apprentice programs are part of what we make an investment in here in the Federal budget. But what we are not doing is putting it on steroids, and that is what we need to do now.

Our legislation would create enough incentives for 500,000 new apprentice program individuals over the next 10 years. We think this is critically important because we know how much the U.S. economy needs these skilled workers. According to the National Skills Coalition, 53 percent of U.S. jobs are middle-skilled, meaning that they require some postsecondary education. Yet only 43 percent of U.S. workers are trained at that level. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, 67 percent of their members report a

shortage of available, qualified workers. We are going to need 3.5 million manufacturing jobs over the next decade, and this leaves us with a shortage of about 2 million.

So we need to give our businesses the skill levels they are looking for so they can be competitive, so they can meet their market needs, and so they can make profits and help grow our economy. We can't let them be deterred by the fact that they have the opening and they have the jobs, but they just don't have the skill level. By doing an incentive program, we can help get a national message out: The apprentice program is a key part of our economic strategy, and skilling a workforce for the jobs of today and tomorrow is the best recipe for growing our economy.

There has been an overall decline in employer-provided training over the last two decades. By making this investment now, we are going to help U.S. businesses with the investment that should be made and, further, as I said, expedite getting people into the programs we need to get them into. If we are going to be competitive and our businesses are going to compete in this global economy and they are going to continue to innovate, they need the workforce to do it.

I think about the chip fabrication industry. Before Intel came along, probably no one knew how to do chip fabrication. But there was a sector of our economy that taught and educated people on chip manufacturing. That will not be the last innovation our economy sees. In aerospace, we have been able to, with composite manufacturing, make lighter weight planes. That composite was a huge shift from the aluminum that dominated aerospace. But composite manufacturing is a whole new skill level in which we are still training and educating the workforce. We need to compete in that sector, which is so important to manufacturing jobs.

I would say that every aspect of our economy needs apprentices. But what does the apprentice get out of it? Not only do they get a job and they get to be skilled on the job, but they also earn more. Over the course of their career, a registered apprentice earns about \$300,000 more than a non-apprentice working in the same field. A study done by our State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board found that completing apprentices earned \$13,000 more per year just as they started.

So apprentices are a win-win for us and our economy. They give the employer the skills they are seeking to make their companies successful, and the individual worker gets trained and hired in a field that takes away this uncertainty about our economy, which has so plagued us over the last decade or two, and the community gets a more successful employment base and successful companies that add to the economy of a region and to our country.

I am so glad to be here with my colleague Senator COLLINS, who has



known that this apprentice program has been a success, and that is why she and I have partnered for years on this program. We hope now that by reintroducing it and getting more of our colleagues to join in, they, too, will talk about why apprentices are so important today.

We hope there is a guy down the street in the White House, who had a program called “Apprentice,” who takes seriously the bipartisan effort of two Senators who have been at this for a few years, and says: This is where we should be spending our money and making an investment to skill, educate, and employ Americans right now, for today.

I yield to my colleague from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the Apprenticeship and Jobs Training Act, which Senator CANTWELL and I are reintroducing today.

Few issues are as important to the American people as the availability of good jobs in our communities. It is crucial that we continue to improve job training initiatives to help people find jobs in fields with open positions. Many business owners in Maine have told me that they do, in fact, have jobs available, but they cannot find qualified workers to fill these highly skilled vacant positions. In fact, I cannot visit a machine shop in the State of Maine, no matter where it is located, and find that they are not looking for skilled machinists. There is such a shortage. And those are good jobs. They are jobs with good benefits and job security.

One way for employees to acquire the skills needed to succeed in these in-demand fields is through apprenticeship programs. Apprentices gain hands-on experience that is invaluable to them and to their employers. These programs help workers secure good-paying jobs.

According to the Department of Labor’s Employment and Training Administration, more than 49,000 participants graduated from an apprenticeship program in fiscal year 2016. In Maine, we have some innovative job-training apprenticeship programs at places like Bath Iron Works, which builds naval destroyers, and the Portsmouth Naval Ship Yard, which has an extraordinary program. Partnering with employers like these and others, more than 2,220 individuals in Maine worked actively on industry-recognized skill certifications in just the last year. That number—impressive as it is—remains insufficient to meet the needs of employers statewide.

We must do all we can to ensure that an adequate pool of skilled workers is available. Our legislation would help achieve this goal by giving a \$5,000 tax credit to businesses that hire apprentices full time in high-demand mechanical, technical, healthcare, or technology professions. In order for a business to claim the credit, the apprentice must be employed for at least 7 months. What we find is that the peo-

ple who go through these apprenticeship programs stay in these jobs, thus benefiting both the worker and the employer.

Our bill also provides incentives for experienced workers who spend at least 20 percent of their time passing their hard-earned knowledge on to the next generation. These workers would be allowed to receive some retirement income early without facing tax penalties. That is a way we can ensure that the experienced older worker is passing knowledge on to the next generation.

Finally, our bill would ensure that the brave men and women who defend our country are given credit for the skills they learned in the military while wearing our Nation’s uniform. Training received while serving in the Armed Forces would count toward an apprentice’s training requirement.

This bill would help to better align the needs of our Nation’s employers with potential employees. It would promote hiring and the creation of new jobs. It would enhance the skills that the people of our country need to obtain good-paying, secure employment. The Presiding Officer and I were talking about this very issue at lunch today and the need to bridge that skills gap.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support our bill, and I want to salute Senator CANTWELL for her leadership over many years in working on this issue. This is something that should unite us all—Democrats, Republicans, Independents. It is not a partisan issue; it is looking at ways that we can help more Americans secure good-paying jobs that will last them for a lifetime.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1353. A bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the right to vote is among the most sacred rights guaranteed by our Constitution. It forms the foundation for our democracy and inspires countless people across the world still striving for a meaningful opportunity to engage in the political process and shape their futures.

My friend JOHN LEWIS has often said that “the right to vote is the most powerful nonviolent tool we have in a democracy.” I could not agree more with him. America is a stronger and greater country when more Americans participate in our democracy. We are better when our citizens hold their elected representatives accountable and voice their opinions on the critical issues facing our Nation. We can take a historic step to foster even greater participation in our democracy simply by modernizing the way Americans register to vote.

Today, I am proud to introduce the Automatic Voter Registration Act of

2017. This bill would require States to automatically register citizens who are eligible to vote when they interact with State and Federal agencies. Americans would have the option of declining automatic registration, but this bill would provide for a registration process that is easier for our citizens and one that is more efficient and accurate.

The bill I introduce today streamlines the voter registration process by providing for online registration and greater portability of registration when an individual moves to a different location in the same State. Under this bill, no one can be unfairly penalized for inadvertent registration, and punishment is limited to cases of intentional registration fraud or illegal voting. This bill also includes important privacy protections and makes clear that the information used to automatically register individuals will remain secure. These are commonsense reforms that would not only help Americans vote but also help maintain accurate and up-to-date voter registration rolls.

Last year, Vermont became one of the States leading the country on improving our citizens’ access to the ballot by becoming one of just eight States to approve automatic voter registration. I want to commend Vermont secretary of state Jim Condos for his outstanding work on this issue and for the people of Vermont.

State election officials estimate that tens of thousands of Vermonters will now be registered to vote because of this new law. Implementing these types of reforms nationwide will make America stronger and increase participation of a broader electorate. A recent study by the Center for American Progress on Oregon’s automatic voter registration law that went into effect in January 2016 found that more than 272,000 people were added to voter rolls, and 98,000 of them were new voters in the November 2016 Presidential election. That is a remarkable success story, and hopefully other State legislatures will take notice. The Brennan Center for Justice, which has been a leading voice protecting Americans’ right to vote, concluded in a 2015 report that a comprehensive, nationwide automatic voter registration plan has the potential to increase voter registration by 50 million eligible voters. This would not only save money and increase accuracy, but it would also reduce the potential for fraud and protect the integrity of our elections.

I would like to thank the Brennan Center for Justice for its work on this issue and for working with me on this bill. I would also like to thank Senators DURBIN and KLOBUCHAR for joining me as original cosponsors. Congressman BRADY of Pennsylvania, the ranking member on the House Committee on House Administration, has been a leader on this issue and has introduced a House companion bill.

All members of Congress should support this legislation. We should all

strive to make sure that our constituents have access to the ballot box and are able to have their voices heard. This is of course just one reform we must make to ensure that our citizens' voting rights are protected. In the coming weeks, I intend to reintroduce legislation to restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. It has now been almost 4 years since the Supreme Court's devastating decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, and we have seen the effect of that disastrous ruling as States have attempted to enact discriminatory voter ID laws and other measures intended to prevent minority voters from going to the polls. That is disgraceful, and we must do better. Congress must act to ensure that millions of Americans are not disenfranchised.

The right to vote should not be a partisan issue. It is a right that forms the basis of our democracy, and it is incumbent on all Americans, Democratic and Republican, to ensure that no American's right to vote is infringed. Modernizing our voter registration system is one significant step forward.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAINES. 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:

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today, June 14, 2017 marks the 240th observance of "Flag Day," a day which commemorates the adoption of the flag of the United States by a resolution of the Second Continental Congress in 1777. Deeply symbolic, our flag honors the sovereignty of each of our Nation's 50 States and the great sacrifices many Americans have made to uphold its bedrock principles of freedom and liberty. The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that over one million military service members have given their lives in the line of duty under our flag. Title 4 of United States Code, "The Flag Code" sets specific requirements for the handling and display of the flag, as a sign of respect to the symbol of our Nation.

In 1989, with a disappointing 5-4 vote, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Texas v. Johnson* that the desecration of the United States flag was a form of free speech under the First Amendment to the Constitution. Here, Chief Justice Rehnquist rightly observed in his dissent that "the flag is not simply another 'idea' or 'point of view' competing for recognition in the market-

place of ideas." Justice Kennedy, in his majority concurrence, recognized that many would be dismayed by the court's decision, and himself called the result distasteful. Yet, he explained that the court was bound to its decision according to the provisions of the Constitution. The Supreme Court reaffirmed this decision in *United States v. Eichman* in 1990. It ruled, again by 5-4 vote, that as Constitutional free speech, desecration of the flag cannot be prohibited by Federal or State statute. At the time of the Supreme Court's ruling, 48 of the 50 States had enacted statutes prohibiting desecration of the United States Flag.

My resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution, establishing Congressional authority to prohibit the desecration of the flag of the United States. This resolution initiates the process to amend the Constitution, which must be agreed to by two-thirds of both houses of Congress, and ratified by three-fourths of the States. A high bar to meet, similar legislation passed the House of Representatives in 2006, and fell short of passage in the Senate by only one vote.

My resolution provides Congress with the authority that the Supreme Court decided it lacked in *Texas v. Johnson* and *United States v. Eichman*. This should remove any doubt in the mind of the Supreme Court on the Constitutionality of acts of flag desecration. A matter which has been long settled in the Court of public opinion.

S.J. RES. 46

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years after the date of its submission by the Congress:*

"ARTICLE—

"The Congress shall have power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States."

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 235. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 236. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 237. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 238. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NELSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be pro-

posed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 239. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 240. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra.

SA 241. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 242. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 243. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 244. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 245. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 246. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 247. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 248. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 249. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 250. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra.

SA 251. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 252. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 253. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 254. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 235. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 13. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO VIOLATIONS OF THE INF TREATY BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

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

(1) knowingly directs, implements, provides support for, or otherwise participates in actions or projects of the Government of the Russian Federation that constitute a material breach of the INF Treaty;

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

(b) 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 (a) if such property and interests in property are in 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) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INF TREATY.—The term "INF Treaty" means 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.

(2) RUSSIAN PERSON.—The term "Russian person" means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

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

**SEC. 14. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEES AND AGENTS OF KASPERSKY LAB.**

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) FOUNDERS, DIRECTORS, AND SENIOR CORPORATE LEADERSHIP.—The President shall

impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any citizen or national of the Russian Federation that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is a founder, director, or member of the senior corporate leadership of Kaspersky Lab.

(2) EMPLOYEES AND AGENTS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b)(2) with respect to any citizen or national of the Russian Federation that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is an employee or agent of Kaspersky Lab.

(b) 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 individual subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in 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 individual subject to subsection (a).

(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.

**SA 236.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

**SEC. 11. REPORT ON IRANIAN ACTIVITIES IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.**

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on Iranian activities in Iraq and Syria.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of Iran's support for—

(A) Iraqi militias or political parties, including weapons, financing, and other forms of material support; and

(B) the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria; and

(2) a list of referrals to the relevant United Nations Security Council sanctions committees by the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

(c) FORM.—The President may submit the report required by subsection (a) in classified form if the President determines that it is necessary for the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intel-

ligence, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

**SA 237.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FOREIGN PERSONS THREATENING PEACE OR STABILITY IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.**

(a) SANCTIONS REQUIRED.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b)(1) with respect to any foreign person that—

(1) is responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly—

(A) actions that threaten the peace, security, or stability of Iraq or Syria;

(B) actions or policies that undermine efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform in Iraq; or

(C) the obstruction of the delivery or distribution of, or access to, humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq or Syria;

(2) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1); or

(3) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person that has carried out any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) or paragraph (2).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—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 a person subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

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

(i) EXCLUSION FROM THE 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.

(ii) 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 an alien subject to subsection (a), regardless of when issued.

(II) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subclause (I) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of

section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of the imposition of sanctions under this section.

(3) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that paragraph 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.

(4) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.**—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(c) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may, on a case-by-case basis and for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a foreign person, and may renew the waiver for additional periods of not more than 180 days, if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees at least 15 days before the waiver or renewal of the waiver is to take effect that the waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(3) **SUNSET.**—The provisions of this subsection and any waivers issued pursuant to this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITY.**—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) for purposes of carrying out this section.

(e) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this section.

(2) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—Not less than 10 days before the promulgation of regulations under paragraph (1), the President shall notify and provide to the appropriate congressional committees the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMITTED; ALIEN.**—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

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

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(3) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” means—

(A) an individual who is not a United States person;

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental entity that is not a United States person; or

(C) any representative, agent or instrumentality of, or an individual working on behalf of a foreign government.

(4) **GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ.**—The term “Government of Iraq” has the meaning given that term in section 542.305 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(5) **GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA.**—The term “Government of Syria” has the meaning given that term in section 542.305 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(6) **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.

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

(8) **PROPERTY; PROPERTY INTEREST.**—The terms “property” and “property interest” have the meanings given those terms in section 576.312 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(9) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” has the meaning given that term in section 576.319 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(g) **SUNSET.**—This section shall cease to be effective beginning on January 1, 2022.

**SA 238.** Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NELSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE II—TREATMENT OF BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, OR SANCTIONS ACTIVITIES TARGETING ISRAEL**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Combating BDS Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 202. NONPREEMPTION OF MEASURES BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO DIVEST FROM ENTITIES THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, OR SANCTIONS ACTIVITIES TARGETING ISRAEL.**

(a) **STATE AND LOCAL MEASURES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State or local government may adopt and enforce measures that meet the requirements of subsection (b) to divest the assets of the State or local government from, prohibit investment of the assets of the State or local government in, or restrict contracting by the State or local government for goods and services with—

(1) an entity that the State or local government determines, using credible information available to the public, knowingly engages in a commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel;

(2) a successor entity or subunit of an entity described in paragraph (1); or

(3) an entity that owns or controls, is owned or controlled by, or is under common ownership or control with, an entity described in paragraph (1).

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A State or local government that seeks to adopt or enforce a measure under subsection (a) shall meet the following requirements:

(1) **NOTICE.**—The State or local government shall provide written notice to each entity to which a measure under subsection (a) is to be applied.

(2) **TIMING.**—The measure shall apply to an entity not earlier than the date that is 90 days after the date on which written notice is provided to the entity under paragraph (1).

(3) **OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT.**—The State or local government shall provide an opportunity to comment in writing to each entity to which a measure is to be applied. If the entity demonstrates to the State or local government that the entity has not engaged in a commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel, the measure shall not apply to the entity.

(4) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AVOIDING ERRONEOUS TARGETING.**—It is the sense of Congress that a State or local government should not adopt a measure under subsection (a) with respect to an entity unless the State or local government has made every effort to avoid erroneously targeting the entity and has verified that the entity engages in a commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel.

(c) **NOTICE TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 30 days after adopting a measure described in subsection (a), the State or local government that adopted the measure shall submit written notice to the Attorney General describing the measure.

(2) **EXISTING MEASURES.**—With respect to measures described in subsection (a) adopted before the date of the enactment of this Act, the State or local government that adopted the measure shall submit written notice to the Attorney General describing the measure not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **NONPREEMPTION.**—A measure of a State or local government that is consistent with subsection (a) is not preempted by any Federal law.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section applies to any measure adopted by a State or local government before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) **PRIOR ENACTED MEASURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (2), a State or local government may enforce a measure described in subsection (a) adopted by the State or local government before the date of the enactment of this Act without regard to the requirements of subsection (b).

(2) **APPLICATION OF NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT.**—A measure described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (b) on and after the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY OF STATES.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to abridge the authority of a State to issue and enforce rules governing the safety, soundness, and solvency of a financial institution subject to its jurisdiction or the business of insurance pursuant to the Act of March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33, chapter 20; 15 U.S.C. 1011 et seq.) (commonly known as the “McCarran-Ferguson Act”).

(2) **POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the established policy of the United States concerning final status issues associated with the Arab-Israeli conflict, including border delineation, that can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties.

(3) **SCOPE OF NONPREEMPTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as establishing a basis for preempting or implying preemption of State measures relating to boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel that are outside the scope of subsection (a).

(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ASSETS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “assets” means any pension, retirement, annuity, or endowment fund, or similar instrument, that is controlled by a State or local government.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The term “assets” does not include employee benefit plans covered by title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(2) **BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, OR SANCTIONS ACTIVITY TARGETING ISRAEL.**—The term “boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel” means any activity that is intended to penalize, inflict economic harm on, or otherwise limit commercial relations with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories for purposes of coercing political action by, or imposing policy positions on, the Government of Israel.

(3) **ENTITY.**—The term “entity” includes—

(A) any corporation, company, business association, partnership, or trust; and

(B) any governmental entity or instrumentality of a government, including a multilateral development institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(3) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(3))).

(4) **INVESTMENT.**—The term “investment” includes—

(A) a commitment or contribution of funds or property;

(B) a loan or other extension of credit; and

(C) the entry into or renewal of a contract for goods or services.

(5) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(6) **STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “State or local government” includes—

(A) any State and any agency or instrumentality thereof;

(B) any local government within a State and any agency or instrumentality thereof; and

(C) any other governmental instrumentality of a State or locality.

**SEC. 203. SAFE HARBOR FOR CHANGES OF INVESTMENT POLICIES BY ASSET MANAGERS.**

Section 13(c)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-13(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(C) engage in any boycott, divestment, or sanctions activity targeting Israel described in section 202 of the Combating BDS Act of 2017.”.

**SA 239.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanc-

tions 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON USE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT AND RELATED SERVICES FOR ILLEGAL MILITARY OR OTHER ACTIVITIES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran is designated as the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism and a direct threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies.

(2) Iran, through its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (in this section referred to as the “IRGC”), provides material and financial support to foreign terrorist organizations, including Hamas, Hezbollah, and Kata’ib Hezbollah, as well as to the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, which is responsible for more than 400,000 civilian deaths.

(3) Iran has systematically employed its national air carrier, Iran Air, as well as numerous private and publicly owned Iranian and Syrian air carriers, including Mahan Air, to ferry weapons, troops, and military equipment on behalf of the IRGC and Iran’s Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics (in this section referred to as “MODAFL”) to foreign terrorist organizations and rogue regimes around the world.

(4) On June 23, 2011, the United States Department of the Treasury designated Iran Air for the imposition of 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) for providing material support and services to the IRGC, including shipping military-related equipment on behalf of the IRGC since 2006 and transporting rockets or missiles to Syria.

(5) On January 16, 2016, Iran Air was removed from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons by the Department of the Treasury even though Iran Air had not ceased its illicit and sanctionable activity.

(6) Iran Air remains owned and operated by the Government of Iran and has, since January 16, 2016, flown numerous unscheduled flights on well-known weapons supply routes between Iran and Syria.

(7) In correspondence with Members of Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to confirm that Iran Air has ceased its illicit activity. In a November 23, 2016, letter to Representative Peter Roskam, Thomas Patrick Maloney, Senior Advisor in the Office of Legislative Affairs of the Department of the Treasury wrote: “The United States retains the ability to designate any individual or entity that engages in sanctionable activities under our authorities targeting conduct outside the scope of the JCPOA, including Iran’s support for terrorism, human rights abuses, ballistic missile program, and other destabilizing activities in the region.”.

(8) Evidence supports that, despite being removed from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons on January 16, 2016, Iran Air has continued its illicit and sanctionable activity in support of the IRGC, MODAFL, Hezbollah, and the Bashar al-Assad regime since January 16, 2016.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense,

the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on use by the Government of Iran of commercial aircraft and related services for illicit military or other activities during—

(1) in the case of the first report, the 5-year period preceding submission of the report; and

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

(c) **ELEMENTS OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (b) shall include a description of the extent to which—

(1) the Government of Iran has used commercial aircraft, including aircraft of Iran Air, or related services to transport illicit cargo to or from Iran, including military goods, weapons, military personnel, military-related electronic parts and mechanical equipment, or rocket or missile components;

(2) the commercial aviation sector of Iran, including Iran Air, has provided financial, material, or technological support to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, Iran’s Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics, the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, Hezbollah, Hamas, Kata’ib Hezbollah, any other organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189), or any person on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury; and

(3) foreign governments and persons have facilitated the activities described in paragraph (1), including allowing the use of airports, services, or other resources.

(d) **EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.**—If, in a report submitted under this section, the President determines that Iran Air or any other Iranian commercial air carrier has used commercial aircraft for illicit military purposes on or after January 16, 2016, the President shall, not later than 90 days after making that determination, include the air carrier on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

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

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(f) **SUNSET.**—This section shall cease to be effective on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Iran has ceased providing support for acts of international terrorism.

**SA 240.** Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by him to the 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; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 13. 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.

**SA 241.** Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE II—ISRAEL ANTI-BOYCOTT ACT**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Israel Anti-Boycott Act”.

**SEC. 202. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United Nations Human Rights Council (in this section referred to as the “UNHRC”) has long targeted Israel with systematic, politically motivated, assaults on its legitimacy designed to stigmatize and isolate Israel internationally.

(2) The UNHRC maintains a permanent agenda item known as “Item 7” to ensure that Israel will be criticized at every gathering of the UNHRC.

(3) At its 31st session on March 24, 2016, the UNHRC targeted Israel with a commercial boycott, calling for the establishment of a database, such as a “blacklist”, of companies that operate, or have business relations with entities that operate, beyond Israel's 1949 Armistice lines, including East Jerusalem.

(4) At its 32nd session in March 2017, the UNHRC is considering a resolution pursuant to agenda item 7 to withhold assistance from and prevent trade with “territories occupied since 1967”, including East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and the Golan Heights, stating that businesses that engage in economic activity in those areas could face civil or criminal legal action.

(5) For a half century, Congress has combated anti-Israel boycotts and other discriminatory activity under the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), under part VI of title X of the Tax Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-455; 90 Stat. 1649) (commonly referred to as the “Ribicoff Amendment”), in free trade agreements with Bahrain and Oman, and in Saudi Arabia's accession negotiations to the World Trade Organization.

(6) The recent action of the UNHRC is reminiscent of the Arab League Boycott, which also called for the establishment of a “blacklist” and promoted a primary, as well as a secondary and tertiary, boycott against Israel, targeting United States and other companies that trade or invest with or in Israel, designed to harm Israel, any business operating in, or doing business with, Israel, or companies that do business with companies operating in Israel.

(7) Congress recently passed anti-boycott, divestment, and sanctions measures in the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.) and section 909 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4452), which establish, among other things—

(A) the opposition of the United States to actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel;

(B) requirements that the United States utilize trade negotiations to combat state-led or international governmental organization-led actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel; and

(C) reporting requirements regarding the actions of foreign countries or international organizations that establish barriers to trade or investment for United States companies in or with Israel.

**SEC. 203. STATEMENT OF POLICY.**

Congress—

(1) opposes the United Nations Human Rights Council resolution of March 24, 2016, which urges countries to pressure their own companies to divest from, or break contracts

with, Israel, and calls for the creation of a “blacklist” of companies that either operate, or have business relations with entities that operate, beyond Israel's 1949 Armistice lines, including East Jerusalem;

(2) views such policies as actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel; and

(3) in order to counter the effects of actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel, encourages full implementation of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-296; 128 Stat. 4075) through enhanced, governmentwide, coordinated United States-Israel scientific and technological cooperation in civilian areas such as with respect to energy, water, agriculture, alternative fuel technology, civilian space technology, and security.

**SEC. 204. ADDITIONAL PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO FOREIGN BOYCOTTS UNDER EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.**

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 3(5) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4602(5)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) to oppose—

“(i) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries, or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries, against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person; and

“(ii) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any international governmental organization against Israel;”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “which have the effect” and all the follows and inserting the following: “which have the effect of furthering or supporting—

“(i) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country, or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any foreign country, against a country friendly to the United States or against any United States person; and

“(ii) restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any international governmental organization against Israel; and”.

(b) FOREIGN BOYCOTTS.—Section 8 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4607) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting “, or request to impose any boycott by a foreign country,” after “a foreign country”;

(ii) by inserting “, or support any boycott fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or request to impose any boycott by any international governmental organization against Israel” after “pursuant to United States law or regulation”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or international governmental organization (as the case may be)” after “of the boycotting country”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting “, or requesting the furnishing of information,” after “Furnishing information”; and



(ii) by inserting “or with the international governmental organization (as the case may be)” after “in the boycotting country”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “, or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries,” after “foreign countries”; and

(B) by inserting “or restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any international governmental organization against Israel or requests to impose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by any international governmental organization against Israel” before the period at the end.

(c) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 8(a).—Section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4610) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “or (j)” after “subsection (b)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 8(a).—Whoever knowingly violates or conspires to or attempts to violate any provision of section 8(a) or any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder shall be fined in accordance with section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705).”

(d) DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION.—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.)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the term ‘international governmental organization’ includes the United Nations and the European Union;”

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to actions described in section 8(a) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) taken or knowingly agreed to be taken on or after such date of enactment.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President shall implement the amendments made by this section by exercising the authorities of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

#### SEC. 205. POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL UNDER EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945.

Section 2(b)(1)(B) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(B)) is amended in the sixth sentence by inserting after “child labor,” the following: “or opposing policies and actions that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with citizens or residents of Israel, entities organized under the laws of Israel, or the Government of Israel.”

#### SEC. 206. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this title:

(1) ACTIONS TO BOYCOTT, DIVEST FROM, OR SANCTION ISRAEL.—The term “actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel” has the meaning given that term in section 102(b)(20)(B) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4201(b)(20)(B)).

(2) INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION.—The term “international governmental organization” includes the United Nations and the European Union.

(3) POLITICALLY MOTIVATED.—The term “politically motivated” means actions to impede or constrain commerce with Israel that are intended to coerce political action from or impose policy positions on Israel.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the established policy of the United States or to establish new United States policy concerning final status issues associated with the Arab-Israeli conflict, including border delineation, that can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties.

**SA 242.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### SEC. 13. FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION MODERNIZATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Foreign Agents Registration Modernization and Enforcement Act”.

(b) CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND AUTHORITY.—The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 as sections 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (22 U.S.C. 617) the following:

##### “CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND AUTHORITY

“SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any person or enterprise may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material relevant to an investigation under this Act, the Attorney General, before initiating a civil or criminal proceeding with respect to the production of such material, may serve a written demand upon such person to produce such material for examination.

“(b) Each such demand under this section shall—

“(1) state the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged violation which is under investigation and the provision of law applicable to such violation;

“(2) describe the class or classes of documentary material required to be produced under such demand with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such material to be fairly identified;

“(3) state that the demand is immediately returnable or prescribe a return date which will provide a reasonable period within which the material may be assembled and made available for inspection and copying or reproduction; and

“(4) identify the custodian to whom such material shall be made available.

“(c) A demand under this section may not—

“(1) contain any requirement that would be considered unreasonable if contained in a subpoena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of grand jury investigation of such alleged violation; or

“(2) require the production of any documentary evidence that would be privileged from disclosure if demanded by a subpoena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of a grand jury investigation of such alleged violation.”

(c) INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended—

(A) in subsection (1), by striking “Expect” and inserting “Except”; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

“(j) The term ‘informational materials’ means any oral, visual, graphic, written, or pictorial information or matter of any kind, including matter published by means of advertising, books, periodicals, newspapers, lectures, broadcasts, motion pictures, or any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or otherwise.”

(2) INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS.—Section 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 614) is amended—

(A) in section (a)—

(i) by inserting “, including electronic mail and social media,” after “United States mails”; and

(ii) by striking “, not later than forty-eight hours after the beginning of the transmittal thereof, file with the Attorney General two copies thereof” and inserting “file such materials with the Attorney General in conjunction with, and at the same intervals as, disclosures required under section 2(b).”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “It shall” and inserting “(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall”; and

(ii) by inserting at the end the following:

“(2) Foreign agents described in paragraph (1) may omit disclosure required under that paragraph in individual messages, posts, or transmissions on social media on behalf of a foreign principal if the social media account or profile from which the information is sent includes a conspicuous statement that—

“(A) the account is operated by, and distributes information on behalf of, the foreign agent; and

“(B) additional information about the account is on file with the Department of Justice in Washington, District of Columbia.

“(3) Informational materials disseminated by an agent of a foreign principal as part of an activity that is exempt from registration, or an activity which by itself would not require registration, need not be filed under this subsection.”

(d) FEES.—

(1) REPEAL.—The Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (title I of Public Law 102-395) is amended, under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES”, by striking “In addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, for fiscal year 1993 and thereafter, the Attorney General shall establish and collect fees to recover necessary expenses of the Registration Unit (to include salaries, supplies, equipment and training) pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and shall credit such fees to this appropriation, to remain available until expended.”

(2) REGISTRATION FEE.—The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “FEES

“SEC. 16. The Attorney General shall establish and collect a registration fee, as part of the initial filing requirement and at no other time, to help defray the expenses of the Registration Unit, and shall credit such fees to this appropriation, to remain available until expended.”

(e) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 12 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended to read as follows:

##### “REPORTS TO CONGRESS

“SEC. 12. The Assistant Attorney General for National Security, through the FARA Registration Unit of the Counterintelligence and Export Control Section, shall submit a



semiannual report to Congress regarding the administration of this Act, including, for the reporting period, the identification of—

“(1) registrations filed pursuant to this Act;

“(2) the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated and distributed by agents of foreign principal;

“(3) the number of investigations initiated based upon a perceived violation of section 7; and

“(4) the number of such investigations that were referred to the Attorney General for prosecution.”.

**SA 243.** Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN AND BLOCKING OF PROPERTY WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT FACILITATE CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN.**

(a) **PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.**—

(1) **ISSUANCE OF LICENSES TO CONDUCT OFFSHORE DOLLAR CLEARING.**—The President may not issue any license under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars.

(2) **U-TURN TRANSACTIONS.**—Notwithstanding section 560.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act), a United States person may not process any transfer of funds to or from Iran, or for the direct or indirect benefit of persons in Iran or the Government of Iran, even if the transfer arises from, and is ordinarily incident and necessary to give effect to, an underlying transaction.

(b) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The President shall, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any foreign financial institution that serves as an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars 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) **REPORT BEFORE PROVIDING IRAN ACCESS TO THE UNITED STATES DOLLAR.**—Not later than 30 days before the President implements any measure that would provide access to the United States dollar to the Government of Iran or an Iranian person, the President shall submit to Congress a report that describes the measure.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—This section shall terminate only on the date on which the termination criteria in the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) has been met and the Secretary of State certifies to Congress that Iran is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism (as defined in section 301 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8541)).

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(i)).

(2) **IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “Iranian financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **CONSOLIDATION OF REPORTS.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), each report required by this Act or such section 135 to be submitted to a committee or member of Congress on an on-going basis shall be combined in one report that is submitted to each such committee or member once every 180 days.

**SA 244.** Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN AND BLOCKING OF PROPERTY WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT FACILITATE CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN.**

(a) **PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.**—

(1) **ISSUANCE OF LICENSES TO CONDUCT OFFSHORE DOLLAR CLEARING.**—The President may not issue any license under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars.

(2) **U-TURN TRANSACTIONS.**—Notwithstanding section 560.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act), a United States person may not process any transfer of funds to or from Iran, or for the direct or indirect benefit of persons in Iran or the Government of Iran, even if the transfer arises from, and is ordinarily incident and necessary to give effect to, an underlying transaction.

(b) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The President shall, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any foreign financial institution that serves as an offshore dollar clearing entity to conduct a transaction with an Iranian financial institution in United States dollars 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) **REPORT BEFORE PROVIDING IRAN ACCESS TO THE UNITED STATES DOLLAR.**—Not later than 30 days before the President implements any measure that would provide access to the United States dollar to the Government of Iran or an Iranian person, the President shall submit to Congress a report that describes the measure.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—This section shall terminate only on the date on which the termination criteria in the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment

Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) has been met and the Secretary of State certifies to Congress that Iran is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism (as defined in section 301 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8541)).

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(i)).

(2) **IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “Iranian financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **CONSOLIDATION OF REPORTS.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), each report required by this Act or such section 135 to be submitted to a committee or member of Congress on an on-going basis shall be combined in one report that is submitted to each such committee or member once every 180 days.

**SA 245.** Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 10 through 20, and insert the following:

(4) The IRGC meets the criteria for designation as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(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—

(1) 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); and

(2) an organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

**SA 246.** Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9.** **REPORT ON BOOK ENTRY TRANSFERS CONDUCTED BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH ASSETS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.**

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

(1) An analysis of the legality of overseas book entry transfers conducted by financial institutions present in the United States in connection with assets in which the Government of Iran, or an agency or instrumentality of the Government of Iran, holds a beneficial ownership interest, under—

(A) Executive Order 13599 (77 Fed. Reg. 6659; relating to Blocking property of the Government of Iran and Iranian financial institutions);

(B) part 560 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as the “Iranian Transactions and Sanctions Regulations”); or

(C) any other relevant statutes, executive orders, regulations, or judicial orders.

(2) Recommendations, if any, on how to maintain the integrity of United States sanctions and other financial regulations in light of transfers described in paragraph (1).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “financial institution” means any entity engaged in the business of dealing with monetary transactions, including banks, trust companies, insurance companies, brokerage firms, investment dealers, securities intermediaries, central securities depositories, and post trade services providers.

(2) The term “overseas book entry transfers” means a transaction in which cash is not moved from an account in the United States to an account overseas by wire or other analogous method, but instead is made accessible to an overseas client of a financial institution carrying out the transaction by entry of debits and credits in books or ledgers internal to that financial institution.

(3) The term “present in the United States”, with respect to a financial institution, means that the financial institution has sufficient nexus with the United States so as to be subject to the regulatory authority of the Department of the Treasury.

**SA 247.** Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN RELATING TO SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING UNITED STATES CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) INVESTIGATION.—The President shall initiate an investigation into the possible designation of an Iranian person under subsection (b) upon receipt by the President of credible information indicating that the person has engaged in conduct described in subsection (b).

(b) DESIGNATION.—The President shall designate under this subsection any Iranian person that the President determines has knowingly—

(1) engaged in significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity conducted by the Government of Iran; or

(2) acted for or on behalf of the Government of Iran in connection with such activities.

(c) SANCTIONS.—The President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any Iranian person designated under 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.

(d) SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may suspend the application of sanctions under subsection (c) with respect to an Iranian person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a certification described in paragraph (2) and a detailed justification for the certification.

(2) CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A certification described in this paragraph with respect to an Iranian person is a certification by the President that—

(i) the person has not, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date of the certification, knowingly engaged in activities that would qualify the person for designation under subsection (b); and

(ii) the person is not expected to resume any such activities.

(B) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(e) REIMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—If sanctions are suspended with respect to an Iranian person under subsection (d), such sanctions shall be reinstated if the President determines that the person has resumed the activity that resulted in the initial imposition of sanctions or has engaged in any other activity subject to sanctions relating to the involvement of the person in significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity on behalf of the Government of Iran.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), or any other provision of law.

(g) REPORT.—

(1) 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 describes significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity conducted by the Government of Iran, a person owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, or any person acting for or on behalf of that Government.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the extent to which a foreign government has provided material support to the Government of Iran, to any person owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, or to any person acting for or on behalf of that Government, in connection with the conduct of significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity.

(B) A strategy to counter efforts by Iran to conduct significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity that includes a description of efforts to engage foreign governments in preventing the Government of Iran, persons owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, and persons acting for or on behalf of that Government from conducting significant activities undermining United States cybersecurity.

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

(h) CYBERSECURITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “cybersecurity” means the activity or process, ability or capability, or state whereby information and communications systems and the information contained therein are protected from or defended against damage, unauthorized use or modification, or exploitation.

**SA 248.** Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON IRAN AND NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR AND BALLISTIC MISSILE COOPERATION.**

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

(1) Iran developed a close working relationship with North Korea on many ballistic missile programs, dating back to an acquisition of Scud missiles from North Korea in the mid-1980s.

(2) By the mid-1980s North Korea reverse-engineered Scud B missiles originally received from Egypt, and developed the 500-kilometer range Scud C missile in 1991, and sold both the Scud B and Scud C, as well as missile production technology, to Iran.

(3) In 1992, then-Director of the Central Intelligence Robert Gates, in testimony to Congress, identified Iran as a recipient of North Korean Scud missiles.

(4) In 1993, then-Director of Central Intelligence James Woolsey provided more detail, stating that North Korea had sold Iran extended range Scud C missiles and agreed to sell other forms of missile technology.

(5) Annual threat assessments from the intelligence community during the 1990s showed that North Korea’s ongoing export of ballistic missiles provided a qualitative increase in capabilities to countries such as Iran.

(6) The same threat assessments noted that Iran was using North Korean ballistic missile goods and services to achieve its goal of self-sufficiency in the production of medium-range ballistic missiles.

(7) The intelligence community assessed in the 1990s that Iran’s acquisition of missile systems or key missile-related components could improve Iran’s ability to produce an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

(8) Throughout the 2000s, the intelligence community continued to assess that North Korean cooperation with Iran’s ballistic missile program was ongoing and significant.

(10) North Korea built the nuclear reactor in Syria that was bombed in 2007. Syria failed to report the construction of the reactor to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which was Syria’s obligation under its safeguards agreement with the agency.

(11) Official sources confirm that Iran and North Korea have engaged in various forms of clandestine nuclear cooperation.

(12) North Korea and Iran obtained designs and materials related to uranium enrichment from a clandestine procurement network run by Abdul Qadeer Khan.

(13) In the early 2000s, North Korea exported, with the assistance of Abdul Qadeer Khan, uranium hexafluoride (UF<sub>6</sub>) gas to Libya, which was intended to be used in Libya’s clandestine nuclear weapons program.

(14) On January 6, 2016, North Korea conducted its fourth nuclear weapons test.

(15) On September 9, 2016, North Korea conducted its fifth nuclear weapons test.

(16) Iranian officials reportedly traveled to North Korea to witness its three previous nuclear tests in 2006, 2009, and 2013.

(17) Before North Korea’s 2013 test, a senior American official was quoted as saying “it’s

very possible that North Koreans are testing for two countries”.

(18) In September 2012, Iran and North Korea signed an agreement for technological and scientific cooperation.

(19) In an April 2015 interview with CNN, then-Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter said that North Korea and Iran “could be” cooperating to develop a nuclear weapon.

(20) On March 11, 2017, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats provided written testimony to Congress that stated that Pyongyang’s “export of ballistic missiles and associated materials to several countries, including Iran and Syria, and its assistance to Syria’s construction of a nuclear reactor . . . illustrate its willingness to proliferate dangerous technologies”.

(21) A 2016 Congressional Research Service report confirmed that “ballistic missile technology cooperation between the two [Iran and North Korea] is significant and meaningful”.

(22) Admiral Bill Gortney, Commander of United States Northern Command, testified to Congress on April 14, 2016, that “Iran’s continuing pursuit of long-range missile capabilities and ballistic missile and space launch programs, in defiance of United Nations Security Council resolutions, remains a serious concern”.

(23) There is substantial evidence that Iran and North Korea are working together on nuclear weapons development.

(24) Since the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-277) repealed requirements for the intelligence community to provide unclassified annual report to Congress on the “Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions”, the number of unclassified reports to Congress on nuclear-weapons issues decreased considerably.

(25) Absent these reports, the President has not been required to detail to Congress the assessment of cooperation between North Korea and Iran on nuclear weapon or ballistic missile development.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ballistic missile programs of Iran and North Korea represent a serious threat to allies of the United States in the Middle East, Europe, and Asia, members of the Armed Forces deployed in those regions, and ultimately the United States;

(2) further cooperation between Iran and North Korea on nuclear weapons or ballistic missile technology is not in the security interests of the United States or our allies;

(3) United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015), which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council and supported by the international community, called upon Iran not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches of such missiles, for an eight year period beginning in 2015; and

(4) the Director of National Intelligence has assessed that Iran would use ballistic missiles as its “preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons” which could eventually threaten the United States.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of other relevant agencies, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes an assessment of the extent of cooperation on nuclear programs, ballistic missile development, chemical and biological weapons development, or conven-

tional weapons programs between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of North Korea, including the identity of Iranian and North Korean persons that have knowingly engaged in or directed the provision of material support or the exchange of information (including through the transfer of goods, services, technology, or intellectual property) between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of North Korea;

(2) And a determination whether any of the activities described in paragraph (1) violate United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), 2094 (2013), 2231 (2015), 2270 (2016) and 2321 (2016).

(3) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(4) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

**SA 249.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62 of the amendment, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(3) Activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

**SEC. 292. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON PROCUREMENT OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES RELATING TO SPACE LAUNCHES.**

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title 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;
- (2) the Department of Defense; or
- (3) any other person.

**SA 250.** Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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;
- (2) the Department of Defense; or
- (3) any other person.

**SA 251.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SECTION 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or any other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any Russian Federation entity of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service, by any United States contractor or subcontractor or any other entity, related to or in connection with any space launch conducted for the Federal Government or under a federal contract

**SA 252.** Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 232 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. CARDIN)) to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62 of the amendment, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(3) Activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

**SEC. 292. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON PROCUREMENT OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES RELATING TO SPACE LAUNCHES.**

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title 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;
- (2) the Department of Defense; or

(3) any non-United States Government person.

**SA 253.** Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### **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. Continuation in effect of sanctions for Iranian support relating to terrorism and Iran's ballistic missile program.
- Sec. 9. Review of applicability of sanctions relating to Iran's support for terrorism and its ballistic missile program.
- Sec. 10. Report on coordination of sanctions between the United States and the European Union.
- Sec. 11. Report on United States citizens detained by Iran.
- Sec. 12. Exceptions for national security and humanitarian assistance; rule of construction.
- Sec. 13. Waiver authority; termination of sanctions.

#### **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, development, 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) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) 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 support of, a person referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4) or (5).

(b) **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 (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) **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 sponsor 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. CONTINUATION IN EFFECT OF SANCTIONS FOR IRANIAN SUPPORT RELATING TO TERRORISM AND IRAN’S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—United States sanctions imposed with respect to a person under 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 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), and imposed as a result of activities described in subsection (b), that are in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (c) with respect to the person.

(b) **ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.**—An activity described in this subsection is—

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

(2) support by the Government of Iran for acts of international terrorism.

(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A certification described in this subsection is a certification that the person with respect to which sanctions were imposed under Executive Order 13382 or Executive Order 13224 has not, during the 3-month period immediately preceding the date of the certification, provided support for or otherwise facilitated or engaged in any activity described in subsection (b).

(2) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall submit the certification described in paragraph

(1) to the appropriate congressional committees in writing and shall include a detailed justification for the certification.

(B) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) REIMPOSITION.—If sanctions are suspended with respect to a person under this section, such sanctions shall be reinstated if the President determines that the person has resumed any activity described in subsection (b).

#### SEC. 9. 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 13.

#### SEC. 10. 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. 11. 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. 12. 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 this Act shall not include the authority to impose sanctions with respect to the importation of goods.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—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 shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency 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. 13. WAIVER AUTHORITY; TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) TEMPORARY WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the President may waive a requirement under this Act to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a person for one period of not more than 120 days.

(b) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—Sanctions waived under subsection (a) shall terminate if—

(1) not later than 30 days before the waiver under subsection (a) with respect to the sanctions expires, the President submits to Congress a request to terminate the sanctions; and

(2) during the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the President submits the request to Congress, a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law under subsection (c).

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “joint resolution of approval” means a joint resolution the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress approves the request of the President under section 12 of the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017 submitted on \_\_\_\_\_ to terminate the application of sanctions with respect to \_\_\_\_\_”, with the first blank space being filled with the date and the second blank space being filled with the name of the person to which the request applies.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—On or after the day on which the President submits to Congress a request under subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval with respect to the request may be introduced—

(A) in the House, by the majority leader of the House, for the majority leader and the minority leader of the House, or by Members of the House designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the House; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader of the Senate, for the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate, or by Members of the Senate designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate.

(3) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval shall be referred by the presiding officers of the respective Houses to the appropriate committee.

(4) AMENDMENTS PROHIBITED.—No amendment to a joint resolution of approval shall be in order in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. It shall not be in order to suspend the application of this paragraph in either House or for the Presiding Officer to entertain a request to suspend the application of this paragraph by unanimous consent.

(5) PERIOD FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—If the committee of either House to which a joint resolution of approval has been referred has not reported the resolution at the close of the 15th day after the introduction of the resolution, the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration



of the resolution and the resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(6) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A vote on final passage of a joint resolution of approval shall be taken in each House on or before the close of the 15th day after the resolution is reported by the committee of that House to which the resolution was referred, or after that committee has been discharged from further consideration of the resolution under paragraph (5).

(B) RESOLUTION PASSED BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, prior to the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval of that House, that House receives the same resolution from the other House, then—

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

(ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(7) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) MOTIONS TO PROCEED.—A motion in the House of Representatives to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval shall be highly privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) TIME FOR DEBATE.—Debate in the House of Representatives on a joint resolution of approval shall be limited to not more than 20 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to recommit a joint resolution of approval or to move to reconsider the vote by which a joint resolution of approval is agreed to or disagreed to.

(C) MOTIONS TO POSTPONE.—Motions to postpone, made in the House of Representatives with respect to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(D) APPEALS.—All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval shall be decided without debate.

(E) APPLICABILITY OF RULES.—Except to the extent specifically provided in the preceding provisions of this paragraph, consideration of a joint resolution of approval shall be governed by the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to other resolutions in similar circumstances.

(8) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) MOTIONS TO PROCEED.—A motion in the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval shall be privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) TIME FOR DEBATE.—Debate in the Senate on a joint resolution of approval, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(C) MOTIONS AND APPEALS.—Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a joint resolution of approval shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the resolution, except that in the event the manager of the resolution is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition

thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or the minority leader's designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from time under their control on the passage of a joint resolution of approval, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(D) MOTIONS TO FURTHER LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a joint resolution of approval is not debatable.

(E) MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT.—A motion to recommit a joint resolution of approval is not in order.

(9) 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, 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) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to impose sanctions under this Act with respect to a person with respect to which sanctions were terminated under this section.

**SA 254.** Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 13. RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN PAYMENTS RELATING TO CLAIMS BROUGHT BEFORE THE IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended for a payment described in subsection (b) until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Iran has paid all compensatory damages awarded to a United States person in a final judgment—

(1) issued by a district court of the United States under Federal or State law against the Government of Iran; and

(2) arising from an act of international terrorism, for which the Government of Iran was determined not to be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States or of the States under section 1605A of title 28, United States Code, or section 1605(a)(7) of such title (as in effect on January 27, 2008).

(b) PAYMENTS DESCRIBED.—A payment described in this subsection is a payment by the United States to the Government of Iran or a national of Iran relating to the settlement of a claim before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal.

(c) ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "act of international terrorism" includes—

(1) an act of torture, extrajudicial killing, aircraft sabotage, or hostage taking, as those terms are defined in section 1605A(h) of title 28, United States Code; and

(2) providing material support or resources, as defined in section 2339A of title 18, United

States Code, for an act described in subparagraph (A).

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 2:15 p.m. to conduct an executive session to vote on the following nominations: Mr. Kevin Allen Hassett, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; and the Honorable Pamela Hughes Patenaude, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a Hearing on "Paving the Way for Self-Driving Vehicles."

**COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS**

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Legislative Hearing on S. 517, the Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act."

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider favorably reporting pending nominations.

**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing titled "Ideology and Terror: Understanding the Tools, Tactics, and Techniques of Violent Extremism."

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY**

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 14, 2017, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

**COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 3 p.m. in 428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Tax Reform: Removing Barriers to Small Business Growth."

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget for Veterans' Programs and Fiscal Year 2019 Advance Appropriations Requests.

#### COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, to conduct a hearing entitled "Military Caregivers: Families Serving for the Long Run." The Committee will meet in room 106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 2:30 p.m.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Water and Power is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Wednesday, June 14, 2017, at 2 p.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE

The Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled

"Southeast Europe: Strengthening Democracy and Countering Malign Foreign Influence."

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to a member of my staff, Patrick Flanigan.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### PROVIDING FOR STAYS DURING A PERIOD THAT THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD LACKS A QUORUM

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 1083.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

*Resolved*, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1083) entitled "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.", do pass with an amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. I move to concur in the House amendment, and I ask unan-

imous consent that the motion be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 15; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 722, as under the previous order.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order and that our prayers be with the Capitol Police and the Members of Congress who were hurt today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:44 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 15, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.