

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Fifty-six (56) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs).

Non-MDE includes: Containers, weapon support and support equipment, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-YAK).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: JA-D-YAI, JA-D-YAH.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 4, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Japan—AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs)

The Government of Japan has requested a possible sale of fifty-six (56) AIM 120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs). Also included are containers, weapon support and support equipment, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$113 million.

This sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by meeting the security and defense needs of a major ally and partner nation. Japan continues to be an important force for peace, political stability, and economic progress in the Asia-Pacific region.

The proposed sale will provide Japan a critical air defense capability to assist in defending the Japanese homeland and U.S. personnel stationed there. Japan will have no difficulty absorbing these additional munitions into the Japan Air Self-Defense Force.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, Arizona. There are no offset arrangements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Japan.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-42

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

#### Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The proposed sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to the Government of Japan related to the AIM-120C Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air (AMRAAM). The AIM-120C AMRAAM is a radar guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high flying, low flying, and maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM All Up Round is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technology data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or an equivalent system which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Japan can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Japan.

#### AUTOMATIC GUNFIRE PREVENTION ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the Automatic Gunfire Prevention Act of 2017.

First, I would like to thank Senators BLUMENTHAL, MURPHY, SCHUMER, DURBIN, LEAHY, CORTEZ MASTO, VAN HOLLEN, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, MARKEY, CASEY, REED, HASSAN, MERKLEY, CARPER, CARDIN, COONS, FRANKEN, HARRIS, BOOKER, WHITEHOUSE, HIRONO, SANDERS, WARREN, CANTWELL, MCCASKILL, NELSON, MURRAY, UDALL, KAINE, WARNER, BENNETT, SCHATZ, WYDEN, BROWN, DUCKWORTH, MENENDEZ, and BALDWIN for cosponsoring this legislation. Their support for this bill is deeply appreciated.

Just days ago, in Las Vegas, NV, we experienced the worst mass shooting—in terms of the number of victims—in our Nation's history.

There are now at least 58 dead and nearly 500 wounded as a result of that attack. The grief and pain of so many victims and their loved ones is overwhelming and all too familiar to gun violence victims and survivors all across America.

What makes this mass shooting particularly devastating is that the shooting was done by a single gunman. Within minutes, the gunman exacted devastating firepower on hundreds of people, terrorizing concertgoers and an entire community.

How was this possible?

While facts are still being uncovered, we know that this particular gunman had amassed a vast arsenal. He had at least 23 firearms and hundreds of rounds of ammunition in his hotel room among which were 12 semiautomatic rifles enhanced with “bump-stock” devices.

These bump-stock devices are typically used to turn semiautomatic rifles into functional machine guns, capable of shooting hundreds of bullets per minute.

A semiautomatic rifle's rate of fire is usually 45 to 60 rounds per minute. With a bump-stock device attached, these semiautomatic weapons can fire up to 700 rounds per minute. Bump-stock devices are readily accessible. They can be purchased online or at a store by anyone for merely \$100.

Anyone who has seen YouTube video clips of semiautomatic rifles outfitted with these devices knows just how devastating they are.

The number of bullets that can be sprayed into a crowd within minutes is staggering.

Because they are so dangerous, automatic machine-gun-like weapons have been categorically banned in America since 1986 under the National Firearms Act.

This law was a direct response to the Prohibition Era's mobster crimes during which machine guns were used to kill their victims at a deadly rate.

One seminal event during this period was the St. Valentine's Day Massacre of 1929.

That tragic day was marked by the murder of seven men in a garage on the North Side of Chicago. The massacre was the culmination of a feud between an Irish American gang and another gang led by Al Capone. Organized crime was rampant during that era, and fully automatic weapons were the weapons of choice for gangsters. Indeed, the men who committed the St. Valentine's Day Massacre used Thompson submachine guns, known as “Tommy guns,” to mow down their victims.

The St. Valentine's Day Massacre, which remains in infamy, clearly demonstrated that elected leaders must do something about this violence and get these fully automatic guns out of the hands of killers.

As a result, the National Firearms Act was enacted in 1934. When originally passed, it heavily regulated machine guns, imposing a tax on the making and transferring of machine guns and other lethal weapons. It also imposed a special occupational tax on those engaged in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in firearms regulated under the National Firearms Act.

It also required the registration of all machine guns and other guns regulated under the National Firearms Act with the Treasury Secretary.

Later, in 1986, the National Firearms Act was amended to ban all future automatic weapons from private possession, except for those legally owned and registered as of May 19, 1986.

Therefore, today, automatic weapons are generally banned for civilian use—and rightfully so. They are absolutely lethal weapons of war and have no business being in our homes, our schools, our businesses, and our streets.

Notwithstanding this outright ban, there is a loophole in the law that allows bump-stock devices to configure legal semiautomatic weapons so that they can function like a fully automatic weapon. This loophole must be closed.

If automatic weapons are banned, these devices should be banned. There is no functional difference between automatic weapons and a bump-stock enhanced semiautomatic weapon. Such devices are simply not needed to hunt

or to use in a private home for self-defense.

Like we saw in Las Vegas, these bump-stock devices allow those with a motive to kill to use fully legal firearms to wreak havoc and kill large numbers of people within minutes.

The bill I have introduced is straightforward. It closes the loophole that allows civilians to purchase and use devices that convert semiautomatic weapons into machine guns. Specifically, it bans the sale, transfer, importation, manufacturing, or possession of bump fire devices, trigger cranks, or anything that accelerates a semiautomatic rifle's rate of fire.

The bill further provides an exception to this ban, by allowing for the lawful possession of these devices by law enforcement and the government.

Those who violate the ban would be subject to the same penalty available to those who illegally possess a machine gun under current law.

Closing this loophole should not be a partisan issue. Anyone who has seen footage from the shooting in Las Vegas should recognize that weapons that are altered to emulate automatic gunfire should not be permitted in our communities.

In my view, this bill is a modest proposal. It was one that was included in the Assault Weapons Ban legislation that I proposed 4 years ago, which we failed to pass in 2013.

Tragically, had that legislation been enacted in 2013, it could have perhaps saved lives in Las Vegas.

Indeed, when the police dispatcher was first contacted in Las Vegas at 10:09 PM local time, it took 11 minutes until the last shots were fired and the suspect was neutralized.

Think of that for a moment. If automatic gunfire had been impossible for the gunman, less shots would have sprayed through Las Vegas that night, and less people may have died. That is extraordinarily sobering.

I recall standing here on this floor nearly 4 years ago, urging my colleagues to adopt the assault weapons ban, pleading that it could possibly save lives.

That was on the heels of one of the darkest days in American history, when 20 beautiful children and 6 educators had their lives taken at Sandy Hook Elementary School. It is an absolute travesty that Congress refused to act back then.

It is my strongest belief that when our Nation is faced with dire situations—like sickness, or job stagnation, or human trafficking—it is our job, our solemn oath as lawmakers, to try to solve these problems.

We utterly forsake that solemn oath when we simply do nothing; when we yield to cynicism or to a single lobbying faction.

If we do not act today, we are failing the American people. We are failing our communities. We are failing responsible gun owners.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. We must act. Now is the time.

## IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the United States is facing an urgent nuclear crisis with North Korea. President Trump should not trigger another nuclear crisis with Iran.

North Korea's nuclear program presents a clear and direct threat to the United States. Our top military official, General Dunford, testified last month that North Korea has the capability to strike the U.S. mainland with an intercontinental ballistic missile. North Korea has ramped up the pace of its ballistic missile tests, firing two ICBMs over Japan in recent months. Just last month, North Korea conducted its sixth test of a nuclear weapon, the largest yet.

Meanwhile, President Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong Un are engaged in nuclear brinkmanship. Trump has threatened to "totally destroy" North Korea, has tweeted that North Korea "might not be around much longer," and has rebuked his own Secretary of State for attempting to find a diplomatic solution. With each reckless pronouncement, Trump's threats could bring the United States closer to a war that would put at risk millions of lives, including tens of thousands of American soldiers.

Confronted with the North Korean nuclear threat, President Trump is seeking to provoke another nuclear crisis, this time in the turbulent Middle East. He has repeatedly threatened to withdraw from the agreement that the United States and the international community forged to prohibit Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. He has called the Iran deal an "embarrassment," "the worst deal ever," and has vowed to "rip up" the agreement. In making those threats, Trump is putting our security and credibility at risk.

The Iran deal is working. It has verifiably shut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear bomb, imposed tough constraints on Iran's nuclear program, and subjected Iran to the most comprehensive inspection and monitoring regime ever negotiated. How do we know? We know from Donald Trump himself.

Just 2 weeks ago, President Trump found Iran in compliance and waived nuclear-related sanctions on Iran. In fact, the Trump administration has twice certified Iran's compliance with the deal, acknowledging that adherence to the agreement is in the vital national security interests of the United States. Our State Department, our Defense Department, and our intelligence community have all assessed that Iran is in compliance with the nuclear agreement. Most importantly, President Trump has presented no evidence to Congress, as he is required to do by law, of any potential Iranian breach of the deal. In fact, the administration has yet to brief the Senate on its strategy for Iran, despite weekly requests from my colleagues.

Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, Trump has suggested

that he will refuse to certify Iran's compliance with the deal by October 15, the next deadline. This will effectively kick the deal's fate to Congress, which will then have 60 days to decide whether to reimpose the nuclear-related sanctions on Iran waived under the deal.

Make no mistake: Trump's reasons for not certifying Iran's compliance are based on politics, not national security. He wants to tear up an agreement that has prevented Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, simply because it was negotiated by a democratic administration. Trump has threatened to do this without offering any alternative plan to block Iran from getting a nuclear bomb.

In the absence of any evidence of an Iranian violation, Trump and his team are manufacturing reasons not to certify the deal, citing issues not addressed in the nuclear agreement, such as Iran's sponsorship of regional terrorism, its ballistic missile tests, and its human rights violations.

Iran is subject to sanctions for those malign activities. Since the Iran deal has been implemented, the United States had designated over 100 individuals and entities for sanctions. Congress passed a new law this July, that I cosponsored, sanctioning Iran for these aggressions. It is worth underscoring this point: Donald Trump has yet to issue instructions to his administration on how to implement that sanctions law.

In short, the Iran deal has not prevented the United States from taking measures to hold Iran accountable for its destabilizing actions elsewhere. It has, however, prevented Iran from conducting those same actions with a nuclear weapon. That is where our focus should continue to be. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a far greater menace in the region than a nonnuclear Iran.

The truth is, if the United States had tried to expand the nuclear agreement to also address Iran's ballistic missile tests and its regional terrorism, there would simply be no deal. Russia and China would not have agreed to its terms. Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon was the only point on which all parties were united. Critics of the deal who argue otherwise are not being straight with the American people.

In a world of alternative facts, that point is worth reiterating. No deal, including this one, contains everything we want. That is the nature of a negotiation. Unilaterally withdrawing from the agreement will not produce a better deal today. In fact, we have much less negotiating leverage today. The United States does not have the backing of our allies and partners around the world for withdrawal. Our partners have been crystal clear. They will not renegotiate the deal while it is working. Without that international backing, we have no leverage with Iran.

This brings to bear another, equally important, point. This administration