

Thank you.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 570—EMPHASIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF MEETING NATO SPENDING COMMITMENTS

Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 570

Whereas, for over six decades, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been a successful intergovernmental political and military alliance;

Whereas NATO's collective defense serves as a deterrent against aggression from adversaries and external security threats;

Whereas NATO strengthens the security of the United States by utilizing an integrated military coalition;

Whereas Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that "in order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack";

Whereas, since the formation of NATO, the United States has negotiated with NATO allies over fair and equitable burden sharing;

Whereas, in 1953, President Dwight Eisenhower invited European NATO allies to increase their contribution in defense spending, pointing out that the "American well had run dry";

Whereas, at a 1963 National Security Council meeting, President John F. Kennedy stated that "we cannot continue to pay for the military protection of Europe while the NATO states are not paying their fair share and living off the fat of the land";

Whereas President Richard Nixon's Second Annual Report to the Congress on United States Foreign Policy stated, "The emphasis is no longer on their sharing the cost of America's military commitment to Europe—although financial arrangements may play a part—but on their providing the national forces needed in conjunction with ours in support of an effective common strategy";

Whereas the first NATO defense-spending target was issued in the 1977 NATO Ministerial Guidance, where NATO allies agreed to increase defense spending by 3 percent annually to address the substantially larger defense resource allocations of the Soviet Union;

Whereas, during the 1980s, the United States drastically increased its defense spending to combat threats posed by the Soviet Union, causing its share of total NATO defense spending to rise dramatically, while at the same time, NATO allies failed to meet the 1977 spending target;

Whereas the National Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525) included a sense of Congress that the President should "call on the pertinent members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to meet or exceed their pledges for an annual increase in defense spending";

Whereas, in the 1988 NATO Summit Declaration, NATO allies reaffirmed their "willingness to share fairly the risks, burdens and responsibilities as well as the benefits of our common efforts";

Whereas, in 1990, as the Soviet Union was trending towards collapse, NATO defense

ministers agreed to drop the 3-percent annual increase policy, as allies looked to "reap the benefits of the greatly improved climate in East-West relations";

Whereas, while defense spending among all NATO allies decreased throughout the 1990s, conflicts in Bosnia, and later in Kosovo, clearly illustrated that European NATO allies severely lacked key military capabilities, causing British Prime Minister Tony Blair to state, "If Europe wants the United States to maintain its commitment to Europe, Europe must share more of the burden of defending the West's security interests";

Whereas, at the 2002 NATO Prague Summit, NATO allies entered into a nonbinding agreement to raise defense spending to 2 percent of their gross domestic product (GDP) in order to meet the goals set out in the Prague Capabilities Commitment;

Whereas, before the 2006 NATO Riga Summit, United States Ambassador to NATO Victoria Nuland called the 2-percent metric the "unofficial floor" on defense spending in NATO;

Whereas, at the 2006 NATO Riga Summit, NATO allies declared that "we encourage nations whose defense spending is declining to halt that decline and to aim to increase defense spending in real terms";

Whereas, at the 2008 NATO Bucharest Summit, NATO allies reaffirmed their defense-spending goal;

Whereas, in 2011, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said, "The blunt reality is that there will be dwindling appetite and patience in the U.S. Congress—and in the American body politic writ large—to expend increasingly precious funds on behalf of nations that are apparently unwilling to devote the necessary resources or make the necessary changes to be serious and capable partners in their own defense";

Whereas, in 2014 at the NATO Wales Summit, NATO members officially declared to increase their defense spending to 2 percent of their gross domestic product by 2024;

Whereas the Wales Summit Declaration stated that "[a]llies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defense will aim to continue to do so" and continued, "Allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defense is below this level will: halt any decline in defense expenditure; aim to increase defense expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the 2% guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO's capability shortfalls";

Whereas, for the first time since 1990, there have been three consecutive years of increases in NATO defense spending;

Whereas, since the end of 2014, defense expenditures by NATO Europe and Canada have risen by \$28,000,000,000, representing a 10-percent increase;

Whereas, in 2014, only three NATO allies met the 2-percent spending target, while NATO expects eight allies to meet the target in 2018, and 15 allies to reach the target by 2024;

Whereas, while the 2-percent defense-spending target is an important measure of allies' commitment to NATO, it is imperative that defense expenditures are both interoperable with, and strengthen, NATO's critical military capabilities;

Whereas Russia fundamentally challenges the peaceful world order that NATO has sought to foster and aspires to extend as it continues its illegal occupation of territory in Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia; and

Whereas strengthening NATO's capabilities is critical to the future of the alliance to deter an increasingly aggressive Russia to NATO's east, the threat posed by ISIS, and instability to NATO's south, as well as

emerging security challenges, including terrorism and cybersecurity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as the foundation of transatlantic security and defense;

(2) encourages all member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to fulfill their commitments to levels and composition of defense expenditures as agreed upon at the NATO 2014 Wales Summit;

(3) calls on NATO allies to finance, equip, and train their armed forces to achieve interoperability and fulfill their national and regional security interests; and

(4) recognizes NATO allies who meet their defense spending commitments or are otherwise providing adequately for their national and regional security interests.

SENATE RESOLUTION 571—CONDEMNING THE ONGOING ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF CRIMEA BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 571

Whereas, in February 2014, unidentified Russian armed forces entered Ukrainian territory and took control of key military and government infrastructure in the Crimean peninsula of Ukraine;

Whereas, in March 2014, the parliament of the Russian Federation gave rubber-stamp approval to President Vladimir Putin's request to use military force against Ukrainian territory ostensibly because of the "threat of violence from ultranationalists";

Whereas, on March 27, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 68/262 calling on states and international organizations not to recognize any change in Crimea's status and affirmed the commitment of the United Nations to recognize Crimea as part of Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation's illegal invasion and annexation of Crimea has been widely seen as an effort to stifle the spread of pro-democracy developments across Ukraine in 2014 in the wake of the Euromaidan protests;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a signatory to the 1994 Budapest Memorandum and thus committed to respect the independence, sovereignty, and borders of Ukraine and to refrain from threats, coercive economic actions, or the use of force against Ukraine's territorial integrity and political independence;

Whereas the Russian Federation committed in the 1975 Final Act of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Final Act) to respect the sovereign equality and territorial integrity of other participating States;

Whereas the Russian Federation's obligations under the Charter of the United Nations prohibit the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of other states;

Whereas the Russian Federation's ongoing illegal occupation of Crimea in Ukraine have been widely condemned by the international community as illegal acts;

Whereas the United States and European Union have imposed sanctions on individuals

and entities who have enabled the illegal invasion, annexation, and occupation of Crimea;

Whereas the Department of State has stated in its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices that security services and local authorities in Crimea installed by the Government of the Russian Federation have “worked to consolidate control over Crimea and continued to restrict human rights by imposing repressive Federal laws of the Russian Federation on the Ukrainian territory of Crimea” and that “the most significant human rights problems in Crimea [were] related directly to the Russian occupation”;

Whereas the Department of State has described “an extensive campaign of intimidation to suppress dissent and opposition to the occupation” that has been carried out by Russian security services inside Crimea, including the use of torture and physical abuse, kidnapping, disappearances, and deportations, and reporting from independent human rights groups inside and outside Crimea has documented such alleged human rights violations by Russian security services and paramilitary groups;

Whereas the campaign of intimidation in Crimea has resulted in the prosecution and imprisonment of individuals who oppose or criticize the occupation or support Ukrainian sovereignty as well as the transfer of some individuals from Crimea to Russian Federation territory from prosecution and imprisonment;

Whereas the Department of State has noted that illegal occupying authorities in Crimea have also restricted the fundamental human rights of particular groups, including ethnic Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars, “particularly regarding expressions of nationality and ethnicity, and subjected them to systematic discrimination;”

Whereas human rights groups have cited that such discrimination has been carried out in myriad ways, including through the outlawing in 2016 of the elected representative body (mejlis) of the Crimean Tatar people, the closing of Crimean Tatar and Ukrainian-language schools, and forced conscription;

Whereas the Department of State and other international human rights groups have noted further continuing human rights concerns in Crimea, including the suppression of independent media and civil society through harassment and harsh administrative measures, politicized and unfair judicial processes, and poor prison conditions;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has worked to extend Russian citizenship to individuals inside Crimea and deprived access to public services of those who refuse such citizenship;

Whereas civil society groups have alleged that the Government of the Russian Federation has encouraged Russian citizens to relocate to the Crimean peninsula and has supported the physical destruction of historical sites in Crimea, ostensibly to influence the demographics and political character of the region in favor of the Kremlin; and

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has supported the development of infrastructure and institutional ties between Crimea and the Russian Federation, including the opening of a road and rail bridge over the Kerch Strait on May 15, 2018; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reiterates that Crimea is part of the sovereign territory of Ukraine;

(2) stresses that United States policy should remain that Crimea is part of Ukraine and should reject attempts to change the status, demographics, or political nature of Crimea;

(3) reaffirms respect for the values of democracy, human rights, and rule of law that all individuals in Crimea deserve, including non-Russian ethnic groups and religious minorities;

(4) condemns all human rights violations against individuals in Crimea, and underscores the culpability of the Russian Federation for such violations while this territory is under illegal Russian occupation;

(5) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately respect the political and human rights of individuals in Crimea, including those detained in Crimea or who have been transferred from Crimea to the territory of Russia, and to cease efforts to restrict dissent or change the demographic or political nature of the peninsula;

(6) urges the United States Government, in coordination with the European Union, NATO, and members of the international community, to prioritize efforts to prevent the further consolidation of illegal occupying powers in Crimea, reaffirm unified opposition to the actions of the Russian Federation in Crimea, and secure the human rights of individuals there;

(7) welcomes the sanctions that have been imposed and maintained to date by the United States and European Union against individuals engaged in furthering the illegal occupation of Crimea by the Russian Federation;

(8) calls on the United States Government to continue to use relevant sanctions authorities codified in the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-144), as well as under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note), to address and deter those engaged in furthering the illegal occupation of Crimea and human rights abuses and corruption committed in Crimea or against individuals from Crimea;

(9) welcomes further efforts by the United States Government to encourage the European Union to impose additional Crimea-related sanctions; and

(10) calls upon the United States Government to declare it the foreign policy of the United States to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation, similar to the 1940 Welles Declaration in which the United States refused to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41—RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF THE UNITED STATES-AUSTRALIA RELATIONSHIP—100 YEARS OF MATESHIP

Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PERDUE, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 41

Whereas United States and Australian troops first fought together in and won the Battle of Hamel on the Western Front in France on July 4, 1918, under the command of Australian General John Monash;

Whereas the hard fought victory achieved by the combined forces at Hamel helped turn the tide of World War I;

Whereas Australia has fought together with the United States in every major conflict since 1918;

Whereas more than 100,000 Australian service members have given the ultimate sacrifice alongside their brothers and sisters in arms from the United States;

Whereas the United States and Australia officially established bilateral diplomatic relations on January 8, 1940;

Whereas the United States and Australia formalized their security alliance with the signing of the Australia, New Zealand, United States Security Treaty, done at San Francisco September 1, 1951 (commonly known as the ANZUS Treaty);

Whereas the ANZUS Treaty was invoked the first and only time in response to the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States and Australia share information essential for security and defense through the Five Eyes intelligence alliance;

Whereas the Force Posture Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States of America, done at Sydney August 12, 2014, enables closer security and defense cooperation between the 2 allies;

Whereas the United States and Australia conduct diverse joint military exercises and training to enhance capabilities throughout the world, and Australia hosts United States Marines at bases in its Northern Territory;

Whereas the United States and Australia work closely in a number of international fora, including the Group of Twenty (G-20);

Whereas the Australia-United States Free Trade Agreement, done at Washington May 18, 2004, came into effect on January 1, 2005;

Whereas the United States and Australia conduct \$65,000,000,000 in 2-way trade and have an investment relationship valued at \$1,100,000,000,000;

Whereas July 4, 2018, marks the 100-year anniversary of the Battle of Hamel and serves as the date on which the United States and Australia celebrate the first 100 years of Mateship;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commemorates the 100-year anniversary of the Battle of Hamel, forging the unique and enduring relationship between the United States and Australia;

(2) reaffirms the strong military alliance relationship between the United States and Australia; and

(3) supports continued diplomatic, security, and economic cooperation between the United States and Australia.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3393. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 8, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3393. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 8, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: