

## JOB GROWTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, we are discussing the difference between rhetoric and results when it comes to our economy. Yesterday, I described how my Democratic friends spent the Obama years talking about the importance of rebuilding American manufacturing. They talked about it, but it is the actions of this united Republican government that have made it easier for manufacturers to expand and hire.

It is on our watch that optimism among U.S. manufacturers has hit the highest level that one survey has ever recorded. Well, it turns out that there are quite a few areas where this Republican government is helping to deliver victories that our Democratic friends spent 8 years talking about.

In his 2010 State of the Union Address, President Obama proclaimed that job growth would be the No. 1 focus of the coming year. He said that “the true engine of job creation in this country will always be America’s businesses” and that government’s role was to “create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and to hire more workers.”

Recognizing American job creators as the true engines of prosperity and giving them room to succeed sounds good to me. It sounded good to almost everyone, in fact.

But once again, the policies didn’t match the rhetoric. Instead, the Obama administration twice set all-time records for the number of pages in the Federal Register, and those pages had consequences. By constantly moving the regulatory goalposts, government eroded the certainty businesses need to invest and to hire.

Washington, DC, restricted farmers’ and ranchers’ control over water on their own property. Bureaucrats overwhelmed small banks and credit unions with a rule book designed for Wall Street, and an outdated Federal Tax Code held back job creation and made America much less competitive.

On Democrats’ watch, Americans had to wait out an economic “recovery” that was insufficient, slow, and left whole parts of the country way behind.

Remember the rhetoric and then remember the facts. Republicans have always agreed that job creation must be a top priority, but we have a better idea about how to actually help make it happen. The Republican Congress has used the Congressional Review Act to slash 17 burdensome regulations. That is on top of the administration’s own Executive actions. We have passed, and the President has signed, major changes to Obamacare and to Dodd-Frank, and we passed generational tax reform that puts more hard-earned money in the pockets of working families and gives job creators more flexibility.

So what is happening on our watch? Just a few days ago, the number of Americans newly filing for unemployment benefits hit the lowest level in

more than 48 years. Let me say that again. Newly filing for unemployment benefits hit its lowest level in more than 48 years. Here is how CNN characterized the Labor Department’s most recent jobs report:

The U.S. economy keeps adding jobs at a blistering pace. . . . The job market is so good, many people who had previously given up looking are starting to look again.

According to Gallup, the percentage of Americans saying now is a good time to find a quality job hit its highest level in 17 years. That is not just rhetoric but actual results, due to the hard work of American workers and job creators, with an assist from this Republican government.

Unfortunately, this pro-growth agenda hasn’t gotten much support from across the aisle. Not a single Democrat—not one—voted for the tax reform that helped to turn rhetoric about jobs into actual jobs.

There was hardly any Democratic support for the regulatory housecleaning that has given job creators more confidence to stay on American soil, grow their businesses, and add jobs.

So all of us agree with the rhetoric, but not everyone supported the policy agenda that has helped to deliver these results for the American people.

## 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.

## INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, FINANCIAL SERVICES, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 6147, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby amendment No. 3399, in the nature of a substitute.

Murkowski amendment No. 3400 (to amend No. 3399), of a perfecting nature.

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are officially on day No. 2 of the second tranche of an appropriations package. We have before us the Interior Subcommittee’s appropriations bill, the Financial Services, the T-HUD—Transportation, Housing and Urban Development—and Agriculture. So it is a good combination. It is a good package. It is a strong package. It is a series of appropriations bills that moved through the full Appropriations Committee several months back. Most of these bills advanced either unanimously, as the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee’s bill did, or with a strong bipartisan show of support out of committee.

For those who have followed the appropriations process over the years, you know it is somewhat unprecedented to be able to advance these spending bills through the full committee process, much less to do so in a manner that surely shows the bipartisan approach this committee has taken in this fiscal year.

I acknowledge and recognize the work of Chairman SHELBY and his vice chairman, Senator LEAHY from Vermont, for the truly collaborative process they have encouraged all of us to work toward.

There was an agreement, an understanding, that our appropriations process had not been the model of good governance, of legislating, that we would have liked it to have been, that we would expect it to be, and that our colleagues—much less the American public—would expect it to be.

With a very determined effort, the group of appropriators who came together earlier made a very strong and firm commitment that we were going to get this process back on track. With the leadership of the chairman and the vice chairman, that is exactly where we are. We were able to move a smaller minibus, if you will, a month ago. That is now moving through that conference process. It is not an easy process, we recognize, but nothing around here is easy. If it is worth doing and doing well, it is going to take a little bit of work. We have done that work, and to be here on the 25th of July—to be at a place at which the Senate is poised to advance seven of the appropriations bills out of the Senate—is really quite unprecedented.

In my remarks on the floor on Monday evening, I noted that this was the first time since 2010 we had seen an Interior Appropriations Subcommittee’s bill being brought to the floor of the U.S. Senate. That is a long time. That is too long a time not to have had a fulsome process, a process wherein we not only demonstrate the good work that we as appropriators have done but wherein our colleagues who are not on the committee also view that good work, weigh in, offer their thoughts, offer their amendments, and are a part of the broader, whole process.

How did we get here from there—from a point at which we, effectively, were not legislating as we knew we were capable of doing?

There was an agreement, a commitment, that we were going to stand down on some of the more controversial riders—in other words, those initiatives that were not actual appropriations but were more in line with authorizing within the appropriations bill.

There has been a history around here of seeing a level of authorization, and sometimes that level of authorization on an appropriations bill has created enough controversy that it has ground the whole process to a halt. So standing down on some of these initiatives, on some of these riders, has been an important part of how we have come to be where we are today.

We talk about the need to keep out the poison pills. We have joked—it is not really a joke; it is the reality—that one Member's priority is another Member's poison pill. So how do we work our way through that process?

We will have an opportunity to take up, at least for discussion, some of those priorities that may be significant, and Members have a great deal of desire to see them advance. Members on the other side will look at that and say that is too toxic—you can't go there; you can't do that. How we navigate through that will take a little bit of legislating.

I would ask Members—I would urge Members—to please come to us as their bill managers, whether for the Interior appropriations issues or for the Financial Services issues. Senator LANKFORD is the chairman of that committee. Go to Senator HOEVEN on Ag and to Senator COLLINS on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development—T-HUD. I would urge Members to come to us with their issues, their concerns, their amendments. Let's work through them. Let's get them through the process.

Yesterday, we were able to advance four amendments. Some might say, well, that is not very much, but I would suggest to you that we are getting started. We are getting started in a good way, in a positive way, in an encouraging way, and we want to encourage that good, forward activity.

We all know the most prized commodity around here is time and floor time. We don't have unlimited time on the floor to take up this package of measures. So help us get to the point at which we can work through those issues that we need to in order to bring to the floor that which will require a vote. We will help you and do so in a way that, I think, will do honor to the appropriations process, do honor to the legislative process—again, what we know around here to be regular order.

Unfortunately, I think we have seen that regular order has been less and less regular. It has become extraordinary because we just don't practice it enough. We want to get back to that,

and we have the opportunity to do so. We have demonstrated that with one package, and we are in the midst of demonstrating that this week. I look forward to the full cooperation of Members as we advance.

I see my friend and colleague, the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is on the floor. Again, I acknowledge his great leadership in working with the chairman of the full committee, in really getting us back to a place where we can be proud of our process.

With that, I yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I simply say to the Senator from Alaska, in my having had the honor of serving here with both her father and with the former chair of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Stevens, that I hear her saying things that are very similar to what I had heard both of them say. Perhaps Senator Stevens—rest his soul—would have said it with a little bit more emphasis, especially if he had been wearing his “Incredible Hulk” tie, but the Senator from Alaska is one of those who believes in the Senate working the way it should and getting things done, and I compliment her efforts.

Senator SHELBY and I made a pact that we would try to get these appropriations bills through, which is something that had been stalled for years. The Senator from Alaska has been essential, as have been a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, in our getting that accomplished. We have gotten our bills through. Almost all of them have passed the Appropriations Committee unanimously. I joke that sometimes you can't get a unanimous vote around here that the Sun will rise in the East, but here is a case in which we have shown that it can.

The Senator from Alaska is absolutely right in that one person's poison pill may be another person's essential, but we have worked it out. If we can get the appropriations bill through—and I realize the other body is going on a 6-week vacation, but I hope there will be some who stay around. We are going to be here. We could conference some of these bills and get them passed. I think it would encourage the country to see both bodies do what we have done here in the Senate. It would improve how the government runs.

I share the frustration of heads of Departments, whether here in this administration or any other administration, who never know whether their appropriations are going to pass. How do they plan? How do they spend money? Where do they go?

We can make this process work the way it is supposed to work.

I see the distinguished Democratic leader on the floor, but I do want to compliment the Senator from Alaska for her efforts in making this possible.

I yield the floor.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Vermont for yielding and my colleague from Alaska, as well, for allowing me to interrupt their very important and bipartisan debate.

#### NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. President, 8 years ago, when Elena Kagan was nominated to the Supreme Court, Senate Republicans said: We must get all of her documents from the Clinton Library and have enough time to analyze them so that we can determine whether she should be a Justice. The Republican leadership did not say some of the documents; they did not say a subset of the documents; they did not say the documents for just one administrative job; they said all of her documents.

I showed this letter yesterday to my friend who is now the chairman of the Judiciary, Senator GRASSLEY. He said it is totally different. He is a man of integrity, but I know there are times he gets twisted by his leadership and the President to do things that aren't consistent, and this is one of them.

The Republicans didn't ask only for certain documents. They asked for all, and we are asking for all. This is one of the most important positions in the world and certainly in America. Shouldn't we know everything? It is not just some of the stuff and some of the stuff that the White House wants us to know—but everything.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle demanded all of the documents for Justice Kagan. The Democrats agreed. It was the right thing to do. And because Elena Kagan had nothing to hide, she went happily forward and said: Go right ahead. Now Republicans ought to do the same thing for Judge Kavanaugh, particularly if he has nothing to hide.

For the last week, Senator FEINSTEIN has been ready to jointly request the same documents of Judge Kavanaugh that Republicans demanded of Justice Kagan, but our Republican colleagues are dragging their feet and refusing to agree. They are the reason this whole activity has been slowed down. It is not Democratic obstruction. It is the Democrats' desire for transparency and openness that the Republicans are blocking. They are being the obstructionists.

The Republicans' rationale is—they are downplaying Judge Kavanaugh's role as White House Staff Secretary. They argue that we don't need to see documents from that part of his career, although they have no argument against it. They think we don't need them. We think we do. Why not show them to us?

Here is what Judge Kavanaugh himself has said. He said that “my 3 years as Staff Secretary for President Bush—were the most interesting and in many ways the most instructive.”

Kavanaugh himself said that the very documents we want to see and Republicans are blocking us from seeing are the most instructive. Shouldn't the American people see the writings of what their own nominee calls the most instructive?

As Staff Secretary, Kavanaugh said he "participated in the process of putting together legislation." He drafted and revised Executive orders. He consulted on judicial nominations, including the replacement of Chief Justice Rehnquist. Isn't that something we want to know—what his thoughts were about who should be a Justice? Wouldn't that really inform us of what kind of Justice he might be?

He was one of the most senior officials in the Bush White House, 1 of only 17 out of hundreds of Presidential aides who were paid the maximum White House salary. I am sure he deserved it. That is not the issue. The issue is that he was an extremely high-ranking official there. This is not looking at when he was some clerk. It was a major, defining part of his career.

So here we go. Once again, Republicans are against transparency and are against the full record for one of the world's most powerful positions, which will last a lifetime. All of this stonewalling on getting Judge Kavanaugh's records from his time as Staff Secretary raises these looming questions: What are Judge Kavanaugh and the Republicans hiding? Why are Republicans hiding his full record from the Senate and the American people? What don't they want us to see? What don't they want the American people to see? Is there something there so damning that it might defeat Judge Kavanaugh's nomination? If there is, we are entitled to see it. If there is not, then what is the problem with moving forward?

Just last week, we saw our Republican colleagues defeat a judicial nomination based on something that nominee wrote in college. Are they really going to turn right around and say that the nominee for the highest Court in the land doesn't need to release documents that he wrote far later in his career when his views were far more formed?

This is about transparency. This is about making sure the Senate does its job in the right, complete, and open way. Democrats have made a completely reasonable request for documents—the same request we agreed to when the shoe was on the other foot. We are being consistent. Our Republican colleagues are being hypocritical. What was good for them in the minority when President Obama nominated someone is good for us in the minority when President Trump nominates someone. I will repeat the old saying from the Farmers' Almanac and elsewhere: What is good for the goose is good for the gander. It applies so, so well in this situation.

Our request is eminently reasonable. The quickest way to get this nomina-

tion moving forward is to get the documents and records, and it is for Leader McConnell and Chairman Grassley to agree to our request.

Mr. President, parenthetically, just today, we saw that the White House doctored the transcript and, supposedly, the tape of what Mr. Putin said right after the President and he met. It was sort of like an autocratic country, a nondemocracy. That is what dictators do; they change the facts and change the record. Are our Republican colleagues—so many of them who have stood for transparency—going to join this coverup of records and truth because they don't like the results? That is not America. That is not the America the American people know and love.

#### FARMER BAILOUT

Mr. President, on the farmer bailout, yesterday, President Trump announced a \$12 billion bailout for farmers who have been hurt by the President's economic policies. Obviously, the farmers are hurting or the President wouldn't have done this.

The drawbacks of this particular policy aside, the bailout is another example of the President chasing his own tail. It is becoming a leitmotif in this administration: President Trump's impulsiveness and incompetence, his lack of thoroughness and study of an issue, lead him to act impulsively. He creates a massive problem, and then he is forced to hastily contrive a way to make it look as if he is saving the day.

The irony of this policy should not be lost on anyone. The President's bailout is like a Soviet-style program in which the government props up an entire sector of the economy. That characterization is one that I spoke of this morning to several colleagues, and I have now been told one of my Republican colleagues used the same characterization—Soviet-style program. The Freedom Caucus, the Koch brothers—this is not what even the hard right in America stands for.

Knowing this administration, they will design a bailout to help only massive agribusinesses that will use the money for stock buybacks. Knowing this administration, family farmers are likely to be left to suffer.

It was not so long ago that our Republican friends complained bitterly about picking winners and losers in the market. What is the President doing here? He is picking winners and losers.

The President's policies have hurt scores of Americans. He proposes a massive bailout in this case but tries to slash health insurance for tens of millions of middle-class Americans. He pushes a bailout in this case, but his budgets continue to decimate infrastructure, education, healthcare, environmental protection, and more. I would say that is picking winners and losers.

The President's bailout is another example of President Trump lighting the fire and grabbing the nearest thing off the shelf to douse it and then patting

himself on the back as to what a great guy he has been. It is not good policy, it is not good politics, and it is incredibly telling of this administration's failure to anticipate the consequences of its decisions.

One more point: If you talk to our farmers, they would rather have long-term contracts and good markets. A bailout and storing all these agricultural products on the shelves will lower prices and cause the people we sell to overseas to find other suppliers and sign contracts with them. In the long term, it is going to make things worse.

Where does the bailout stop? What about people who use steel and aluminum? What about other goods that have been targeted by our foreign competitors? Are they going to get bailouts too? Is it going to go up from \$12 billion to \$50 billion to \$100 billion? Amazingly, are our Republican colleagues—this is so against their principles—going to go along? We shall see.

#### RUSSIA

Mr. President, there is one more point on Russia. After President Trump's inexplicable behavior in Helsinki last week, many of us were forced to wonder whether President Putin had something on President Trump because his behavior was so obsequious in front of Putin.

Well, now it seems it is not just a few Democrats who are wondering. Yesterday's Quinnipiac poll showed that 51 percent of Americans believe that the Russian Government has compromising information about President Trump. That is astounding. Our leading enemy has information, compromising information, and then our President acts obsequiously. Whoa, where are we in this country?

Let me repeat that poll. A majority of Americans believe the Russian Government has something on President Trump. That is astounding. The fact that millions of Americans are wondering if our President is compromised by our leading adversary is a message to the White House: America wants you to be tough with President Putin.

The President will say: Oh, this is fake news. This is made up.

Well, President Trump, if Putin has nothing over you, why aren't you being tough with him? The best way to show that Putin has nothing over you is for you to stand up to him—not to be so obsequious and fawning and not to invite him here to the White House this fall.

There should be no more accepting of Putin's denials over a consensus of American intelligence, no more bending over backward to avoid criticizing Putin for interfering in our election, and no more one-on-one meetings with Putin where no one else—not the intelligence community, not our military leaders, not the Congress, and not the least of which, the American people know what was said or agreed to.

The writing is on the wall for the White House. This White House keeps reaching new lows. The American people, so disturbed by the President's

posture toward Russia, believe that President Trump may be compromised by our biggest enemy. I don't think that has ever happened, certainly in my memory, in my lifetime, and I can't remember an incident in history where this has happened this way.

President Trump ought to reverse course immediately. He can start by revoking his invitation to President Putin to visit the White House this fall.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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.

# ZIMBABWE DEMOCRACY AND ECONOMIC RECOVERY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2018

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 499, S. 2779.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2779) to amend the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Amendment Act of 2018".

## SEC. 2. RECONSTRUCTION AND REBUILDING OF ZIMBABWE.

Section 2 of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-99; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended by inserting "to enable Zimbabweans to reconstruct and rebuild Zimbabwe and come to terms with the past through a process of genuine reconciliation that acknowledges past human rights abuses and orders inquiries into disappearances, including the disappearance of human rights activists, such as Patrick Nabanyama, Itai Dzamara, and Paul Chizuze" before the period at the end.

## SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Section 4(a) of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "costly deployment of troops to the Democratic Republic of the Congo" and inserting "private appropriation of public assets"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) In October 2016, the Government of Zimbabwe cleared a small hurdle in its long-standing public sector arrears with the IMF."

## SEC. 4. PROVISIONS RELATED TO MULTILATERAL DEBT RELIEF AND OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 4(b)(2) of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "to propose that the bank should undertake a review of the feasibility of restructuring, rescheduling, or eliminating the sovereign debt of Zimbabwe held by that bank" and inserting "to support efforts to reevaluate plans to restructure, rebuild, reschedule, or eliminate Zimbabwe's sovereign debt held by that bank and provide an analysis based on reasonable financial options to achieve those goals"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "dollar" and inserting "currency".

## SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSISTANCE.

Section 4(d) of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001 is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) PRE- AND POST-ELECTION CONDITIONS.—The following pre- and post-election conditions are met:

"(A) Establishment and public release, without cost, of a provisional and a final voter registration roll.

"(B) The Zimbabwe Electoral Commission is permitted to entirely carry out the functions assigned to it in section 239 of Zimbabwe's 2013 Constitution in an independent manner, and the chairperson meets with and consults regularly with representatives of political parties represented in the parliament of Zimbabwe and those parties contesting the elections.

"(C) Consistent with Zimbabwe's 2013 Constitution, the Defence Forces of Zimbabwe—

"(i) are neither permitted to actively participate in campaigning for any candidate nor to intimidate voters;

"(ii) are required to verifiably and credibly uphold their Constitutionally mandated duty to respect the fundamental rights and freedoms of all persons and to be nonpartisan in character; and

"(iii) are not permitted to print, transfer, or control ballots or transmit the results of elections.

"(D) International observers, including from the United States, the African Union, the Southern African Development Community, and the European Union—

"(i) are permitted to observe the entire electoral process prior to, on, and following voting day, including by monitoring polling stations and tabulation centers; and

"(ii) are able to independently access and analyze vote tallying tabulation and the transmission and content of voting results.

"(E) Candidates are allowed access to public broadcasting media during the election period, as provided in Zimbabwe's Electoral Act, and candidates are able to campaign in an environment that is free from intimidation and violence.

"(F) Civil society organizations are able to freely and independently carry out voter and civic education, and to monitor the entire electoral process, including by observing, recording, and transmitting publicly-posted or announced voting results, including at the ward, constituency, and all higher levels of the vote tallying process.";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (5) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively;

(3) by striking paragraph (4);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.—Zimbabwe has held an election that is widely accepted as free, fair, and credible by independent international and domestic civil society monitors, and the president-elect is free to assume the duties of the office.

"(4) UPDATING STATUTES.—Laws enacted prior to passage of Zimbabwe's March 2013 Constitution that are inconsistent with the new Constitution are amended or repealed or are subject to a formal process for review and correction so that such laws are consistent with the new Constitution.

"(5) UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTION.—The Government of Zimbabwe—

"(A) has made significant progress on the implementation of all elements of the new Constitution; and

"(B) has demonstrated its commitment to sustain such efforts in achieving full implementation of the new Constitution.

"(6) ECONOMIC REFORMS.—The Government of Zimbabwe has demonstrated a sustained commitment to reforming Zimbabwe's economy in ways that will promote economic growth, address unemployment and underdevelopment, and restore livelihoods, including significant progress toward monetary policy reform, particularly with the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe, and currency exchange reforms.

"(7) ROLE OF TRADITIONAL LEADERS.—Traditional leaders of Zimbabwe observe section 281 of the 2013 Constitution and are not using humanitarian assistance provided by outside donor organizations or countries in a politicized manner to intimidate or pressure voters during the campaign period."; and

(5) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by striking "consistent with" and all that follows through "September 1998".

## SEC. 6. REMOVAL OF AUTHORITY TO PAY LAND ACQUISITION COSTS.

Section 5(a) of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ", including the payment of costs" and all that follows through "thereto; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) identify and recover stolen public assets."

## SEC. 7. INCLUSION OF AUSTRALIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM IN CONSULTATIONS ABOUT ZIMBABWE.

Section 6 of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001 is amended by inserting "Australia, the United Kingdom," after "Canada."

## SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ENFORCEMENT OF SOUTHERN AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY TRIBUNAL RULINGS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Zimbabwe and the Southern African Development Community (referred to in this section as "SADC") should enforce the SADC tribunal rulings from 2007 to 2010, including 18 disputes involving employment, commercial, and human rights cases surrounding dispossessed Zimbabwean commercial farmers and agricultural companies.

## SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES-ZIMBABWE BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government is optimistic about the possibility for a stronger bilateral relationship with Zimbabwe, including in the areas of trade and investment, if—

(1) the Government of Zimbabwe takes concrete, tangible steps outlined in paragraphs (2) through (6) of section 4(d) of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001, as amended by section 5 of this Act; and

(2) takes concrete, tangible steps towards—

(A) good governance, including respect for the opposition, rule of law, and human rights;

(B) economic reforms such as respect for contracts and private property rights; and

(C) identification and recovery of stolen private and public assets within Zimbabwe and abroad.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn, the Flake amendment at the desk be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.