

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) An explanation for the reason for each discrepancy between sanctions imposed by the European Union and sanctions imposed by the United States described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

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

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

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

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

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

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United States citizens, including

United States citizens who are also citizens of other countries, detained by Iran or groups supported by Iran that includes—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—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. 12. PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.**

(a) **CASE-BY-CASE WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis and for a period of not more than 180 days, a requirement under section 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 to impose or maintain sanctions with

respect to a person, and may waive the continued imposition of such sanctions, not less than 30 days after the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to waive such sanctions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

**BUILDING AND SUSTAINING A LARGER NAVY**

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, I rise this afternoon to direct the attention of this body to an important national security issue: building and sustaining a larger Navy.

President Trump wants a 350-ship Navy, which aligns with the Navy's requirement for 355 ships. Right now we have only 275 ships in the battle fleet. Increasing the size of the Navy by 80 ships, even as older ships retire each year, is a test of national will. It will not happen overnight. However, Congress has the responsibility to lay a firm foundation this year to prepare for a deliberate and responsible buildup in the future. A healthy shipbuilding industrial base is necessary to succeed.

Today, I will offer some general comments about the state of shipbuilding. Then I will focus on the submarine industrial base, in particular, because of its unique challenges. Finally, I will make suggestions on how Congress can support the industrial base in general and the submarine yards specifically.

Last month, my subcommittee convened two hearings on this matter. The first was with naval officials. This took place in a classified setting because of their expertise and because of sensitive information. The other hearing was with the country's two top shipbuilders—Huntington Ingalls and General Dynamics—as well as the Shipyards Council of America, which is the trade association for suppliers. We discussed the industrial base as it exists today and the challenges associated with building up the fleet.

Based on my subcommittee's work, here are four general impressions of the state of shipbuilding.

No. 1, the yards are turning out most classes of ships on time and on budget. Ingalls Shipbuilding just delivered the newest big-deck amphibious ship—the LHA-13 weeks early. Electric Boat and Newport News continue to deliver Virginia-class attack submarines, or SSNs. Construction time for attack submarines has declined by 1½ years—from 84 months to 66 months. There are a few notable exceptions, but, by and large, industry is delivering for the warfighter and for the taxpayer.

No. 2, most yards have excess capacity to ramp up shipbuilding. This is very good news for national security. The Navy's accelerated fleet plan concluded that the industrial base can build an additional 29 ships—above projections—over the next 7 years. The glaring exceptions are the submarine yards, which will struggle to meet planned demand as the new Columbia-class ballistic missile submarine production starts. In terms of capacity, our submarine yards have a ways to go.

No. 3, two decades of low-rate shipbuilding have significantly reduced the supplier base. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that ships cost more today than they did during the Reagan buildup, even when adjusting for inflation. Twenty years ago, about 17,000 suppliers served the submarine business. Now only about 3,000 first-tier suppliers are left. Let me repeat this. We used to have 17,000 suppliers. Now we have 3,000. These 3,000 suppliers include large corporations, such as Northrop Grumman and L3, which have tens of thousands of employees. These 3,000 suppliers also include mom-and-pop small businesses with just a few employees. Whether they deal with large corporations or small businesses, the shipyards increasingly buy from sole-source suppliers. In fact, Newport News spends about 65 percent of its budget in buying pieces and parts from single and sole-source suppliers. General Dynamics faces a very similar situation. I have little doubt that this dramatic erosion in the supplier base explains why ships cost more today.

No. 4, in terms of my general observations, Congress has a critical role to play in supporting a buildup through advance procurement funding, through multiyear procurement authority, and through block buys. These tools can stimulate the supplier base, stabilize the workforce, and achieve significant savings through producing economies of scale. In addition, incremental funding authority is a tool that Congress can authorize to smooth out peaks and valleys in appropriations. This makes it easier to buy more ships in 1 year without busting the budget.

To sum it up, most yards are performing well and have the capacity to ramp up. The submarine yards are doing exceptional work but will struggle because of capacity. All shipbuilders face a diminished supplier base, which undermines competition, and Congress can help improve the supplier situation and stabilize the skilled workforce through using acquisition authorities.

That is a snapshot of the overall shipbuilding industrial base. Now let's turn to submarines specifically. Let's begin with the Navy's requirements.

In 2016, the Navy set a new requirement. The total requirement for ships is 355. That includes an increase of 47 ships from the previous level. For the Navy's submarine fleet, the new plan calls for 66 attack submarines and 12 ballistic missile submarines. We currently have 52 attack submarines—a number that will eventually decline to 41 over the next decade unless we do something about it. I propose we do something about it. We currently have 14 ballistic missile submarines as part of our nuclear deterrent. Beginning in 2021, 12 of these will be replaced by the new Columbia-class ballistic missile submarines.

To reiterate, we need 355 ships. That includes 66 attack submarines and 12 ballistic missile submarines. How does the President's budget request match up? The fiscal year 2018 request includes nine ships and prioritizes readiness more so than modernization. Congress needs to work with the President to reach his goal and to reach the requirement of 350 to 355 ships. I look forward to working with the administration on these budget numbers in order to make them work and to help the President achieve his goal.

Now let's talk about submarines. The budget request fully funds R&D for Columbia-class SSBNs to keep the program on track. The budget also funds the procurement of two Virginia-class submarines. We have followed this policy for years.

The Navy will struggle to ramp up submarine production because of the industrial base for submarines and how it will be stretched to capacity. The CBO tells us that reaching 355 ships in 15 years is not possible because we lack submarine production capacity. Electric Boat and Newport News are investing billions to recapitalize facilities, workforce, and suppliers, but that re-

capitalization effort is aimed at meeting current projected demand.

Arresting the decline in attack submarines, while maintaining the schedule for the Columbia-class SSBN, will take a significant recapitalization effort. We have done it before, and we can do it again. From the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, industry steadily delivered three attack submarines per year and added a fourth SSBN on time and on budget. There is no reason we cannot do this again. We must take decisive action now to make this a reality. There are four ways in which Congress can help.

No. 1, repeal the defense budget caps. Sufficient and stable funding is the starting point for expanding submarine and shipbuilding capacity. The Budget Control Act-mandated budget caps have damaged military readiness and choked off modernization. While intended as a way to incentivize us to reform mandatory programs, the BCA defense caps have proved to be a self-inflicted wound. We cannot solve our spending and debt problem on the backs of our warfighters and industrial base, much less on the backs of the security of Americans. Congress needs to end the defense budget caps immediately.

No. 2, we need to accelerate and fully fund advance procurement. This will help stimulate and encourage new entrants into the supplier base. We need more competition. We need more suppliers. Driving down the cost per ship will free up resources to buy more ships.

No. 3, we need to incentivize capital investment. Congress should work with industry to identify responsible and cost-effective ways to incentivize investments in facilities and capital equipment.

No. 4, we need to target some appropriations to fund process improvements. I mentioned earlier that Newport News and Electric Boat have shaved a year and a half off Virginia production through more efficient manufacturing. We need more of this sort of thing.

Shipbuilding is a team effort, and these are four ways in which Congress can help to constructively participate in this national project.

The requirement for a bigger Navy is clear. The Navy needs our help to fulfill its mission. Numbers matter when it comes to projecting naval power in this day and age. The President and the Navy agree that we must build a bigger Navy.

To summarize, the shipbuilding industrial base is up to the task. Submarine production will be the most challenging part of this. There is limited capacity for submarine yards, and we need to do something about that, but Congress can take a number of steps now. We must start to build a foundation this year. I am committed—and I hope the entire Congress is committed—to setting this firm foundation, and I certainly intend to use my

chairmanship on Seapower for this goal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### CLIMATE DISRUPTION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, climate disruption is a significant concern for the health of our planet. It is affecting everything from our agriculture to our economy, to our forests, to our world's glaciers, to our ice sheets, and, certainly, to the distribution of the world's insects and the diseases they carry.

President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement has attracted additional attention to the role that America should play in taking on this major challenge. How significant are the impacts of climate disruption to our forests and our farming and our fishing? What are the business opportunities of transforming an economy from that based on fossil fuels to that based on clean and renewable energy? What are other nations doing? How fast do we need to move to save the planet?

There will be many scholarly speeches on these topics here on the floor—many who will have been informed by the experiences that Senators will have had in their home States, both in the evolution of wind and solar energy and the changes that they are seeing in their forests and their farming and their fishing. I hope to draw attention and, hopefully, insights as to these issues in a more lighthearted fashion by presenting periodic episodes of a Senate Climate Disruption Quiz. Today, I am presenting episode No. 1 of this Disruption Quiz series. Let's get started.

Question No. 1: Which famous CEO resigned from three Presidential councils after President Trump announced that the United States would withdraw from the Paris Agreement? Was it Bob Iger of Disney? Was it Elon Musk of Tesla and SpaceX? Was it Travis Kalanick, the CEO of Uber? Consider which of these individuals made this decision.

The right answer is Elon Musk. Congratulations if that is what you guessed.

Bob Iger of Disney resigned from a Presidential council, but he resigned only from one, not three. He resigned from the Presidential Strategic and Policy Forum, and he has been quite significant in putting forward other environmental issues, such as the zero waste of Disney's theme parks.

He said when he resigned:

Protecting our planet and driving economic growth are critical to our future, and they aren't mutually exclusive.

He continued:

I deeply disagree with the decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

Travis Kalanick, the controversial and besieged Uber CEO, also resigned from the same council, that being the

Presidential Strategic and Policy Forum, but he did so in response to the President's Muslim ban, not to the announcement that the United States would withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

That takes us to Elon Musk, who resigned from three councils—the President's Strategic and Policy Forum, Manufacturing Initiative, and Executive Council on Infrastructure.

He tweeted:

Am departing Presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or for the world.

So that is the first question. Now get ready to see if you can answer the second question correctly.

Question No. 2: As of today, which two countries are not party to the Paris Agreement? Is it Syria and Nicaragua? Is it Iran and North Korea, two members of the axis of evil? Is it Togo and Indonesia, or is it India and Cambodia? I am sure you have heard climate news about all of these countries, but you may not know which ones are the only two countries in the world that are not members of the Paris Agreement.

By the way, the United States is not on this list because even though we have announced we are withdrawing, that takes some time, and we are actually still a member.

The correct answer is Syria and Nicaragua.

Nicaragua hasn't signed on because they don't believe the Paris Agreement goes far enough in its fight against climate disruption. Today, more than half of Nicaragua's electricity comes from renewable resources—wind, solar, wave, and geothermal. The Government of Nicaragua predicts that within a few years, the percentage of electricity from renewables will rise to 80 percent. Because of the abundance of these resources, a 2013 World Bank report labeled Nicaragua "a renewable energy paradise."

The reason Syria didn't participate or sign on to the Paris Agreement is because it is in the midst of a horrific 6-year-long civil war that has claimed the lives of 300,000 men, women, and children and driven millions out of the country.

Now we will turn to question No. 3. Thanks in part to warmer temperatures and milder winters, cases of which tick-borne illness have more than doubled since 1991? Is the answer Colorado tick fever or tularemia or Lyme disease or Heartland virus?

By the way, all of these are real diseases. Well, Colorado tick fever is a viral infection that is mostly found in the mountain areas of the Western United States and Canada and is transmitted by the bite of an infected Rocky Mountain wood tick. Tularemia, which is also known as rabbit fever or deer fly fever or O'Hara's fever, is certainly a scary-sounding disease. Lyme disease is mostly transmitted by deer tick bites and is predominantly found in the Northeast and upper Midwest, the Mid-

Atlantic regions of the country. And then there is the Heartland virus, which is transmitted by the lone star tick.

Well, the correct answer is—drum roll—C, Lyme disease.

Since 1991, the number of cases of Lyme disease in the United States has doubled. Approximately 30,000 people are diagnosed with the disease each year, but because it is very difficult to diagnosis, the Centers for Disease Control thinks the real number of cases is about 10 times that, or 300,000 people per year here in the United States. The main reason for the increase we have seen in Lyme disease is warmer temperatures and milder winters. Cold winters kill ticks; warm winters don't. That is what it boils down to.

On to question No. 4. Who was recently quoted as saying that "the fuel of choice right now, certainly for us, is wind"? Was it Bono, the lead singer of U2 and founder of the One Campaign, known for its activist work in Africa? Was it Gwyneth Paltrow, the award-winning actress? Was it Ben Fowke, the CEO of Xcel Energy, which owns and operates 13 coal plants around the country? Was it Pope Francis, who gave our President a copy of his encyclical when the President visited with him just a few weeks ago?

Well, it turns out the answer is C, the CEO of Xcel Energy. That is a little bit surprising given that they operate more than a dozen coal plants, but it is also a company that generates one-fifth of its electricity from wind.

In January, the company shut down a large natural gas plant in Colorado for 2 days, and wind, on average, provided the power for half of its customer demand. Wind is Xcel's fuel of choice because once the turbines are built, the cost of the fuel to operate the turbines is zero. The fuel, plainly speaking, is free. And that is what led him to this comment saying that it is a preferred choice. Anytime you can get free fuel, it beats gearing up your coal plant or your natural gas plant.

Now we will turn to question No. 5, our final question. The Power Minister of which country recently announced that they intend to sell only electric cars by the year 2030? Is the answer India, which is home to 1.3 billion citizens, the world's third largest oil importer and a country with 300 million individuals who don't yet have access to electricity? Is it Germany, a manufacturing powerhouse, which has had a large feed-in tariff—a subsidy, if you will—to encourage distributed solar, solar panels on the tops of commercial buildings and homes? Is it China, where the use of cars has absolutely exploded. And the pollution in Beijing is among the worst pollution in the world, driven largely by the combustion of fossil fuels. Is it Canada, which has a new Prime Minister, Prime Minister Trudeau, who has prioritized tackling climate disruption?

If you guessed Germany, you are almost right but not quite. Germany's