



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2015

No. 46

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Merciful God, enthroned above all powers, thank You for bestowing on us the dignity of being called Your children. You are mighty in power and we are grateful for the masterpiece of another day. Lord, forgive us when we forget that You are still in charge of what happens in our Nation and world. This world belongs to You, and though the wrong seems very strong, Your sovereignty still prevails. Your power is far beyond any conceivable authority.

Guide our Senators with Your sovereignty. Use them, Lord, to solve the critical problems in our time, contributing to the peace and stability of this land we love. Bless those who support them in their work as You surround us all with the shield of Your divine favor.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is hard to believe what we saw yesterday. Democrats actually filibustered a bill

to help victims of modern slavery apparently because leftwing lobbyists told them to. Yes, their historic mistake is callous and extreme, but more than that it is tragic.

I mentioned the story of Melissa yesterday. Melissa was sold into sexual slavery before she had even become a teenager. She still bears the scars of her years of torment, the beatings, the shackling, the emotional cruelty. When Melissa finally escaped, she wasn't embraced as a victim, she was branded as a criminal.

Melissa's story is heartbreaking, but it is anything but unique. Stories such as hers remind us how important the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act is. It is stories such as hers that remind us that no excuse about not reading a bill and no command from leftwing lobbyists could justify filibustering the critical help this human rights bill would provide.

So we have not given up on the thousands of victims in this country who suffer as Melissa did—shaken and shackled but still hanging on to hope. Democrats owe these victims, not lobbyists, help—help the Senate is so close to passing.

A strong majority of the Senate, including several Democrats, have already voted in favor of this human rights bill. Now all it takes is a few more Democrats of courage to ignore the lobbyists and do what is right. All that will mean is the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee supporting the very same bill still hanging on to hope for just a few weeks earlier.

Apparently, all of these Senators were for this human rights bill before they were against it, and it is not like the bipartisan provision now suddenly in question is anything new. As the Congressional Research Service notes, bipartisan provisions such as this one "have been enacted in a variety of contexts since 1970," appearing in authorizing legislation as diverse as the State Children's Health Insurance Program,

the Legal Services Corporation Act, the Department of Defense Authorization Act, the Foreign Assistance Act, and others—language that is quite common and has been voted for numerous times by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

That is why the distinguished Democratic leader, my friend, had been such a strong supporter of the bipartisan Hyde provision for so many years and why he said during his tenure as majority leader: "My belief in the sanctity of life is why I have repeatedly voted against using taxpayer money for abortions." That was my friend, the Democratic leader. That is the declared view of my friend. It is what he said just a few short years ago before he and his party voted to filibuster a bill that would help the victims of modern slavery.

So this afternoon we invite Democrats to ignore the lobbyists and do the right thing. We invite every Democrat to help us write a happy ending to this story, where the forces of hope and humanity, not powerful lobbyists, prevail.

THE SENATE BUDGET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, several weeks ago the White House released an unserious budget that would have raised taxes by nearly \$2 trillion and increase the national debt by more than \$7 trillion. In other words, it was more of the same old tired, failed policies of the past. Hardly anyone took that budget seriously mostly because it was not meant to be taken seriously.

Contrast that with the balanced budget the Senate will introduce this morning. It is a budget that controls spending, reduces the deficit, and improves programs such as Medicaid. It is a budget that will support economic growth and more opportunity for hardworking families while protecting our most vulnerable citizens. It is a budget

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1591

that will allow us to repeal and replace a program that hurts the middle class, ObamaCare. It will allow us to repeal and replace a program that hurts the middle class, ObamaCare.

I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator ENZI, for his good work on this sensible budget.

We have heard some talk of shrinking deficits these days. Of course, Republicans are proud to take credit for helping force some fiscal responsibility on the Obama administration, but we know these deficits will soon shoot up dramatically if Washington does not start making more commonsense choices.

The reality is our country still has many tough fiscal challenges to confront. These are not challenges that can just be taxed away. These are not challenges that can be denied away either. But by working together these are challenges we can overcome, and the way we can overcome them is with sensible ideas to get spending under control and make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable, just as the Senate's budget proposes to do.

TRADE PROMOTION LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have one final matter. For all the issues that may divide Democrats and Republicans these days, there is one thing many of us can agree on—trade is good for America. There is bipartisan agreement that trade is good for American wages with export-related manufacturing jobs paying nearly 20 percent more than other kinds of jobs, and there is bipartisan agreement that trade is good for American jobs overall.

According to one study, trade supports nearly 40 million jobs nationally—about one out of every five jobs and more than one-half million jobs in my State of Kentucky alone. In fact, Kentucky's exports in goods and services have already increased dramatically since the enactment of trade agreements with countries such as Australia, from about \$10 billion a year to almost \$30 billion a year. Trade is good for Kentucky and trade is good for America, and that is why this is an issue where the White House and Congress are working together to support American jobs and wages.

While the United States has historically been a world leader in opening more markets to the products our country makes and grows, we have fallen woefully behind in recent years.

Thankfully, emerging agreements with countries in Europe and the Pacific present us with a real chance to catch up. These agreements present us with the unique opportunity to export more of what we make over there so we can create more American jobs right here at home. But we cannot make this important progress for America's middle class without passing the right kind of trade legislation in Congress first.

There is bipartisan agreement—at least in principle—to do exactly that, but the details will obviously be important. We want to ensure we get those details of that legislation right so we can get the best agreements possible for the American people. We certainly don't want to be considering legislation that would make these goals harder to achieve—undermining future economic and job growth.

The good news is our country has decades of experience with the kind of bipartisan trade promotion legislation that allows for the best deals for American workers to be negotiated by America's trade representatives and then approved by Congress. Several members of my conference will speak about that issue on the floor today. Like many of our Democratic friends, these Senators are interested in getting the best deals possible for the American people—the kind of deals that would only be possible with truly effective and bipartisan trade legislation. So they will explain this important issue, and that is just what is needed. They will explain it in further detail.

Before I leave the floor, I wish to recognize the good work of the chairman of the Finance Committee for being an incredible advocate on this issue, and allow me to also recognize the ranking member of the Finance Committee for working hard to try to get this right. We all look forward to working with these Members, and all Members, on this very important issue.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING SENATOR PAUL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, just as an aside, most everybody knows at this point that on New Year's Day I fell and hurt myself and injured my right eye.

During this period of time, the Presiding Officer—who by the way is a medical doctor, an ophthalmologist—has been so kind and thoughtful and considerate in visiting with me, giving me encouragement and some expert advice as to what he has seen in the past and given me hope for better sight out of my right eye. I appreciate it very much.

I want the people of Kentucky to know how thoughtful and considerate and kind the Presiding Officer has been to me over these past few months.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, instead of being bogged down in another Republican-contrived fight, I have proposed a path forward that is very simple and very direct. While we work toward an agreement to pass trafficking legislation—and there is work being done on that as we speak—we should move to

the Executive Calendar and consider the nomination of a very fine person, Loretta Lynch.

Democrats are fully committed to voting for Lynch's nomination and returning immediately to the trafficking bill. The Senate can do two things at the same time. We can certainly work on coming up with a path forward on trafficking and also do something to move forward and have a vote for a new Attorney General.

The chief law enforcement officer of this country—the man who is now the Attorney General—said months ago he wants to leave. He has been winding down. It is not right for this country not to have a fully engaged Attorney General.

I am disappointed that with all the work the Senate needs to accomplish, the majority leader is bound and determined to waste the rest of this week with the same votes we took yesterday. I was told we are going to have the same votes today that we had yesterday, and we will have the same votes on Thursday that we are going to have today and that we had on Tuesday.

Albert Einstein, a genius, said the pure definition of insanity is somebody who does the same thing over and over again and comes up with the same result. It is insane to keep going forward on these votes that everyone knows are going to turn out the same way.

Loretta Lynch has waited 130 days. There is no reason to delay her confirmation another minute. We can vote for her confirmation now and move back to the trafficking bill right now.

THE HOUSE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Gandhi said, "Action expresses priorities." Action expresses priorities. Congressional Republicans' actions on the budget clearly demonstrate how little regard they have for the American middle class. I want to get into a few examples. Their budget proposal—the one the House is going to send to us soon—ends Medicare as we know it, replacing it with another voucher program. It takes health care away from 16.4 million Americans now insured through the Affordable Care Act. It guts Medicaid and undercuts millions of families who rely on it to fund nursing homes and other care. It cuts billions in education funding—billions—and it cuts job training and employment services for 4 million American workers. The list goes on and on.

But we know one thing their budget does not do. It doesn't cut a single tax loophole for the superwealthy to reduce the deficit. Not one. Instead, this budget is brimming with more tax breaks for the megarich—many new tax breaks. In fact, the Republican budget would drastically cut the tax bill for the average millionaire while raising taxes on the middle class. That is not just irresponsible, it is immoral.

Of course, lowering taxes for millionaires and billionaires will add to the

deficit, not cut it. Republicans claim they are reducing the deficit, but that is not true. In truth, they are using mirrors and a lot of smoke in an effort to fool the American people.

House Republicans are really hiding the ball—moving the ball—claiming massive savings without explaining how. They are, for lack of a better description, cooking the books, using speculative and what they call “dynamic scoring.” What is dynamic scoring? This is an effort to claim they are balancing the budget. Dynamic scoring says, here is all this tax revenue and other money we are going to get and it will help significantly. The fact is everyone knows there isn't any truth to that. It is only some numbers on paper. They are relying on transparent tricks to hide their refusal to protect our military from sequestration and budget cuts. Yet Republicans say of their own budget plan, we do not rely on gimmicks or creative accounting to balance our budget.

The definition of “gimmick” is a concealed, devious aspect or feature of something, as a plan or a deal—a concealed, devious aspect or feature.

Well, we have a perfect example of a gimmick in the Republican budget that the House is working on and we are told they will complete. It sounds like a gimmick to me. At least one Republican from the House agrees with me. Congressman KEN BUCK of Colorado said yesterday, “It's all hooley.” The budget is all hooley. But as Dana Milbank said in today's Washington Post, speaking of the House Republicans' plan: “True, the budget does not rely on gimmicks. The budget is a gimmick.” That is a direct quote.

We don't need gimmicks. We need a responsible budget and this is not a responsible budget. This is not responsible governance.

Unfortunately, though, this is the budget we have come to expect from today's Republican Party—a party that is so committed to supporting the superwealthy that they are throwing America's middle class and the military overboard.

Democrats are focused on the middle class. We want to create jobs, invest in the future, and make sure that all Americans benefit from an improving economy.

We are more than happy to work with our Republican colleagues in order to make our goals a reality. Unfortunately, helping the middle class just doesn't seem to be a priority for congressional Republicans.

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be

in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the time equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half, and the majority controlling the second half.

The assistant Democratic leader.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is the Executive Calendar of the U.S. Senate. This Executive Calendar tells us the nominations that are pending before the U.S. Senate where action is needed. There is one name to be found on this calendar on page 4—a name which has been sitting on this calendar longer than any nominee for Attorney General of the United States of America over the last 30 years. This name has been sitting on this calendar for 20 days, which doesn't seem like an extraordinarily long period of time. However, it turns out that the previous nominees for Attorney General were moved so quickly on this Senate calendar that the last five combined, by Democratic and Republican Presidents, took less time to be confirmed than this one name. What is that name? It is Loretta E. Lynch of New York to be Attorney General—a name that was submitted to the U.S. Senate by President Barack Obama to make history—a name, a nominee to make history. This is the first African-American woman in the history of the United States to be nominated to serve as Attorney General. It is a civil rights milestone that her name has been submitted.

I sat through the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, and it was a packed room. All the TV cameras were there. Loretta Lynch came and sat at the table, with her father behind her, with her family around her, with close friends gathered from all over the United States, and this woman calmly, in a dignified way, gave the most compelling testimony I have heard of any witness before the Senate Judiciary Committee, including those who came before us seeking to be appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court. She was excellent. No one laid a glove on her. No one raised any concern about her nomination. And then, when the public witnesses were invited to come in from both the Republican and Democratic sides to comment on her nomination, Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont asked all of them gathered: Is there any one of you who opposes the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General? Not one. Not one.

Yet, here we are now, with this nomination pending longer than any Attorney General nomination in the last 30 years. Why? Why has the Senate Republican leadership decided to target this good woman and to stop her from serving as the first female African-American Attorney General of the United States of America? There is no good reason. There is no substantive

reason. She has been an extraordinary prosecutor in New York. She has the support of so many outstanding organizations. The National District Attorneys Association supports Loretta Lynch, as do the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. The FBI Agents Association supports Loretta Lynch, and a long list of Republican- and Democratic-appointed former U.S. Attorneys, including Patrick Fitzgerald from my State of Illinois, and former FBI Director Louis Freeh, appointed by a Republican President, and Deputy Attorney General Larry Thompson from the George W. Bush administration. The list goes on and on.

The fact is there is no substantive reason to stop this nomination. The Republican majority leader announced over the weekend that he was going to hold this nomination of Loretta Lynch until the bill which is pending before the Senate passes, whenever that may be.

So Loretta Lynch, the first African-American woman nominated to be Attorney General, is asked to sit in the back of the bus when it comes to the Senate calendar. That is unfair. It is unjust. It is beneath the decorum and dignity of the U.S. Senate.

This woman deserves fairness. She seeks to lead the Department of Justice, and the U.S. Senate should be just in its treatment of her nomination. To think that we would jeopardize her opportunity to serve this Nation and to make history is fundamentally unfair.

What is the issue? The issue is this important bill. It is a bill which relates to human trafficking. As chairman of the constitution subcommittee, I have held hearings on this subject and it is heartbreaking to hear how primarily young women have been enslaved and exploited not just around the world but in the United States. I support this legislation. I think we should move it forward. What is holding this up is very simple: one sentence. Out of a 112-page bill, there is 1 sentence on pages 50 and 51 that relates to the issue of abortion.

I needn't tell anyone following this debate how controversial and divisive that issue can be and has been for so many decades in the United States. The fact is that issue has nothing to do with human trafficking. It should be debated at another moment, another time, on another bill. But, sadly, this 1 sentence in this 100-page bill is holding it up from being considered on the floor.

If the senior Senator from Texas, who is the lead sponsor on this bill, would come to the floor and simply remove this one sentence, this bill would pass. It would pass this afternoon, overwhelmingly. There is no question about it. He knows it. We have told him that. We have offered that to him, but he refuses.

So this good bill language is on the calendar, the Senate is mired in controversy, and Loretta Lynch sits on the calendar for another day.

It has been 130 days since President Obama announced the nomination of this woman to serve as our Attorney General. That is more than three times the period of time it took for us to confirm Attorney General Ashcroft. It is more than 2½ times as long as it took to confirm Attorney General Mukasey and twice as long as it took to confirm Attorney General Holder.

It is time for us to give Loretta Lynch an opportunity to continue to serve America and to make civil rights history by allowing this African-American woman to step forward and serve. It is time to stop holding her hostage to a political debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate that has nothing to do with her obvious qualifications to serve this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is one thing Americans have made clear, it is that they want their leaders to do something about the economy. The recession may have officially ended almost 6 years ago, but millions of Americans are still struggling economically and opportunities are still few and far between.

One big thing we can do to help the economy and expand opportunities for American workers is pass trade promotion authority or what we refer to as TPA. Our prior trade agreements have been a boon to the economy, providing American workers with jobs and American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers with new markets for their goods. In my home State of South Dakota, 74 percent of exports go to countries with which the United States has a free-trade agreement. Between 2005 and 2014, South Dakota saw a 110-percent increase in exports to free-trade agreement countries. That has been a huge benefit to South Dakota farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers.

Speaking of farmers and trade, today is National Agriculture Day. I would just like to add as an aside that the substantial agriculture trade surplus the United States currently enjoys is a tribute to the efficiency and the productivity of America's farmers and ranchers. I salute American farmers, ranchers, and agribusinesses that provide America and the world with a safe and abundant food supply.

Passing trade promotion authority is one way we can ensure an even greater

global expansion of U.S. agricultural trade. Currently, the administration is in the process of negotiating two new trade agreements that would open vast new markets for American products and put American goods on a level playing field internationally. The first of these agreements, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, is being negotiated with a number of Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, and Vietnam. Currently, American goods face heavy tariffs in many of these countries—at times as high as 85 percent. Tariffs of that size put American goods at incredible disadvantage compared to their foreign competitors. Tariffs provide a powerful disincentive for citizens in other nations to purchase American products. Removing this disincentive would increase foreign demand for U.S. products, which would mean more business for U.S. farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers and more jobs and opportunities for American workers.

Just to give an example of how important trade is to American agriculture, we currently export half of U.S. wheat, milled rice production, and soybean production; 70 percent of almond, walnut, and pistachio production; more than 75 percent of cotton production; 40 percent of grapes; 20 percent of cherries; 20 percent of apples; 20 percent of poultry and pork production; and 10 percent of beef production.

If you think about it, there are approximately now 260 preferential trade agreements worldwide. Only 20 of those involve the United States. Every time we have entered into a new trade agreement where we have been able to eliminate tariffs and duties on a lot of our products, we see an explosion in exports into those particular markets. That is why negotiating the strongest possible transpacific trade agreement, as well as the agreement the United States is negotiating with the European Union, has to be a priority. For that, we have to have trade promotion authority.

Trade promotion authority has been the means by which nearly every U.S. free-trade agreement has been negotiated. The idea behind TPA is very simple: Congress sets the negotiating priorities the administration must follow and then requires the administration to consult with Congress during the negotiating process. In return, Congress promises a simple up-or-down vote on the final agreement, instead of a lengthy amendment process that could leave the final agreement looking nothing like the deal the administration negotiated.

The promise of that up-or-down vote on a final agreement is the key. That is what gives our trading partners the confidence they need to put their best offers on the table, which allows for a successful conclusion of negotiations. Trade promotion authority demonstrates that Congress and the administration are on the same page when it comes to the content of trade agree-

ments and that the final agreement will be either accepted or rejected, not amended beyond recognition.

Trade promotion authority expired in 2007. Republicans have been pushing for renewing it ever since. The President is also on board. He called for trade promotion authority in this year's State of the Union Address.

This is an excellent chance, I would add, for Democrats and Republicans to accomplish something significant for the American people and to show that Washington is working again.

Unfortunately, while the President and Republicans are united on this issue, many Senate Democrats continue to oppose trade promotion authority legislation. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is currently engaged in negotiations on a TPA bill with the committee's ranking member, the senior Senator from Oregon. I am hopeful and I know a lot of us on the committee and many of us in this Chamber are hopeful that these efforts will yield legislation both Republicans and Democrats can support.

Republicans are very open to suggestions and improvements. In fact, I expect the final agreement will include many elements advocated by the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senate Democrats, such as greater transparency surrounding trade negotiations. However, the one thing Republicans cannot support is an attempt to undermine the core of trade promotion authority—that guaranteed up-or-down vote that gives other countries the confidence to put forward their best offers in trade negotiations. Simply put, we cannot afford to weaken TPA.

I know the senior Senator from Utah, who is the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee—who is on the floor right now; and we will hear from him in just a few minutes—is working very hard to ensure that we have a strong TPA agreement that we can bring to the floor of the Senate, that we can pass through the Congress, and that we can put on the President's desk so that we can enable these trade negotiations to continue in a way that will lead to a conclusion, to a result that is good for American manufacturers and service industries and American farmers and ranchers.

If we fail to pass TPA, which will likely spell the failure of the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the United States-European Union trade agreement, we will not be maintaining the status quo. Just because we are not negotiating agreements does not mean other countries will not be. Other countries will secure favorable treatment of their goods, and American goods will fall further and further behind. That is not something we can afford in this economy.

If we pass TPA, on the other hand, that will allow the transpacific trade agreement and the United States-European Union trade agreement to move forward, which means American producers will benefit from new markets

for their goods and American workers will benefit from new jobs and opportunities. Since 2009, exports have accounted for more than 1 million new jobs here in the United States. If we pass the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the United States-European Union trade agreements, we could be looking at more than 1 million more new jobs over the next few years.

It is time to pass TPA, to get these agreements concluded, and to let American workers and businesses start experiencing the benefits. It has been far too long. Mr. President, 2007 is when the last TPA expired. We are losing ground by the day when we are not in the room and a part of negotiating new trade agreements that are beneficial to American businesses, farmers, and ranchers.

I wish to point out one more time that there are approximately now 260 preferential trade agreements worldwide, only 20 of which involve the United States. So if we want to participate in a growing global economy where 95 percent of the world's population lives, we have to become aggressive in creating the trading opportunities that will enable our businesses to prosper, to create good-paying jobs here in the United States, to raise incomes for middle-income families in this country, and to give us as a country an opportunity to lead the world when it comes to an economy that benefits all people—not just those here in the United States but all around the world. We have the wherewithal, the know-how, the technology, the creativity, and the innovation in our economy to make that possible, to make it happen. That is why these trade agreements are so essential.

These trade agreements, as I pointed out, do not happen unless we have trade promotion authority in place to make sure they happen. If we do not have it in place and these trade agreements do not get done, it is not that America—that we are just going to be standing still, we are going to be losing ground as countries around the world that are aggressively trying to negotiate trade agreements and improve the economies of their countries continue to do that, leaving us further and further behind.

So I hope we can get this passed through the Senate Finance Committee, passed through the Senate, the House of Representatives, and on the President's desk where it can be signed into law. The sooner that happens, the better it will be for our economy, for jobs, for American businesses, and for American farmers and ranchers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, and I appreciated the wonderful remarks of the senior Senator from South Dakota, Mr. THUNE. He is working very hard on that committee and really making a difference, as I think most people on the

committee are trying to do. But he makes a difference, and I truly appreciated his remarks today.

I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor to talk about the importance of Trade Promotion Authority, or TPA, to the health of our Nation's economy. At the beginning of this Congress, I, along with many of my colleagues, stated publicly that trade was one of the few areas where the new Republican Congress would be able to find common ground with President Obama. I still believe that is the case.

I chatted with him just last week—one of the few conversations I have had with him since he has been President—and I was very appreciative. He would like to get this done, and he is right.

The Obama administration is currently negotiating some of the most ambitious trade agreements in our Nation's history. The first is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, an Asia-Pacific trade agreement being negotiated between the United States and 11 other countries. On the other side of the world, the United States is negotiating a bilateral trade agreement with 28 countries of the European Union; that is called T-TIP.

Together, these two trade agreements have the potential to greatly expand access to U.S. trade with other countries, allowing our job creators to sell more American-made goods and services. They are in demand. We just have to get in the game. This helps us create and support more high-paying export-related jobs at home. Of these two agreements, the TPP negotiations, or the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations, are further advanced. According to administration officials, the agreement could be concluded over the next few months. That is good news.

Now, I wish talk about the bad news. Without renewal of effective TPA procedures, the administration will simply not be able to conclude a strong TPP agreement.

Why is TPA, or trade promotion authority, so important?

TPA is a compact between the Senate, the House, and the administration. Under this compact, the administration agrees to pursue specified objectives and consult with Congress as it negotiates trade agreements. Both the House and the Senate agree to allow for expedited consideration of trade agreements without amendments. This is essential for the conclusion and passage of strong trade agreements.

Put simply, without TPA, our trading partners will not put their best offers on the table because they will have no guarantees the agreement they sign will be the same one Congress will vote on in the end. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota made that very clear. They don't want to agree with our Trade Representative and then have countless amendments in the House and the Senate that could change the whole agreement they had agreed to. That is why trade promotion authority became such an important part of our international relations.

As former Deputy USTR Miriam Sapiro said in a recent speech:

Neither our Asian nor our European partners want to get into the real give-and-take that's necessary to reach a final agreement until they are sure that the president has the authority that he needs to conclude the deal. Absent that, they are content to wait.

In other words, if we want good trade agreements, we must have strong TPA procedures in place, and we need to be clear on one other point: The specifics of those procedures matter. They matter a great deal. This is bipartisanship at its best.

Our goal should not be to pass just any TPA bill. Our goal should be to pass the strongest bill possible. That is the only way to ensure we get the best possible deal out of our trade negotiations, which is, in the end, the purpose of TPA. We have used the same basic TPA structure for every major trade agreement over the last four decades and, quite frankly, the results speak for themselves.

As my colleagues have so eloquently stated today, we do not need new, untested changes to establish TPA procedures that can hamper the process and make it harder for both our negotiators to reach a good deal and for Congress to be able to vote on agreement up or down.

When Republicans took control of the Senate this year and I became the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I made renewing TPA my top trade priority for this Congress. I set out to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to craft the best possible bill. We already had a good framework in place—the bill I introduced last year with former Chairman Baucus and Chairman Camp, which had broad support in Congress, in the administration, and in the business community.

My goal has been to see if we could improve upon that product in order to broaden support for TPA. I am certainly willing to do that, but I have made it clear throughout this process that I cannot agree to any bill that would dilute the effectiveness of TPA as a tool to negotiate and enact strong trade agreements.

Recently, I had the opportunity to talk personally with President Obama about TPA, as I mentioned. I think he understands the importance of getting a strong TPA bill through Congress. That is why I am willing to work with him to make the advancement of our Nation's trade agenda a higher priority. I am hoping the President will do his part to help persuade the Members of his party to support an effective TPA bill. He says he will, and I believe him.

Make no mistake. Our competitors are not sitting on their laurels when it comes to trade. There are literally hundreds of trade agreements under negotiation throughout the world, and the United States is party to only a few.

This hurts our exporters badly. This bill is really necessary. We need to do

better. We need to do everything we can to ensure that the United States is not only a participant in international trade but a leader. The only way we can do that is by passing a strong TPA bill.

I stand ready and willing to work with the White House and my colleagues in the Senate to get an effective TPA bill introduced out of committee and onto the Senate floor as soon as possible.

We cannot afford to miss this opportunity. This is a grand opportunity for us. It is bipartisan down the line, and I think it would be a great accomplishment for the Congress of the United States to get this done. But, more importantly, it would be a great accomplishment for the President and this administration to have this done. It would give him the tools to do a lot of the things that need to be done.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

Vitter amendment No. 284 (to amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I did not come down to speak on this particular bill. I am back for week No. 4 of waste of the week.

In recent weeks, I have highlighted what I describe as excess spending of taxpayer dollars. We have talked about double dipping in unemployment insur-

ance, where if we could close this loophole, we could save the taxpayer \$5.7 billion in savings.

We have also talked about duplication in Federal economic development programs. There are 50-some programs that provide for workforce training spread among a number of agencies. Surely we can reduce that number significantly. And if we could do so, we could save the taxpayer \$200 million.

And last week—somewhat tongue in cheek, nevertheless not small change—I talked about a \$387,000 grant issued by the National Institutes of Health in which 18 New Zealand white rabbits were given, four times a day, 30-minute massages to determine whether they would be relieved of some soreness after they were given some physical exercise. Then four massages a day, 30 minutes apiece, costing \$387,000, to prove that a massage helped to make them feel better or removed some of those aches and pains.

I think we could have asked any athlete from any college. As we are moving into college basketball's March Madness and Final Four that we all engage in at this time of year, we could ask any college athlete, or any person for that matter who is doing work in the yard: Do you think 4 30-minute massages a day would help you feel a little better and help you with some of those aches and pains? Do we need to spend \$387,000 of taxpayer dollars in order to prove this and give rabbits massages?

So up we go with the chart. Waste of the week. This is week No. 4, and I would like to talk about a so-called bonus that has been given by our Federal Government that is quite egregious.

I am sure many look forward to a potential bonus at the end of the year—though it doesn't apply in our business here. A bonus sounds like something that comes along with something that was earned, but what if it was a bonus you didn't earn? Is it still a bonus or does it become fraud?

Internal Revenue Service Commissioner John Koskinen recently confirmed to the Senate that unless action is taken, an amnesty bonus would be available to millions who have broken our immigration laws. All of this stems from the President's announcement in November of 2014 to grant 3 years of tentative legal status to as many as 4 million individuals who crossed America's borders into this country illegally. Fortunately, President Obama's Executive amnesty has been temporarily blocked by a Federal court. Hopefully, that blockage will survive all legal challenges to undo it. But if this amnesty plan moves forward, 4 million illegal individuals will be granted Social Security numbers.

Why does this matter? Well, when you are granted a Social Security number, it triggers certain benefits, including eligibility for the earned income tax credit for up to 3 prior years in future tax filing years.

The earned income tax credit is a benefit for working people who have low to moderate income. It is an incentive and a reward for those who choose to work, and it does help to reduce the number of those who are dependent on government welfare programs. It allows some individuals to receive payments from the U.S. Treasury just by filing a tax return. It reduces the amount of tax an individual owes and it may also provide a tax refund.

Why is this issue qualified as waste of the week? Since the President is trying to legalize an additional 4 million individuals, if his action is upheld by the court, 4 million people will now have retroactive access to this benefit and taxpayers foot the bill for these 4 million illegal immigrants who will be in a position to earn this tax credit.

The Joint Committee on Taxation says this so-called amnesty bonus for those who have come into our country illegally will drain about \$2.1 billion from the United States Treasury.

I am for legal immigration. The United States has a rich history as a destination where people from all over the world can come to make a better life for themselves. We are a nation of immigrants. As a matter of fact, I am the son of an immigrant. My mother came here with her family, and it has been the narrative of our family. Legal immigration is what has made America the great prosperous country it is today. But we also are a nation of laws, and Congress should help ensure that legal immigrants to our country can benefit from the opportunities they need to succeed, but that doesn't include rewarding those who are gaming our immigration system to receive benefits they do not legally qualify for.

To address this matter, I have joined with Senator GRASSLEY and several other of my colleagues to introduce legislation that would correct this issue. If we can correct this issue, we will save the taxpayers an estimated \$2.1 billion in future spending.

So up we go with the thermometer here, and we will be adding another \$2.1 billion to the money that can be saved our taxpayers by eliminating duplication, by pursuing awards that are not legally given, by looking at the way the Federal Government wastes money by giving rabbits back rubs, and we are going to continue to fill this up until we hopefully reach the \$100 billion goal. That is not small change.

I continue to hear from Hoosiers and others who write and say: Yes, we haven't been able to address the big issues of debt and deficit, but we can go after government waste. And those who say we can't afford to cut spending a nickel because we have cut so much so far clearly have not paid attention to the billions of dollars that can be saved the taxpayers simply by addressing the waste and illegal use of the taxpayer money.

I look forward to sharing some more of these in coming weeks, and I thank the sponsor of the bill here for giving

me the time to come down and add another waste of the week to the list climbing toward our goal of \$100 billion in savings for the taxpayer, who is overtaxed already.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the pending business, the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Bill.

The Senate is now on the second week of the trafficking bill and my colleagues in the minority refuse to allow this body to amend or pass this bipartisan bill. When this legislation was reported out of committee, not a single Democrat on the committee raised any concern with the inclusion of the protections offered by the Hyde amendment. This was hardly surprising, after all, Democrats have previously voted in favor of legislation that includes similar long standing statutory protections—such as the Affordable Care Act. That is why it's so shocking that Democrats—out of nowhere—have had a change of heart on the Hyde amendment, and are now obstructing efforts to help victims of human trafficking.

I urge my colleagues who are filibustering this legislation to consider the gravity of their actions. While Democrats play politics as usual, thousands of victims—many of whom are children—are assaulted and abused every day, hoping someone will hear their cries for help. We cannot and must not allow political gamesmanship to stand in the way of helping thousands of victims of human trafficking. Now is the time we must work together to protect our Nation's most vulnerable from a horrific trade that robs our children of their childhood and rejects the sanctity of life.

Let us honor our commitment to protect children from abuse, neglect and rape. Let us put aside politics and do the right thing by moving forward on this bill.

Mr. COATS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here today for two reasons. One is to manage the bill at hand for the next few hours, and the other is to talk a little bit about Loretta Lynch, and how I hope we can resolve both these issues.

I believe when it comes to the human trafficking bill on the floor, as well as my bill, the safe harbor bill—which is not the one on the floor, but it is also a strong bipartisan bill that passed out of the Judiciary Committee with every single person voting for it, 20 to 0. I want to talk a little bit about the bill so people don't forget it. It is expected

to be an amendment to the bill on the floor when we get these issues resolved.

I am hopeful that at some point here—and I hope it is today—we are going to turn the corner on some of the language we have been hearing on the floor. I think it is becoming a sad situation, especially sad for the victims of trafficking, and I think we have a moment in time today and tomorrow where we can actually work on this and try to resolve it. I believe this great august body, which has dealt with many large issues in the past—100 people who I think have come to this place with good will—should be able to resolve it in some way, get through this, and get this bill done.

As we continue to work on the issues with the bill at hand, Senator CORNYN's bill, I also want to talk about the bill I have and why both these bills are important and actually work together.

On trafficking. First, we know the numbers. More than 27 million people around the world are victims of some kind of trafficking each year. It is not always sex trafficking. Sometimes it is labor trafficking and other things. When it comes to sex trafficking, the average age of a victim when she is trafficked is 13 years old. She is not even old enough to go to a high school prom, not even old enough to get a driver's license.

When you look at the statistics around the world, it is the third biggest international criminal enterprise in the world. The first is the illegal trafficking of drugs. I don't think that is a surprise. The second is the illegal trafficking of guns, and the third is the illegal trafficking of children, mostly little girls. But what people don't always realize when they think about trafficking—I think they often think about kids who are found in the bottom of a boat. That does happen, horrible stories like that. But when it comes to the United States of America, 83 percent of the victims—83 percent of the victims—are from our own country. They are from our own country. They are girls such as Tamara Vandermoon of Minnesota. She was 12 when she was first sold for sex. She was not even a teenager. She was just mad at her mom, and she ran away. A pimp found her and made her all kinds of promises—promises that sounded pretty good when you are a scared kid away from home. It happened when she was the most vulnerable. He took advantage of her before she even had a chance to grow up and be an adult. She has worked to change her life around through services and help in our State.

Our State has been the leader in this area. That is one of the things why I introduced the safe harbor bill, which I hope will be the first amendment to this bill after we resolve these issues. My bill also is sponsored with Senator CORNYN. He and I have worked together on this bill.

Another example—because people always use numbers. I used a bunch of numbers at the beginning of this

speech, but I think sometimes people know behind those numbers, every single one of those numbers, is a child.

Two weeks ago, out of the U.S. Attorney's office in Minnesota, our case was charged, and it happened a few months ago. It was a 12-year-old in Rochester, MN, which is an idyllic community, a beautiful place. This little 12-year-old got a text. She was with a girl who was a little older than herself. The text invited them to a party. She thought that was pretty cool. She goes to the McDonald's parking lot. She is at the McDonald's parking lot, and this pimp puts her in the car. She thinks she is going to a party. She gets carted up to the Twin Cities. She gets raped. He takes sexually explicit pictures of her. He puts them on Craigslist. She gets sold the next day to two other guys, raped by two other guys.

Finally they were able to track down this perpetrator. He has been charged with a very serious crime by the U.S. Attorney's office. This happened in Minnesota. We can ask Senator HERTKAMP, who has been involved in this issue. It happens in the oil patches in North Dakota. It happens on the streets of Washington, DC. It happens all over this country.

We may say, why is everyone talking about this now in this day and age? I look at this, as a former prosecutor, as back when people viewed domestic violence as a crime that was behind doors, that no one wanted to talk about it, and no one realized it was a crime. They thought of it as a family issue.

When we start seeing kids who are in situations of domestic violence are multiple times more likely to commit crimes themselves because they grow up seeing it, we realize it is not just an issue between two people. As horrible as the injuries are to the immediate victim, it is also an issue for their entire family and for the entire community. We learned that about domestic violence. We learned that about child abuse. Now we are starting to see this about trafficking.

We can't have a 12-year-old who is a criminal, right? The 12-year-old is a victim of this. The 12-year-old doesn't know what they are doing. They are only 12 years old, but they are a victim, they are not a criminal. That is the focus of the Safe Harbor Act.

I want to thank my colleague, Republican ERIK PAULSEN in the House, who has taken this bill on. We have worked together on it. A version of it has passed the House. We like ours a little bit better because it has the national sex trafficking strategy in it, and that is the bill we are going to be putting on as an amendment. ERIK has been a true leader on this issue, and we just talked yesterday about it. This bill actually now has—a version of it, my safe harbor bill—has passed the House twice. It doesn't have the issues with the Hyde amendment. Hopefully it will be the first bill, the first amendment, when we resolve these other issues.

What does the bill do? What it does is looks at what has been working in States across the country. According to a report by Polaris—a group that is among many groups as a leader on sex trafficking—it shows that 15 States across the country have taken these safe harbor laws. The laws basically say we are not going to treat these kids as criminals. We are going to make sure they are treated as victims, that they get the services they need. And mostly then from a law enforcement perspective—from someone who was a prosecutor for 8 years, ran an office of 400 people and saw these cases coming in and out of our doors all the time—what it means is these victims will then better testify against the people whom we want to get. Those are the perps. Those are the people running the rings. Those are the johns who are buying the sex. By having this approach, we have a much better chance of going after the people who are doing this.

The Ramsey County attorney's office out of St. Paul, MN, with their leader John Choi, was able to get a 40-year sentence last year of someone who was running one of these rings. We have had numerous prosecutions in Minnesota.

This idea of having a shelter, a place for the victims to go—because otherwise what is going to happen if they don't think they are going to get help or maybe get some job training, have a place to stay, they are going to go right back to the pimp, and then they are not going to be willing to testify and tell their story. That is what has happened through history, and that has enabled the rings to get worse and worse.

The other thing we know that has enabled them to get worse is the Internet. We love the Internet, but it has allowed people to market things on all kinds of Web sites and in all kinds of devious ways. They are able to sell young girls and young boys on these Web sites. They get a text and they show up and think they are going to a party. That is what is happening. It is behind closed doors and it is hidden. That is one of the reasons we are seeing this increase and these problems coming up, in addition to the realization we are not going to tolerate this anymore.

We have 15 States across the country that already have the safe harbor laws. Another 12 States are making good progress in this direction. It is not starting from scratch. As I said, my home State is one of the first ones, but we are seeing them. What our bill does is create incentives for States to adopt these kinds of laws. It is not involving a lot of money. It is taking existing programs and trying to create incentives so that States will adopt these laws.

The other piece of the bill is that it allows victims of these crimes to qualify for certain Federal job programs that they may not qualify for now. It

also creates a national strategy, as I mentioned, to combat human trafficking.

I always found when I was a prosecutor that people didn't care who took on the case, whether it was a local prosecutor or the State AG or the U.S. Attorney's office. They just wanted people to get the job done. They didn't actually understand the jurisdictional divisions. By making this national sex trafficking strategy the idea—and I have seen this with the Violence Against Women Act—it may not be that we are mandating people do a certain thing, but we put out there some best practices that local offices can cover. We look at what is working in certain States. Then we put those out there because we have a national sex trafficking strategy, and we give people ideas of what they can do best.

Those are parts of the bill. It is pretty straightforward. Again, it is not the bill on the floor right now which, of course, has an important purpose, to help fund some of the shelters and pay for it by an increase on the fees on perpetrators, but it is a part of the solution.

Another part of the solution we haven't talked too much about over the last few days, because there have been a lot of other things going on, I think we have to also remember the role of the private sector. We certainly have seen this in our State, where Marilyn Carlson Nelson, who is a wonderful business leader, headed up Carlson Companies for many years. Carlson Companies owns the Radisson Hotels. She has made training of her workforce a major part of this because it is the people on the frontline—and you can see Delta and all the others, American, United, a lot of the airlines are making this a priority as well. They are training their workers because they are on the frontline, and they are going to see this happen. They are going to see the victims. They are going to figure out something is going on that is wrong, so they can at least report it to their hotel's security or whatever authorities they think they need to; they can stop it right there on the ground floor and report it to the authorities.

We shouldn't forget that. Because unless these private sector entities who see it happening come forward—this isn't in any of our bills. This is something they are doing on their own. Unless they do that, we can have all the laws we want on the books, but it is really hard to catch these things from happening. I am proud of the work they have done.

My good friend Cindy McCain, HEIDI HEITKAMP, and I went to Mexico last spring with the major focus on sex trafficking. We met with the attorney general of Mexico and met with the head of their law enforcement in Mexico City about this very topic. Because Mexico, along with many other countries, has girls who do come in and are brought in for purposes of sex trafficking. I do want to emphasize, how-

ever, this is not just an international problem, but over 83 percent of the victims are from our country. But they have been coordinating with us on a number of successful prosecutions by giving us information so when the cases come to the United States, we view this. They have their own internal problems with this and other things as well, obviously, in Mexico. We went there not to say you are doing something wrong. We went there to say we have our own problems, and so do you. Let's figure out how we can work together on this issue.

Again, Cindy McCain is an example of someone who on the private side has been very involved with her foundation in working on this issue and helping with shelters and other things. The private sector piece of this, they can be called trafficking facilitators, unknowingly, because they are allowing this to happen. But in a way, they are a major part of the solution. I do not want us to forget that as we go forward and as they work with us to address the needs of the victims, and mostly to be able to catch these cases and bring them to law enforcement.

That is kind of a tour through what the safe harbor bill does. Again, Senator CORNYN and I have talked about it being the first amendment to the bill. I am very aware that we need to work out the issues on the underlying bill, and I am hopeful after days of acrimony that at some point we are going to be able to work together. I am hoping there will be a different flavor to people's discussions about this issue today.

LYNCH NOMINATION

The Loretta Lynch nomination now has been tied into this. I have a little bit of a different approach because I do not think we should be slowing it down anymore. I understand that we have to work out the issues on the sex trafficking, and there is plenty of blame that can go around. But I think the major focus should be on working it out instead of playing this blame game.

Loretta Lynch, on the other hand—I do not understand why our friends on the other side of the aisle have been delaying this for so long. I understand this is a major job, but this is a woman who has had 900 written questions and an 8-hour job interview, to my mind, where members of the Judiciary Committee could ask her whatever they wanted, in several rounds of questions, if they wanted. She also met with members of that committee. I am sure that anyone who wanted to meet with her—I know she has met with at least 59 Senators to date. That is a pretty major job interview. Twenty-five U.S. Attorneys from Republican and Democratic administrations have approved and suggested that she is more than fit for this job.

How do I come down on this? I come down on this as a perspective of knowing that Attorney General Holder wants to leave. I think he has done some really good things. I know some

of my colleagues have not been a big fan of his. This is an opportunity for them to put someone new in. We will start with that.

The second thing is this is someone who is highly qualified. Coming from a State where we have indicted 20 people for criminal activity related to al-Shabaab with their terrorist activities in Somalia, we have recently indicted a number of people who decided they were going to go fight with ISIS, coming out of our State. And I am proud of our communities, our Muslim and Somali communities, that have been working with law enforcement on this. This has been an effort, because no kid should be going over there and no parent wants their kid to go join a terrorist organization.

That being said, to keep our communities safe, we have to be very aggressive about these cases. So given that these cases are going on right in my hometown, I would really like to have the support of an Attorney General in place, and one who is nominated before this body. And as the nominee, she is someone who is uniquely qualified to handle these kinds of cases that the citizens in my State want to have handled, these terrorism cases. In fact, her office is No. 1 in the country when it comes to how many terrorism cases they have successfully handled in New York. So she is a seasoned U.S. attorney. She is not someone who comes from a political background; she is someone who comes from a prosecutor background and is a former prosecutor and someone who wants to see that kind of commonsense, no-nonsense mentality in the Attorney General's office.

I highly recommend that my colleagues not only vote for her confirmation but just let this come to the floor as soon as possible.

Some of the critiques I have heard against her from some of my colleagues—some have said she has been lawless, and that doesn't quite make sense to me, especially when we look at who has been backing her from the law enforcement community, such as the 25 U.S. attorneys I mentioned. The New York police commissioner has endorsed her, as has the president of the Federal Law Enforcement Association and the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. These people are not exactly known for supporting lawlessness.

The other thing that has been mentioned by many of my colleagues that concerns me as to the reason they gave for blocking her nomination is that she said when she was at a hearing that she would be supportive, as the chief law enforcement person for our country, of the President's policies when it comes to immigration.

Let's start with the law. We know this is now tied up in the courts, and there are different court decisions. One court is upholding the Executive order of the President, and another court has said it is not legal. We have had dis-

putes on it in the courts. All right. But when we look through time, we realize every President since Dwight Eisenhower has done some kind of Executive order of varying degrees. George H.W. Bush did a major Executive order involving many immigrants. When we look at those through history, we realize those Presidents to some degree or other—I know the Liberian community in Minnesota. They have been for decades on an emergency order, and that is why they are in our State. Every year, they have to come back, and sometimes Congress does something and sometimes the President does something. But year after year, they need this Executive order because of the status under which they came to this country. They are law-abiding citizens. They are working throughout our State and have been here for 15 or 20 years. And that is just one example.

These Executive orders on immigration have been going on since Dwight Eisenhower. I don't really have the time to look back and see what every Attorney General did at the time, but my guess is that the Attorneys General under Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon and both Bushes and Bill Clinton all said: OK, this is legal. You can go ahead and do this Executive order.

I am not saying this one is not of more magnitude. It is. But there was a major Executive order when George Bush was President. We know that. So why we would then somehow take that history and extrapolate it into, OK, well, Loretta Lynch is somehow lawless just because she said the President could issue an Executive order—it just doesn't make any sense to me at all.

We have a woman who has been prosecuting these cases of terrorism for years. We have someone who has significant support from Democratic and Republican U.S. attorneys from many administrations. We have someone who really did pass her senatorial job review. I understand that my colleagues feel strongly about immigration and that they didn't like what the President did, and the President himself said he would like to tear up that piece of paper that contained the Executive action if only this body and the House would pass comprehensive immigration reform.

When I look back through this whole story, one of my proudest moments was when the Senate came together on comprehensive immigration reform. I am on the Judiciary Committee, and I believe that was the best moment for the Judiciary Committee in the last few years. Under Chairman LEAHY's leadership, our committee was able to work together across party lines, starting with the Gang of 8 who came up with the base concept, which was half Democrats and half Republicans, including Senator DURBIN, Senator MCCAIN, Senator SCHUMER, Senator BENNET, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator FLAKE, and the work of many other Members, which made it possible to get that bill done.

So the Gang of 8 got that done, and from there we went to the committee with a bill, and we spent days voting on amendments. We voted on amendments that stretched over every part of the bill, whether it was the fence at the border or what would happen with undocumented workers or the work Senator HATCH and I did on making sure we had the green card and visa system up to date. We have a situation in our country right now where we have literally unlimited visas for wild hockey players. We love our hockey team in Minnesota, and they are able to recruit a bunch of Canadians. That is good for us, but doctors from the Mayo Clinic are not able to bring in a spouse if they want to come from another country.

We have to look at this as to the undocumented workers who are here, we have the border issues, and we also have these issues related to agriculture and the innovation economy that make this comprehensive reform so important. Let's remember that when it comes to business issues, we have a case where 200 of our Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or kids of immigrants. Ninety of our Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants. Thirty percent of our U.S. Nobel laureates were born in other countries.

I neglected to add MARCO RUBIO to the Gang of 8 as I recall in my mind everyone who was in it.

That is why I was such a fan of the comprehensive immigration reform—because it was so important to look at all parts of the issue.

So now I get to Loretta Lynch. We passed a bill with pretty strong support here—I think it was like 68 votes or something in that neighborhood—and then it went over to the House and it sat there in a deep freeze. That bill sat there for over a year somewhere between the chocolate ice cream and the frozen peas. We were never able to get it out of the House, and that is what led to the President's Executive order, and now somehow—OK, that is fine, it was bad enough that that all happened, and I am still hopeful we will be able to get this done, but how that story leads to Loretta Lynch's confirmation being held up is beyond belief to me. I think it is time to get her nomination voted on. I don't think it should be related to the present difficulties we are having with this bill that I care so much about and mostly also with my safe harbor legislation, which has been slotted to be the first amendment.

I am hopeful we will be able to work everything out with the bill that is on the floor right now—I truly am—because I don't think it is fitting of the Senate to keep up this fight when there are victims of sex trafficking every single day, such as that 12-year-old girl out of Rochester, MN. How are we going to explain this to that little girl, that we are fighting it out every single day instead of trying to come to a resolution?

I remember when we were down in Mexico—HEIDI HEITKAMP and Cindy

McCain and I—and visited one of the shelters there. We met all the girls who were there. There was one girl there named Paloma. All the other girls had an interpreter and they talked to us through the interpreter, but she spoke a little English. She introduced herself, and then she just started to cry and could not stop crying. As she cried, you just knew that whatever happened to her was so bad, she could not even talk about it.

It reminded me of when Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator GRAHAM, Senator HOEVEN, and I were on a trip and went to a refugee camp in Jordan and met with a group of refugees. One of the women there said that what she had seen happen to her family in Syria was so sad that it would make stones cry. That is what I thought of when I saw Paloma, that what had happened to her—this little, young, beautiful, 12-, 13-year-old girl—what had happened to her was so sad that it would make stones cry.

I hope my colleagues keep this in mind as we work on these two bills. I am tired of talking about how this happened or how we got where we are. There is a way to resolve this problem, and certainly the nomination of the Attorney General of the United States should not be held up because of it.

I yield the floor.

I see my good friend Senator ISAKSON from Georgia is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I encourage the Members of the Senate to vote favorably on cloture so we can move forward on the important bill on human trafficking.

Mr. President, I come to the floor to ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I don't normally come to the floor and address a question that was asked rhetorically on the floor the night before, but I am compelled to do so today.

There were two instances that happened in the last week where my name and the Coca-Cola name came up, and I thought I should set the record straight.

This weekend, in an op-ed published in USA TODAY, the Democratic leader, HARRY REID, and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, the Senator from Rhode Island, made the following statement:

Republicans in Congress who represent great corporations headquartered in their states ignore those corporations—Walmart in Arkansas, Coca-Cola in Georgia, VF Corporation in North Carolina—when they explain the business case for addressing climate change and are already reducing their own pollution.

Republicans in Congress who root boisterously for their state university sports teams ignore the warnings of scientists and researchers at those very universities on climate change.

Then last night on the floor of the Senate, in his 93rd speech on global

warming, Senator WHITEHOUSE made the following statement and asked this rhetorical question: "I don't know whether Coca-Cola has ever spoken about climate change to Senator ISAKSON . . . from Coca-Cola's home State of Georgia." So I came to answer that rhetorical question and to answer the reference that was made in the editorial by Senator REID and Senator WHITEHOUSE.

This is a picture of me and Senator COONS in Ghana, Africa. It is 5 years old. At the request of the Coca-Cola Company, he and I traveled the continent of Africa looking at clean water projects all over that continent. African people who never had the opportunity to drink clean water now have sustainable clean water plants thanks to the Coca-Cola Company. These plants are environmentally safe, environmentally friendly, noncarbon-emitting water purification systems.

During the course of the years I have been in the U.S. Senate, the Coca-Cola Company has briefed me on the following things about their business as it deals with climate change or carbon.

They have saved 7 billion gallons of water in the United States with facility improvements in the United States. They have donated 70,000 ingredient drums for reuse as rain barrels, have supported over 100 watershed projects across North America, and have partnered with the National Forest Service to provide water to 60 million Americans.

On energy and climate, they have improved cooling equipment efficiency by 60 percent in their operation since the year 2000. They own the largest heavy-duty hybrid electric truck fleet in North America and have improved energy efficiency in manufacturing by 8 percent since 2008.

In packaging, over 96 percent of total waste is diverted away from landfills.

Since 2007, they have distributed 240,000 public recycling bins. They have achieved a 70 million-pound reduction in packaging material, and innovative packaging avoids 150,000 metric tons of CO₂ emissions—150,000 metric tons of CO₂ emissions.

As far as agriculture, they have invested over \$1 million to support sustainable agriculture in Georgia and across the United States. They have supported the planting of 25,000 acres of new orange groves in Florida and 4,100 new jobs in energy efficiency.

That is what the Coca-Cola Company has advised me of since I have been in the U.S. Senate in terms of their commitment to a clean environment for our world and country.

I believe the climate does change, but I don't believe climate change is a religion, I think it is science. I have done everything I can as a Senator to educate myself on the carbon and climate change issue. Seven years ago, I went with Senator BOXER from California to Disko Bay in Greenland with Dr. Ally, the leading glaciologist in the world, to study what he says about the

possibility of carbon being the cause of climate change. There are mixed reviews and mixed scientific evidence on that.

I am the first person to say we should reduce our carbon footprint. It is good for the atmosphere and our health. Eight years ago, when I had just entered the U.S. Senate, I bought a hybrid vehicle. I still drive that hybrid Ford Escape today. I did so because I thought it was a good business and a good atmospheric decision. I didn't buy it because someone made me; I bought it because I cared. My wife and I recycle because we think it is a good idea.

There are lots of things we can do to reduce the footprint of carbon, but to infer in USA TODAY or in a speech that we are not cognizant of the things that are done by our corporations to reduce carbon emissions and reduce the danger to the environment is just wrong and it is just unfair.

Senator WHITEHOUSE wrote a great book, which I read, called "Virtues." It is about the great virtues of living a good and healthy life, and one of those virtues is truth. The truth is that all of us care about the environment; we just don't all subscribe to the same theory about what happens.

We should all be praising the good things that corporations are doing and recognize that it is not just Democrats and not just Republicans, but it is American politicians who make the policies that determine where we go in the future.

I think it is very important that we reduce carbon emissions, but I think it is important to be practical in those reductions. We can pass all the great regulations in the world that are good for the environment, but if they shut down the American economy and American business, they are probably not a very good idea.

The environment and business should work in harmony together rather than be adversaries and enemies. Publications like what appeared in USA TODAY over the weekend or speeches like the one that was made last night don't do anything to foster harmony or a good commitment; instead, they raise controversy.

I love SHELDON WHITEHOUSE. He is a great U.S. Senator. I appreciate Leader REID and what he does. But I don't appreciate the references that were made about Coca-Cola or about me in the article they wrote over the weekend or the speech that was made last night.

In fact, as I thought about what I would do in terms of responding to what was said, I sat down last night and made an interesting observation. Monday of this week before I left Georgia to come up here, I met with the Southern Company, and one of the discussions that came up were the solar panels they put out in the Southwest to amend the grid out there with solar energy—something that is environmentally sound and doesn't emit carbon. They talked about Plant Vogtle, where they are adding three or four reactors, which is renewable energy and

recyclable, and it emits no carbon and is now being generated in Georgia—reliable electricity with carbon-free generation through nuclear power.

Yesterday, I had a meeting with the UPS corporation, which just happens to be one of the leaders in the world using nonfossil fuel-burning waste to deliver their packages.

You can go down the list of corporate America and the things they are doing to reduce carbon emissions every single day, and they deserve the credit. But they don't need to be criticized or lectured by Members of the Senate for not lobbying me because they do lobby me. They believe, as I believe, that reducing carbon is good, but it shouldn't be a religion; it should be dealt with scientifically. It is important that we understand that every contribution we can make to a carbonless environment is a good contribution, but we can't abolish it absolutely. Every regulation we pass to improve our environment is important, but if it shuts down American business, it probably is not the right decision to make.

So since the question was asked rhetorically last night on the floor of the Senate, I thought I would come to the floor and answer it in person. I believe truth is a virtue. The truth is the Coca-Cola Company has informed me continuously about the efforts they have made to reduce carbon emissions and to improve their environmental contribution. There is no greater evidence of that than me drinking water that just came out of a purification plant in Ghana, Africa, out of a Coca-Cola cup. I think that is about the best evidence we can possibly find that they have delivered their message. They are doing their job. I am proud of the Coca Cola Company.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wanted to clarify something I said when I spoke about the work the Senate did on comprehensive immigration reform in relation to the Loretta Lynch nomination. I mentioned the Gang of 8, and I think I got seven of them right. I wish to clarify exactly who was a Member of the Gang of 8: Senator SCHUMER, Senator DURBIN, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator BENNET, Senator MCCAIN, Senator FLAKE, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator RUBIO. That was the starting-off point for the comprehensive immigration reform that passed through the Senate.

I wish to get back to the matter at hand. As I stand in the Chamber today, I am going to keep reminding people of why we are really here, why the bill is on the floor—which is about sex trafficking—and the reason we want to try to resolve these issues and actually focus on the matter at hand and not on extraneous issues and other issues and other fights. My own Republican Congressman who carries my bill, the safe harbor bill—which of course is not the bill at issue but we hope will be the

first amendment—has noted that we just need to move on and get these bills done and not play politics as usual. That is going to be my focus today as I manage this bill.

So I thought I would read on the floor a book that has been a national bestseller by Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times and his wife Sheryl WuDunn. It is a book about sex trafficking. It is an incredible book. It focuses more on international sex trafficking. As we know, our bills here—the one that is on the floor and the one I have authored—are about how our own country gets a handle on this, by getting better laws in place and creating incentives and working with the private sector and doing things so our country, I think from my perspective, internationally can be a true leader. We can't be a true leader and tell these states and democracies and countries that aren't even democracies across the world that they need to do a better job if we don't do a better job.

To me, this should be a major tenet of our foreign policy. Once we get women so that they are not treated as slaves and they are not treated as chattel—once we get them to that circumstance—countries always do better. When we have women who can work and own businesses, women who can serve in government, it changes a whole society.

So that is why the sex trafficking bill is on the floor and the one that I have that will be considered as an amendment. The reason we need to get through where we are right now and focus on the real issue at hand is that our country can not only help the victims in our own country, but by shining a light on this, by being a leader on this internationally, it will help us work with other countries—not saying they are doing something bad when we have our own problem, but saying, Here is what we did and here is how we are handling this and we want to work with you as partners and we want to have women be treated with respect throughout the world.

So this book, as I said, focuses on international sex trafficking. It is called "Half the Sky." I love this name. It is a Chinese proverb. It talks about how women basically are holding up half the sky. That is what it is about. Women are holding up half the sky. We can't forget about half the sky and just let half the sky go and let them be sold into slavery and not be treated equally and expect a society to function.

So this is how the book starts out. It has a great quote from Mark Twain. I like jokes. Listen to this one: "What would men be without women? Scarce, sir, mighty scarce."

It is making the point again that women hold up half the sky.

So this is the book and how it starts:

Srey Rath is a self-confident Cambodian teenager whose black hair tumbles over a round, light brown face. She is in a crowded

street market, standing beside a pushcart and telling her story calmly, with detachment. The only hint of anxiety or trauma is the way she often pushes her hair in front of her black eyes, perhaps a nervous tic. Then she lowers her hand and her long fingers gesticulate and flutter in the air with incongruous grace as she recounts her odyssey.

Rath is short and small-boned, pretty, vibrant, and bubbly, a wisp of a girl whose negligible stature contrasts with an outsized and outgoing personality. When the skies abruptly release a tropical rain shower that drenches us, she simply laughs and rushes us to cover under a tin roof, and then cheerfully continues her story as the rain drums overhead. But Rath's attractiveness and winning personality are perilous bounties for a rural Cambodian girl, and her trusting nature and optimistic self-assuredness compound the hazard.

When Rath was fifteen, her family ran out of money, so she decided to go work as a dishwasher in Thailand for two months to help pay the bills. Her parents fretted about her safety, but they were reassured when Rath arranged to travel with four friends who had been promised jobs in the same Thai restaurant. The job agent took the girls deep into Thailand and then handed them to gangsters who took them to Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia. Rath was dazzled by her first glimpses of the city's clean avenues and gleaming high-rises, including at the time the world's tallest twin buildings; it seemed safe and welcoming. But then thugs sequestered Rath and two other girls inside a karaoke lounge that operated as a brothel. One gangster in his late thirties, a man known as "the boss," took charge of the girls and explained that he had paid money for them and that they would now be obliged to repay him. "You must find money to pay off the debt, and then I will send you back home," he said, repeatedly reassuring them that if they cooperated they would eventually be released.

Rath was shattered when what was happening dawned on her. The boss locked her up with a customer, who tried to force her to have sex with him. She fought back, enraging the customer. "So the boss got angry and hit me in the face, first with one hand and then with the other," she remembers, telling her story with simple resignation. "The mark stayed on my face for two weeks." Then the boss and the other gangsters raped her and beat her with their fists.

"You have to serve the customers," the boss told her as he punched her. "If not, we will beat you to death. Do you want that?" Rath stopped protesting, but she sobbed and refused to cooperate actively. The boss forced her to take a pill; the gangsters called it "the happy drug" or "the shake drug." She doesn't know exactly what it has, but it made her head shake and induced lethargy, happiness, and compliance for about an hour. When she wasn't drugged, Rath was teary and insufficiently compliant—she was required to beam happily at all customers—so the boss said he would waste no more time on her: She would agree to do as he ordered or he would kill her. Rath then gave in. The girls were forced to work in the brothel seven days a week, fifteen hours a day. They were kept naked to make it more difficult for them to run away or to keep tips or other money, and they were forbidden to ask customers to use condoms. They were battered until they smiled constantly and simulated joy at the sight of customers, because men would not pay as much for sex with girls with reddened eyes and haggard faces. The girls were never allowed out on the street or paid a penny for their work.

"They just gave us food to eat, but they didn't give us much because the customers

didn't like fat girls," Rath says. The girls were bused, under guard, back and forth between the brothel and a tenth-floor apartment where a dozen of them were housed. The door of the apartment was locked from the outside. However, one night, some of the girls went out onto their balcony and pried loose a long, five-inch-wide board from a rack used for drying clothes. They balanced it precariously between their balcony and one on the next building, twelve feet away. The board wobbled badly, but Rath was desperate, so she sat astride the board and gradually inched across.

"There were four of us who did that," she says. "The others were too scared, because it was very rickety. I was scared, too, and I couldn't look down, but I was even more scared to stay. We thought that even if we died it would be better than staying behind. If we stayed we would die as well."

Once on the far balcony, the girls pounded on the window and woke the surprised tenant. They could hardly communicate with him because none of them spoke the language, but the tenant let them into his apartment and then out the front door. The girls took the elevator down and wandered the silent streets until they found a police station and walked inside. The police first tried to shoo them away, then arrested the girls for illegal immigration. Rath served a year in prison under Malaysia's tough anti-immigrant laws, and then she was supposed to be repatriated. She thought a Malaysian policeman was escorting her home when he drove her to the Thai border—but then he sold her to a trafficker, who peddled her to a Thai brothel.

So I say to my colleagues, this is what we are talking about. This story is in another country, but this same story is repeated in our country day in and day out. If we are going to try to lead in Cambodia and try to change the world for these girls, we have to lead in our own country. Certainly we have to lead by focusing on the issue at hand, which is sex trafficking, and what we can do in our country. What can we do? Well, we can have better services for the victims. We can set up our law enforcement system in a way that works by not treating—for so long, these young 12-year-olds and 13-year-olds were thought of as criminals when, in fact, they are victims. How can we say someone is not raped, how can we say the story of this girl, who thought she was going to work to have a better life for herself as a dishwasher, then gets raped—how can we say that is not rape, that it is prostitution or a crime? No. She is a victim.

That is what the safe harbor bill—which I have introduced and which I am hopeful will be the first amendment once we work out these other issues—would do. It would treat these girls and boys as victims.

So I wish to remind my colleagues what we are truly dealing with. This is not supposed to be a fight over abortion. This is a fight about how to help these young girls throughout our country and by virtue of us being a leader throughout the world.

So I am going to continue reading from the book, just so we are all reminded what we are talking about.

Rath's saga offers a glimpse of the brutality inflicted routinely on women and girls

in much of the world, a malignancy that is slowly gaining recognition as one of the paramount human rights problems of this century.

The issues involved, however, have barely registered on the global agenda. Indeed, when we began reporting about international affairs in the 1980s—

This is a book by Nicholas Kristof and his wife Sheryl, whose book, "Half the Sky," is a national best seller. The subhead is "Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide."

Again, why am I reading this? Because this is what we are supposed to be talking about here. This is a bill we are supposed to be getting done and not talking about extraneous issues that I think we should be able to resolve because they have been resolved in the past. To do that, we have to decide that these girls are important enough to do that.

Continuing on, they talked about how these issues have barely registered on the global agenda:

Indeed, when we began reporting about international affairs in the 1980s, we couldn't have imagined writing this book. We assumed that the foreign policy issues that properly furrowed the brow were lofty and complex, like nuclear nonproliferation. It was difficult back then to envision the Council on Foreign Relations fretting about maternal mortality or genital mutilation. Back then the oppression of women was a fringe issue, the kind of worthy cause the girl scouts might raise money for—

And I hope that is not how we are treating this in the Senate. I hope that is not how we are treating it, and I hope we are not treating it as a political football.

We preferred to probe the recondite "serious issues."

So this book is the outgrowth—

The writers write—

of our own journey of awakening as we worked together as journalists for The New York Times. The first milestone in that journey came in China. Sheryl is a Chinese-American who grew up in New York City, and Nicholas is an Oregonian who grew up on a sheep and cherry farm near Yamhill, Oregon. After we married, we moved to China, where seven months later we found ourselves standing on the edge of Tiananmen Square watching troops fire their automatic weapons at prodemocracy protestors. The massacre claimed between four hundred and eight hundred lives and transfixed the world. It was the human rights story of the world. It was the human rights story of the year, and it seemed just about the most shocking violation imaginable.

Then the following year, we came across an obscure but meticulous demographic study that outlined a human rights violation that had claimed tens of thousands more lives. This study found that thirty-nine thousand baby girls die annually in China because parents don't give them the same medical care and attention that boys receive—and that is just in their first year of life. One Chinese family-planning official, Li Honggui, explained it this way: "If a boy gets sick, the parents may send him to the hospital at once. But if a girl gets sick, the parents may say to themselves, 'Well, let's see how she is tomorrow.'"

... A similar pattern emerged in other countries, particularly in South Asia and the Muslim world. In India, a "bride burning"—

to punish a woman for an inadequate dowry or to eliminate her so a man can remarry—takes place approximately once every two hours, but these rarely constitute news.

In . . . Pakistan, five thousand women and girls have been doused in kerosene and set alight by family members or in-laws—or, perhaps worse, been seared with acid—for perceived disobedience in the last nine years. Imagine the outcry if the Pakistani or Indian governments were burning women alive at those rates. Yet when the government is not directly involved, people shrug.

Again, how does this apply to the matter at hand? We know there are girls who are victims of trafficking who are put into slavery—sex slavery—every single day in this country. So if we think we can be a leader when it comes to what is going on around the world and we want to hold our Nation up, then we have to be a leader in this Chamber this week and get this bill done and get these extraneous issues behind us that people feel strongly about. But, as I said, somehow we have been able to handle these issues in the past on other bills, and I hope the girls we are talking about here are just as important as those other issues.

When a prominent dissident was arrested in China—

I go back to the book—

we would write a front-page article; when 100,000 girls were routinely kidnapped and trafficked into brothels, we didn't even consider it news. Partly that is because we journalists tend to be good at covering events that happen on a particular day, but we slip at covering events that happen every day—such as the . . . cruelties inflicted on women and girls. We journalists weren't the only ones who dropped the ball on this subject. [A tiny portion] of U.S. foreign aid is specifically targeted to women and girls.

They then go on to quote a Nobel Prize-winning economist who has developed a way to look at gender inequality that is a striking reminder of the stakes involved.

"More than 100 million are missing," Sen wrote in a classic essay in 1990 in "The New York Review of Books," spurring a new field of research. Sen noted that in normal circumstances women live longer than men, and so there are more females than males in much of the world. Even poor regions like most of Latin America and much of Africa have more females than males. Yet in places where girls have a deeply unequal status, they vanish. China has 107 males for every 100 females in its overall population . . . India has 108, and Pakistan has 111.

I remember at the McCain Institute, where Cindy McCain and HEIDI HEITKAMP and I spoke on a panel, that Senator MCCAIN had just returned from a trip abroad and had been in a country that was experiencing enormous upheaval. He had asked: "Where are the girls?" And someone said to him: "Most of them have been sold." They had been sold. So this is really happening, and the people in this Chamber know it is happening. That is why, again, I get back to the fact that if we want to do something about it here, we need to resolve these issues, we need to do it without going into a blame game, and we need to get this done so we can pass this bill—and not have a dispute

over abortion—that, in fact, helps the very girls we are supposed to help. Only then can we be a leader in the world.

I will go back to the book:

The worst of these abuses tend to occur in poor nations, but the United States and other western countries are not immune. In America, millions of women and girls face beatings or other violence from their husbands or boyfriends and more than one in six undergo rape or attempted rape at some point in her life, according to the National Violence Against Women survey. Then there is forced prostitution. Teenage runaways are beaten, threatened and branded (with tattoos) by pimps in American cities, and thousands of foreign women are trafficked into the United States as well. Still, in poor countries gender discrimination is often lethal in a way that is usually not in America. In India, for example, mothers are less likely to take their daughters to be vaccinated than their sons—that alone accounts for one fifth of India's missing females—while studies have found that, on average, girls are brought to the hospital only when they are sicker than boys taken to the hospital. All told, girls in India from 1 to 5 years of age are 50 percent more likely to die than boys the same age. The best estimate is that a little Indian girl dies from discrimination every four minutes.

A big, bearded Afghan . . . once told us that his wife and son were sick. He wanted both to survive, he said, but his priorities were clear: A son is an indispensable treasure, while a wife is replaceable. He had purchased medication for the boy alone. "She is always sick," he gruffly said of his wife, "so it's not worth buying medicine for her."

Again, why is this relevant to the matter at hand? I think these young girls and women in our own country and across the world deserve to be treated seriously. They deserve not to be treated as a political football on extraneous issues this Chamber likes to debate.

This bill needs to be treated just as seriously—and my safe harbor bill—as any other bill. Somehow, the people in charge of these institutions have been able to work out the differences.

Modernization and technology can aggravate the discrimination. Since the 1990s, the spread of ultrasound machines has allowed pregnant women to find out the sex of their fetuses—and then get abortions if they are female.

Again, we are talking about China.

"We don't have to have daughters anymore!" someone said in China.

To prevent sex-selective abortion, China and India now bar doctors and ultrasound technicians from telling a pregnant woman the sex of her fetus. Yet that is a flawed solution.

According to the book:

Research shows that when parents are banned from selectively aborting female fetuses, more of their daughters die as infants. Mothers do not deliberately dispatch infant girls they are obligated to give birth to, but they are lackadaisical about caring for them. A development economist at Brown University . . . quantified the wrenching trade-off: On average, the deaths of fifteen infant girls can be avoided by allowing 100 female fetuses to [die].

This is what is going on around the world right now.

The global statistics on the abuse of girls are numbing. It appears that more girls have

been killed in the last fifty years, precisely because they were girls, than men were killed in all the battles of the twentieth century. More girls are killed in this routine "gendercide" in any one decade than people were slaughtered in all the genocides of the twentieth century. In the nineteenth century, the central moral challenge was slavery. In the twentieth century, it was the battle against totalitarianism. We believe that in this century the paramount moral challenge will be the struggle for gender equality around the world.

That will be the struggle to help these girls.

Maybe this is the battle we are having right now. Maybe this institution has to come up to speed. We have 20 Senators who are women. Twenty percent of the Senate are women. That is pretty good. It is the best we have ever gotten. But when you look at the numbers, the numbers aren't frequent when you look back through history. Maybe that is what we are going to have to do to have people take these bills seriously and not play king of the hill with a bill as serious as this one.

I will continue to read "Half the Sky" by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn.

The owners of the Thai brothel to which Rath was sold did not beat her and did not constantly guard her. So two months later, she was able to escape and make her way back to Cambodia.

Upon her return, Rath met a social worker who put her in touch with an aid group that helps girls who have been trafficked start new lives. The group, American Assistance for Cambodia, used \$400 in donated funds to buy a small cart and a starter selection of goods so that Rath could become a street peddler. She found a good spot in the open area between the Thai and Cambodian customs offices. . . . Travelers crossing between Thailand and Cambodia walk along this strip, the size of a football field, and it is lined with peddlers selling drinks, snacks and souvenirs.

Rath outfitted her cart with shirts and hats, costume jewelry, notebooks, pens and small toys. Now her good looks and outgoing personality began to work in her favor, turning her into an effective saleswoman. She saved and invested in new merchandise, her business thrived, and she was able to support her parents and two younger sisters. She married and had a son, and she began saving for his education.

In 2008, Rath turned her cart into a stall, and then also acquired the stall next door. She also started a "public phone" business by charging people to use her cell phone. So if you ever cross from Thailand into Cambodia at Poipet, look for a shop on your left, halfway down the strip, where a teenage girl will call out to you, smile, and try to sell you a souvenir cap. She'll laugh and claim she's giving you a special price, and she's so bubbly and appealing she'll probably make the sale.

Rath's eventual triumph—

If you remember from the first part of the book that I read, she was sold into slavery when she simply thought she was going to work as a dishwasher; she was sold into sex and repeatedly raped—

is a reminder that if girls get a chance, in the form of an education or a microloan, they can be more than baubles or slaves; many of them can run businesses. Talk to Rath today—after you've purchased that

cap—and you'll find that she exudes confidence as she earns a solid income that will provide a better future for her sisters and for her young son.

Many of the stories in this book are wrenching, but keep in mind this central truth: Women aren't the problem but the solution. The plight of girls is no more a tragedy than an opportunity.

I will repeat that:

Women aren't the problem but the solution. The plight of girls is no more a tragedy than an opportunity.

That was a lesson we absorbed in Sheryl's ancestral village, at the end of a dirt road amid the rice paddies of southern China. For many years we have regularly trod the mud paths of the Taishan region to . . . the hamlet in which Sheryl's paternal grandfather grew up. China traditionally has been one of the most oppressive and smothering places for girls, and we could see hints of this in Sheryl's own family history. Indeed, on our first visit, we accidentally uncovered a family secret: a long-lost stepgrandmother. Sheryl's grandfather had traveled to America with his first wife, but she had given birth only to daughters. So Sheryl's grandfather gave up on her and returned her to Shunshui, where he married a younger woman as a second wife and took her to America. This was Sheryl's grandmother, who duly gave birth to a son—Sheryl's dad. The previous wife and daughters were then wiped out of the family memory.

Something bothered us each time we explored [the town] and the surrounding villages: Where were the young women?

This is, by the way, what Senator McCain said when he returned from a country that was repressed.

Young men were toiling industriously in the paddies or fanning themselves in the shade, but young women and girls were scarce. We finally discovered them and we stopped in the factories that were then spreading throughout the [Guangdong] Province, the epicenter of China's economic eruption. These factories produced the shoes, toys, and shirts that filled America's shopping malls, generating economic growth rates almost unprecedented in the history of the world—and creating the most effective antipoverty program ever recorded. The factories turned out to be cacophonous hives of distaff bees.

Eighty percent of the employees on the assembly lines in coastal China are female, and the proportion across the manufacturing belt of East Asia is at least 70 percent. The economic explosion in Asia was, in large part, an outgrowth of the economic empowerment of women. "They have small fingers, so they're better at stitching," the manager of a purse factory explained to us. "They're obedient and work harder than men," said the head of a toy factory. "And we can pay them less." Women are indeed the linchpin of the region's development strategy.

Economists who scrutinized East Asia's success noted a common pattern. These countries took young women who previously had contributed negligibly to the gross national product and injected them into the formal economy, hugely increasing the labor force. The basic formula was to ease repression, educate girls as well as boys, give the girls the freedom to move to the cities and take factory jobs, and then benefit from a demographic dividend as they delayed marriage and reduced childbearing. The women meanwhile financed the education of younger relatives, and saved enough of their pay to boost national savings rates. This pattern has been "the girl effect." In a nod to the female chromosomes, it could also be called "the double X solution."

Evidence has mounted that helping women can be a successful poverty-fighting strategy anywhere in the world, not just in the booming economies of East Asia. The Self Employed Women's Association was founded in India in 1972 and ever since has supported the poorest women in starting businesses—raising living standards in ways that have dazzled scholars and foundations. In Bangladesh, Muhammad Yunus developed microfinance at the Grameen Bank and targeted women borrowers—eventually winning a Nobel Peace Prize for the economic and social impact of his work.

I would note here—just a little side-note, as I am reading through Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn's book, to make everyone in this Chamber remember why we are here. We are here to help girls, not just in the United States, but in the world. We are here to hold up "Half the Sky." We are here to show that this Chamber, at its best, can actually help the people we are supposed to help, the most vulnerable in our society, instead of debating extraneous issues that we are unable to resolve on this bill but that we seem able to resolve on other bills that just must be more important than the girls and the women of this world. That is all I can figure out.

But I would like to note, as I read about one of their suggestions for things that help girls and women around the world, this idea of microcredit. My dad, who is kind of an adventurer and goes around the world, actually wrote a book on microcredit called "The Miracles of Barefoot Capitalism"—in case he is watching on C-Span, I thought he would like that note—with his wife Susan Wilkes. They are big believers in helping women around the world with microcredit.

So then they go on in the book to talk about helping people through microcredit.

In the early 1990s, the United Nations and the World Bank began to appreciate the potential resource that women and girls represent. Investment in girls' education may well be the highest return investment available in the developing world.

I think it is something that we need to remember in the United States as we look at the low numbers of girls that go into science and technology and head up companies, because for some reason they do not have the confidence to go into those fields or they are not encouraged to go into those fields. If we in the Senate cannot even say they should not be trafficked and we cannot do anything to help them, I do not think we are helping that cause very much.

Larry Summers wrote, when he was the chief economist of the World Bank: "The question is not whether countries can afford this investment, but whether countries can afford not to educate more girls."

In 2001, the World Bank produced an influential study, *Engendering Development Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voice*, arguing that promoting gender equality is crucial to combat global poverty. UNICEF issued a major report arguing that gender equality yields a "double

dividend" by elevating not only women but also their children and communities. The United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) summed up the mounting research this way: "Women's empowerment helps raise economic productivity and reduce infant mortality. It contributes to improved health and nutrition. It increases the chances of education for the next generation."

More and more, the most influential scholars of development and public health—including Sen and Summers, Joseph Stiglitz, Jeffrey Sachs, and Dr. Paul Farmer—are calling for much greater attention to women and development.

Private aid groups and foundations have shifted gears as well. "Women are the key to ending hunger in Africa," declared the Hunger Project. French foreign minister Bernard Kouchner, who founded Doctors Without Borders, bluntly declared of development: "Progress is achieved through women." The Center for Global Development issued a major report explaining "why and how to put girls at the center of development." CARE is taking women and girls as the centerpiece of its antipoverty efforts. The Nike Foundation and the NoVo Foundation are both focusing on building opportunities for girls in the developing world. "Gender inequality hurts economic growth," Goldman Sachs concluded in a 2008 research report that emphasized how much developing countries could improve their economic performance by educating girls. Partly as a result of that research, Goldman Sachs committed \$100 million to a "10,000Women" campaign meant to give that many women a business education.

I think this is actually a really good book. I just plan to keep reading it whenever I can over the next few days until we get a resolution to this problem.

I am going to take a look at how many pages it is. Well, if you include the notes, it is 296 pages. I will obviously take breaks when our colleagues come down here. But I do think it is really important that we keep the pressure on, that the women and girls of this country demand that this get resolved, because as I said, we have somehow been able to resolve it on other bills. I think this bill and the bill that I have, the safe harbor bill, are just as important. I think our colleagues, in my discussions with them, know several ways we could resolve this problem, including just eliminating this extraneous provision. But there might be other ways as well. We know what they are. I hope they keep working on them.

Concerns about terrorism after the 9/11 attacks triggered interest in these issues as an unlikely constituency: the military and counterterrorism agencies. Some security experts noted that the countries that nurture terrorists are disproportionately those where women are marginalized. The reason that there are so many Muslim terrorists, they argued, has little to do with the Koran but a great deal to do with the lack of robust female participation in the economy and society of many Islamic countries. As the Pentagon gained a deeper understanding of counterterrorism . . . it became increasingly interested in grassroots projects such as girls' education. Empowering girls, some in the military argued, would disempower terrorists. When the Joint Chiefs of Staff hold discussions of girls' education in Pakistan and Afghanistan . . . you know that gender is a

serious topic on the international affairs agenda. That's evident also in the Council on Foreign Relations. The wood-paneled halls that have been used for discussions of MIRV warheads . . . are now employed as well to host well-attended sessions on maternal mortality.

This is now Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn speaking in their book, which has been a national best seller, "Half the Sky." It is about sex trafficking and how important it is to take this issue on—not just in our own country but the world.

We will try to lay out an agenda for the world's women focusing on three particular abuses: sex trafficking and forced prostitution; gender-based violence, including honor killings and mass rape; and maternal mortality, which still needlessly claims one woman a minute. We will lay out solutions such as girls' education and microfinance, which are working right now.

While the most urgent needs are in the developing world, wealthy countries also need to clear up their own neighborhoods. If we are to lead the way we must show greater resolution in cracking down on domestic violence and sex trafficking in our own neighborhoods, rather than just sputter about abuses far away.

It is true that there are many injustices in the world, many worthy causes competing for attention and support, and we all have divided allegiances.

This sounds kind of like us, right? There are a lot of different topics and things that we have to take on, and there are many worthy causes that are calling for our attention and support. We all have divided allegiances. I think that is kind of what is going on in this Chamber. But why do we need to focus on this? Well, I will go back to the book.

We focus on this topic because, to us, this kind of oppression feels transcendent—and so does the opportunity. We have seen that outsiders can truly make a significant difference.

Consider Rath once more.

Now, remember, this was the girl that was sold into sex trafficking in Malaysia.

We had been so shaken by her story that we wanted to locate that brothel in Malaysia, interview its owners, and try to free the girls still imprisoned there. Unfortunately, we could not determine the brothel's name or address. (Rath didn't know English or even the Roman alphabet, so she hadn't been able to read signs when she was there.) When we asked her if she would be willing to return to Kuala Lumpur and help us find the brothel, she turned ashen. "I don't know," she said. "I don't want to face that again." She wavered, talked it over with her family, and ultimately agreed to go back in the hope of rescuing her girlfriends.

Rath voyaged back to Kuala Lumpur with the protection of an interpreter and a local antitrafficking activist. Nonetheless, she trembled in the red light district upon seeing the cheerful neon signs that she associated with so much pain. But since her escape, Malaysia has been embarrassed by public criticism about trafficking, so the police had cracked down on the worst brothels that imprisoned girls against their will. One of those was Rath's. A modest amount of international scolding had led a government to take action, resulting in an observable improvement in the lives of girls at the bottom

of the power pyramid. The outcome underscores that this is a hopeful cause, not a bleak one.

Honor killings, sexual slavery, and genital cutting may seem to Western readers to be tragic but inevitable in a world far, far away. In much the same way, slavery was once widely viewed by many decent Europeans and Americans as a regrettable but ineluctable feature of human life. It was just one more horror that has existed for thousands of years. But then in the 1780s a few indignant Britons, led by William Wilberforce, decided that slavery was so offensive that they had to abolish it. And they did. Today, we see the seed of something similar, a global movement to emancipate women and girls.

By the way, later in the book—since I have read it already, but now I will be able to read it again—they talk about how, in fact, it was the evidence of that brutality of the slavery, of the stench of the people who were slaves who were in the bottom of that ship that really drove action. Yes, the activists and William Wilberforce understandably get a lot of the attention and well-deserved credit for what happened, but it was the evidence that led to Britain, the people and their society, long before many other countries had even thought about abolishing slavery—it was the evidence of the brutality that led them to make a change.

That is one of the things that we need to talk about and why I am talking about this here today. We have to get back on what really matters here, such as the story of the 12-year-old girl in Rochester, MN—a 12-year-old girl who just got a text message and went to a McDonald's parking lot and was shoved into a car and then brought to the Twin Cities and then raped. Then her pictures were taken—sexually explicit pictures—and put on Craigslist. Then she was sold the next day and raped by two men.

That is what this is really about. It is not about these extraneous fights and what has been going on, dragging this Chamber down, and even stopping us from confirming a well-qualified person for the Attorney General of the United States. That is what they are talking about here. It is the evidence that the American people see. They start demanding change. I hope that is happening today.

So let's be clear about this up front. We hope to recruit you to join—

These are the authors.
—an incipient movement to emancipate women and fight global poverty by unlocking women's power as economic catalysts. That is the process underway—not a drama of victimization but of empowerment, the kind that transforms bubbly teenage girls from brothel slaves into successful businesswomen.

This is a story of transformation. It has change that is already taking place, and change that can accelerate if you will just open your heart and join in.

I think we need some opening of hearts here in the Chamber. I am going to take one break to talk to our staff, and then I will be back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am reading the book "Half the Sky," by Nicholas D. Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. I think it is a beautiful book. It is on sex trafficking around the world and what has been happening around the world. A part of this is that I think we need to make the point that we can lead in our country when it comes to sex trafficking.

We have Senator CORNYN's bill, and we know there is an issue with one of the provisions that needs to be resolved—and I don't think it is a provision that is related to this topic—but we are hopeful people of good will can come together and resolve this issue. The easiest way would be to take it out. We can have other discussions. Somehow, through history, the Senate has been able to come together and take care of this issue with the Hyde amendment and other bills.

I think the point I am trying to make today is this bill is just as important as those bills and that these girls who are victims of sex trafficking are just as important as anyone else in this country.

I am going to continue reading this book. I am hopeful—as I mentioned, it is very long, and I will obviously pause for my colleagues who come to the floor, but I am going to continue reading it until we get this resolved.

We are now on chapter 1, "Emancipating Twenty-First-Century Slaves." The quote on this is actually from Christopher Buckley, one of my favorite authors, from "Florence of Arabia," from the beginning of the chapter: "Women might just have something to contribute to civilization other than their vaginas."

That might not have been said on this floor that many times, but he is a humorous writer. Now, let's go on with the book:

The red-light district in the town of Forbesgunge does not actually have any red lights. Indeed, there is no electricity. The brothels are simply mud-walled family compounds along a dirt path, with thatch-roofed shacks set aside for customers.

Children play and scurry along the dirt paths, and a one-room shop on the corner sells cooking oil, rice, and bits of candy. Here, in the impoverished northern Indian state of Bihar near the Nepalese border, there's not much else available commercially—except sex.

As Meena Hasina walks down the path, the children pause and stare at her. The adults stop as well, some glowering and the tension rises. Meena is a lovely, dark-skinned Indian woman in her thirties with warm, crinkly eyes and a stud in her left nostril. She wears a sari and ties her black hair back, and she seems utterly relaxed as she strolls among people who despise her.

Meena is an Indian Muslim who for years was prostituted in a brothel run by the Nutt,

a low-caste tribe that controls the local sex trade. The Nutt have traditionally engaged in prostitution and petty crime, and theirs is the world of intergenerational prostitution, in which mothers sell sex and raise their daughters to do the same.

Meena strolls through the brothels to a larger hut that functions as a part-time school, sits down, and makes herself comfortable. Behind her, the villagers gradually resume their activities.

"I was eight or nine years old when I was kidnapped and trafficked," Meena begins. She is from a poor family on the Nepal border and was sold to a Nutt clan, then taken to a rural house where the brothel owner kept prepubescent girls until they were mature enough to attract customers. When she was twelve—she remembers that it was five months before her first period—she was taken to the brothel.

"They brought in the first client, and they'd taken lots of money from him," Meena recounted, speaking clinically and without emotion. The induction was similar to that endured by Rath in Malaysia, for sex trafficking operates on the same business model worldwide, and the same methods are used to break girls everywhere. "I started fighting and crying out, so that he couldn't succeed," Meena said. "I resisted so much that they had to return the money to him. And they beat me mercilessly, with a belt, with sticks, with iron rods. The beating was tremendous." She shook her head to clear the memory. "But even then I resisted. They showed me swords and said they would kill me if I didn't agree. Four or five times, they brought customers in, and I still resisted, and they kept beating me. Finally they drugged me: They gave me wine in my drink and got me completely drunk." Then one of the brothel owners raped her. She awoke, hungover and hurting, and realized what had happened. "Now I am wasted," she thought, and so she gave in and stopped fighting customers.

In Meena's brothel, the tyrant was a family matriarch, Ainul Bibi. Sometimes Ainul would beat the girls herself, and sometimes she would delegate the task to her daughter-in-law or her sons, who were brutal in inflicting punishment.

"I wasn't even allowed to cry," Meena remembers. "If even one tear fell, they would beat me. I used to think that it was better to die than to live like this. Once I jumped from the balcony, but nothing happened. I didn't even break a leg."

Meena and the other girls were never allowed out of the brothel and were never paid. They typically had ten or more customers a day, seven days a week. If a girl fell asleep or complained about a stomachache, the issue was resolved with a beating. And when a girl showed any hint of resistance, all the girls would be summoned to watch as the recalcitrant one was tied up and savagely beaten.

"They turned the stereo up loud to cover the screams," Meena said dryly.

India almost certainly has more modern slaves, in conditions like these, than any other country. There are 2 to 3 million prostitutes in India, and although many of them now sell sex to some degree willingly, and are paid, a significant share of them entered the sex industry unwillingly. One 2008 study of Indian brothels found that of Indian and Nepali prostitutes who started as teenagers, about half said they had been coerced into the brothels; women who began working in their twenties were more likely to have made the choice themselves, often to feed their children. Those who start out enslaved often accept their fate eventually and sell sex willingly, because they know nothing else and are too stigmatized to hold other jobs.

China has more prostitutes than India—some estimates are as high as 10 million or more—but fewer of them are forced into brothels against their will. Indeed, China has few brothels as such. Many of the prostitutes are freelancers working as ding-dong xiaojie (so called because they ring hotel rooms looking for business), and even those working in massage parlors and saunas are typically there on commission and can leave if they want to.

Paradoxically, it is the countries with the most straightlaced and sexually conservative societies, such as India, Pakistan, and Iran, that have disproportionately large numbers of forced prostitutes. Since young men in those societies rarely sleep with their girlfriends, it has become acceptable for them to relieve their sexual frustrations with prostitutes.

The implicit social contract is that upper-class girls will keep their virtue, while young men will find satisfaction in the brothels. And the brothels will be staffed with slave girls trafficked from Nepal or Bangladesh or poor Indian villages. As long as the girls are uneducated, low-caste peasants like Meena, society will look the other way—just as many antebellum Americans turned away from the horrors of slavery because the people being lashed looked different from them.

In Meena's brothel, no one used condoms. Meena is healthy for now, but she has never had an AIDS test. (While HIV prevalence is low in India, prostitutes are at particular risk because of their large number of customers.) Because Meena didn't use condoms, she became pregnant, and this filled her with despair.

"I used to think that I never wanted to be a mother, because my life had been wasted, and I didn't want to waste another life," Meena said. But Ainul's brothel, like many in India, welcomed the pregnancy as a chance to breed a new generation of victims. Girls are raised to be prostitutes, and boys become servants to do the laundry and cooking.

In the brothel, without medical help, Meena gave birth to a baby girl, whom she named Naina. But soon afterward, Ainul took the baby away from Meena, partly to stop her from breast-feeding—customers dislike prostitutes who are lactating—and partly to keep the baby as a hostage to ensure that Meena would not try to flee.

"We will not let Naina stay with you," Ainul told her. "You are a prostitute, and you have no honor. So you might run away." Later a son, Vivek, followed, and the owners also took him away. So both of Meena's children were raised by others in the brothel, mostly in sections of the compound where she was not allowed to go.

"They held my children captive, so they thought I would never try to escape," she said. To some degree, this strategy worked. Meena once helped thirteen of the girls escape, but didn't flee herself because she couldn't bear to leave her children. The penalty for staying behind was a brutal beating for complicity in the escape.

Ainul had herself been a prostitute when she was young, so she was unsympathetic to the younger girls. "If my own daughters can be prostituted, then you can be, too," Ainul would tell the girls. And it was true that she had prostituted her own two daughters. ("They had to be beaten up to agree to it," Meena explained. "No one wants to go into this.")

That is a good place to stop and talk a little about what we are doing on the floor. No one wants to go into this. That is what these bills are about. These bills are about having a victims

fund. These bills are about creating a safe harbor so we don't treat these young victims as criminals, like we have in Minnesota with the safe harbor law. And it is about trying to get something done.

We know an extraneous provision is on this bill and that we need to resolve this one way or another. As I have noted, we have been able to resolve this in the past, and I welcome my colleagues to come and speak about this issue. I hope this blame game is behind us, and that we won't be making accusations but instead we will actually work on getting this bill done. Because lost in all of this is the fact this isn't just some game people can play. These are actual young girls.

As I said, why is this international prostitution relevant to what we are talking about? It is relevant because our country can actually become a leader in this area. We can be a leader. We can actually do something in America to show we are taking this on. Our bill, the safe harbor bill I am leading, which we hope will be the first amendment to this bill, sets up a national sex trafficking strategy. We don't have one right now.

As a former prosecutor, I know when we work between Federal and State and local authorities, and we take on these cases and do it in a smart way, we actually are able to get things done. We did it with the Violence Against Women Act, when everyone thought that was just a situation where you can beat your wife and no one is going to notice. It happened behind closed doors. But we took it on as a country and we changed things and changed things for women in this country. Now we can do this with prostitution.

We can no longer see this as a victimless crime. There is a victim. The victim is 12 years old. She is someone in your State right now. So that is why these bills are so serious and why we need to continue to get them done. I am going to keep talking about this issue because I think at some point we have to realize why we are here and what we are talking about, instead of using it as a political football.

So the story goes on:

Meena estimates that in the dozen years she was in the brothel, she was beaten on average five days a week. Most girls were quickly broken and cowed, but Meena never quite gave in. Her distinguishing characteristic is obstinacy. She can be dogged and mulish, and that is one reason the villagers find her so unpleasant. She breaches the pattern of femininity in rural India by talking back—and fighting back.

The police seemed unlikely saviors to girls in the brothels because police officers regularly visited the brothels and were serviced free. But Meena was so desperate that she once slipped out and went to the police station to demand help.

"I was forced into prostitution by a brothel in town," Meena told the astonished officer at the police station. "The pimps beat me up, and they're holding my children hostage." Other policemen came out to see this unusual sight, and they mocked her and told her to go back.

"You have great audacity to come here!" one policeman scolded her. In the end, the police sent her back after extracting a promise from the brothel not to beat her. The brothel owners did not immediately punish her. But a friendly neighbor warned Meena that the brothel owners had decided to murder her. That doesn't happen often in red-light districts, any more than farmers kill producing assets such as good milk cows, but from time to time a prostitute becomes so nettlesome that the owners kill her as a warning to the other girls.

Fearing for her life, Meena abandoned her children and fled the brothel. She traveled several hours by train to Forbesgunge. Someone there told one of Ainul's sons, Manooj, of her whereabouts, and he soon arrived to beat up Meena. Manooj didn't want her causing trouble in his brothel again, so he told her that she could live on her own in Forbesgunge and prostitute herself, but she would have to give him the money. Not knowing how she could survive otherwise, Meena agreed.

Whenever Manooj returned to Forbesgunge to collect money, he was dissatisfied with the amount Meena gave him and beat her. Once Manooj threw Meena to the ground and was beating her furiously with a belt when a respectful local man intervened.

"You're already pimping her, you're already taking her lifeblood," remonstrated her saviour, a pharmacist named Kuduz. "Why beat her to death as well?"

It wasn't the same as leaping on Manooj to pull him off, but for a woman like Meena, who was scorned by society, it was startling to have anyone speak up for her.

To have anyone speak up for her. That is what I hope we are going to be doing in this Chamber in the next few days, that we are going to speak up for these victims and show that we want to actually get something done and that they have value outside of being a political football.

Manooj backed off, and Kuduz helped her up. Meena and Kuduz lived near each other in Forbesgunge, and the incident created a bond between them. Soon Kuduz and Meena were chatting regularly, and then he offered to marry her. Thrilled, she accepted.

Manooj was furious when he heard about the marriage, and he offered Kuduz 100,000 rupees (\$2,500) to give Meena up—a sum that perhaps reflected his concern that she might use her new respectability as a married woman to cause trouble for the brothel. Kuduz wasn't interested in a deal.

"Even if you offered me two hundred fifty thousand rupees, I will not give her up," Kuduz said. "Love has no price."

After they were married, Meena bore two daughters with Kuduz, and she went back to her native village to look for her parents. Her mother had died—neighbors said she had cried constantly after Meena disappeared, then had gone mad—but her father was stunned and thrilled to see his daughter resurrected.

Life was clearly better, but Meena couldn't forget her first two children left behind in the brothel. So she began making journeys back—five hours by bus—to Ainul Bibi's brothel. There she would stand outside and plead for Naina and Vivek.

"As many times as I could, I would go back to fight for my children," she remembered. "I knew they would not let me take my children. I knew they would beat me up. But I thought I had to keep trying."

It didn't work. Ainul and Manooj didn't let Meena in the brothel; they whipped her and

drove her away. The police wouldn't listen to her. The brothel owners not only threatened to kill her, they also threatened to kidnap her two young daughters with Kuduz and sell them to a brothel. Once a couple of gangsters showed up at Meena's house in Forbesgunge to steal the two little girls, but Kuduz grabbed a knife and warned: "If you even try to steal them, I'll cut you into pieces."

Meena was terrified for her two younger girls, but she couldn't forget Naina. She knew that Naina was approaching puberty and would soon be on the market. But what could she do?

So these stories are pretty raw, and they are stories we usually don't tell on the floor of the United States Senate. But I think we need to, because maybe it is the only way people will remember why we are here and what we are supposed to be doing right now, which is to get these bills done and then hopefully confirm an Attorney General of the United States, which is something else we need to do that seems completely unrelated to these sex trafficking stories of these girls, except for one reason, and that is that we would want to have an attorney general in place so they can enforce the law.

Some of these cases are actually Federal, such as the one we had in Minnesota involving the little girl from Rochester, or the case in Senator HEITKAMP's State of North Dakota involving the incident of a sex trafficking ring in the oil patch. This is going on right now in this country. So what could an Attorney General do? I would ask: What can we do? What we can do is to get this bill done.

Again, I welcome my colleagues to come and talk about this issue, but I hope when they talk about it we will actually focus on the matter at hand—not blame anyone anymore, not talk about the things we disagree on but what we agree on. And then, hopefully, that will lead to the discussions I know are going on to resolve this bill because we can get this resolved.

Continuing to read, this is the writers talking now:

Interviewing women like Meena over the years has led us to change our own views on sex trafficking. Growing up in the United States and then living in China and Japan, we thought of prostitution as something women may turn to opportunistically or out of economic desperation. In Hong Kong, we knew an Australian prostitute who slipped Sheryl into the locker room of her "men's club" to meet the local girls, who were there because they saw a chance to enrich themselves. We certainly didn't think of prostitutes as slaves, forced to do what they do, for most prostitutes in America, China, and Japan aren't truly enslaved.

Yet it's hyperbole to say that millions of women and girls are actually enslaved today. (The biggest difference from nineteenth-century slavery is that many die of AIDS by their late twenties.) The term that is usually used for this phenomenon, "sex trafficking," is a misnomer. The problem isn't sex, nor is it prostitution as such. In many countries—China, Brazil, and most of sub-Saharan Africa—prostitution is widespread but mostly voluntary (in the sense it is driven by economic pressure rather than physical compulsion). In those places, brothels do not lock

up women, and many women work on their own without pimps or brothels. Nor is the problem exactly "trafficking" since forced prostitution doesn't always depend on a girl's being transported over a great distance by a middleman.

The story I told, by the way, of the girl in Rochester, she just went about an hour-and-a-half drive. So this idea the trafficking is just about going from one nation to another or being in the hold of a boat or something like that is not necessarily always the case. So we use the words sex trafficking because people have to understand this is more than just one pimp and one prostitute, that these are usually rings and these girls are usually brought someplace where they do not want to be. But it doesn't necessarily mean they are brought long distances.

So when we talk about the bills on the floor, let's remember that, and I think this is a good reminder from this book.

And, by the way, if I ever mispronounce names or words, my apology to the authors Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. I have to say it is kind of small print, and I am trying my best. I know the Presiding Officer has a good command of English and will help me out or correct me if I make a mistake.

The horror of sex trafficking can more properly be labeled slavery.

The total number of modern slaves is difficult to estimate. The International Labour Organization, a UN agency, estimates that at any one time there are 12.3 million people engaged in forced labor of all kinds, not just sexual servitude. A UN report estimated that 1 million children in Asia alone are held in conditions indistinguishable from slavery. The Lancet, a prominent medical journal in Britain, calculated that "1 million children are forced into prostitution every year and the total number of prostituted children could be as high as 10 million."

Antitrafficking campaigners tend to use higher numbers, such as 27 million modern slaves. That figure originated in research by Kevin Bales, who runs a fine organization called Free the Slaves. Numbers are difficult to calculate in part because sex workers can't be divided neatly into categories of those working voluntarily and those working involuntarily. Some commentators look at prostitutes and see only sex slaves; others see only entrepreneurs. But in reality there are some in each category and many other women who inhabit a gray zone between freedom and slavery.

I will note this number—I have always tried to get the right number of how many victims we are talking about—but as I noted at the beginning of my remarks this morning, the 27 million modern slaves includes victims of not just sex trafficking but also labor trafficking.

Back to the book.

An essential part of the brothel business model is to break the spirit of girls through humiliation, rape, threats and violence. We met a 15-year-old Thai girl whose initiation consisted of being forced to eat dog droppings so as to shatter her self-esteem. Once a girl is broken and terrified, all hope of escape squeezed out of her, force may no longer be necessary to control her. She may smile and laugh at passersby, and try to grab them

and tug them into the brothel. Many a foreigner would assume that she is there voluntarily, but in that situation complying with the will of the brothel owner does not signify consent.

Our own estimate is that there are 3 million women and girls (and a very small number of boys) worldwide who can be fairly termed enslaved in the sex trade. That is a conservative estimate that does not include many others who are manipulated and intimidated into prostitution. Nor does it include millions more who are under eighteen and cannot meaningfully consent to work in brothels. We are talking about 3 million people who in effect are the property of another person and in many cases could be killed by their owner with impunity.

Technically, trafficking is often defined as taking someone (by force or deception) across an international border. The U.S. State Department has estimated that between 600,000 and 800,000 people are trafficked across international borders each year, 80 percent of them women and girls, mostly for sexual exploitation. Since Meena didn't cross a border, she wasn't trafficked in the traditional sense. That's also true of most people who are enslaved in brothels. As the U.S. State Department notes, its estimate doesn't include "millions of victims around the world who are trafficked within their own national borders."

The bills that we have—the one before us and my bill, the safe harbor bill, which we would like to see as the first amendment, which passed the Judiciary Committee with 20 votes on a bipartisan basis—these bills are focused on sex trafficking within our own borders, although some of the victims will be brought in from other countries. This book, "Half the Sky," is so good because it really is about what is going on all around the world and all these victims around the world. Every country has their own problems. Despite all of the political machinations and extraneous provisions and other things, what we are trying to get done today is to do something real to help the victims of sex trafficking through the fund Senator CORNYN has in his bill and then in my safe harbor bill, which is also a strong bipartisan bill, to make it clear there is a good model we can use across the country that has been used in 15 States and others, and one dozen more are working on them, where Minnesota has been one of the States leading the way to view these girls as victims and not as criminals, when the average age is 12 years old, not even old enough to go to a high school prom, not even old enough to drive the car.

Again, I welcome my colleagues to come down and talk about this issue. I am just going to keep filling in reading this book when no one is on the floor. I only hope that when we talk about this bill and this issue, we do it with some respect for the victims of these crimes and the respect they deserve.

Technically, trafficking is often defined as taking someone (by force or deception) across an international border. The U.S. State Department has estimated that between 600,000 and 800,000 people are trafficked across international borders each year, 80 percent of them women and girls, mostly for sexual exploitation. Since Meena didn't cross

a border, she wasn't trafficked in the traditional sense. That's also true of most people who are enslaved in brothels. As the U.S. State Department notes, its estimate doesn't include "millions of victims around the world who are trafficked within their own national borders."

Again, as I have noted, 83 percent of the victims in the United States are from the United States, and I don't think that is what we think of when we first think about sex trafficking, but those are facts.

In contrast, in the peak decade of the transatlantic slave trade, the 1780s, an average of just under eighty thousand slaves were shipped annually across the Atlantic from Africa to the New World. The average then dropped to a bit more than fifty thousand between 1811 and 1850. In other words, far more women and girls are shipped into brothels each year in the early twenty-first century than African slaves were shipped into slave plantations each year in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries—although the overall population was of course far smaller then. As the journal *Foreign Affairs* observed: "Whatever the exact number is, it seems almost certain that the modern global slave trade is larger in absolute terms than the Atlantic slave trade in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was."

As on slave plantations two centuries ago, there are few practical restraints on slave owners. In 1791, North Carolina decreed that killing a slave amounted to "murder," and Georgia later established that killing or maiming a slave was legally the same as killing or maiming a white person. But those doctrines existed more on paper than on plantations, just as Pakistani laws exist in the statute books but don't impede brothel owners who choose to eliminate troublesome girls.

While there has been progress in addressing many humanitarian issues in the last few decades, sex slavery has actually worsened. One reason for that is the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe and Indochina. In Romania and other countries, the immediate result was economic distress, and everywhere criminal gangs arose and filled the power vacuum. Capitalism created new markets for rice and potatoes, but also for female flesh.

A second reason for the growth of trafficking is globalization. A generation ago, people stayed at home; now it is easier and cheaper to set out for the city or a distant country. A Nigerian girl whose mother never left her tribal area may now find herself in a brothel in Italy. In rural Moldavia, it is possible to drive from village to village and not find a female between the ages of sixteen and thirty.

I believe this is one of the countries that Senator MCCAIN visited, when I talked to him after he came back last Easter, where he simply didn't see the girls. He asked: Where are the girls? And they said: Well, the girls—many of them have been sold into sex. So these are things that are happening right now in this world and in our own country.

A third reason for the worsening situation is AIDS. Being sold to a brothel was always a hideous fate, but not usually a death sentence. Now it often is. And because of the fear of AIDS, customers prefer younger girls whom they believe are less likely to be infected. In both Asia and Africa, there is also a legend that AIDS can be cured by sex with a virgin, and that has nurtured demand for young girls kidnapped from their villages.

These factors explain our emphasis on sex slaves as opposed to other kinds of forced labor. Anybody who has spent time in Indian brothels and also, say, at Indian brick kilns knows that it is better to be enslaved working a kiln. Kiln workers most likely live together with their families, and their work does not expose them to the risk of AIDS, so there's always hope of escape down the road.

Inside the brothel, Naina and Vivek were beaten, starved, and abused. They were also confused about their parentage. Naina grew up calling Ainul [the brothel's owner] Grandma, and Ainul's son Vinod, Father. Naina sometimes was told that Vinod's wife, Pinky, was her mother; at other times she was told her mother had died and that Pinky was her stepmother. But when Naina asked to go to school, Vinod refused and described the relationship in blunter terms.

"You must obey me," he told Naina, "because I am your owner."

The neighbors tried to advise the children. "People used to say that they could not be my real parents, because they tortured me so much," Naina recalled. Occasionally, the children heard or even saw Meena coming to the door and calling out to them. Once Meena saw Naina and told her, "I am your mother."

"No," Naina replied. "Pinky is my mother."

Vivek remembers Meena's visits as well. "I used to see her being beaten up and driven away," he says. "They told me that my mother was dead, but the neighbors told me that she was my mother after all, and I saw her coming back to try to fight for me."

Naina and Vivek never went to a day of school, never saw a doctor, and were rarely allowed out. They were assigned chores such as sweeping floors and washing clothes, and they had only rags to wear—and no shoes, for that might encourage them to run away. Then, when Naina was twelve, she was paraded before an older man in a way that left her feeling uncomfortable. "When I asked 'Mother' about the man," Naina recalled, "she beat me up and sent me to bed without dinner."

A couple of days later, "Mother" told Naina to bathe and took her to the market, where she bought her nice clothes and a nose ring. "When I asked her why she was buying me all these things, she started scolding me. She told me that I had to listen to everything the man says. She also told me, 'Your father has taken money from the man for you.' I started crying out loudly."

Pinky told Naina to wear the clothes, but the girl threw them away, crying inconsolably. Vivek was only eleven, a short boy with a meek manner. But he had inherited his mother's incomprehension of surrender. So he pleaded with his "parents" and his "grandma" to let his sister go, or to find a husband for her. Each appeal brought him only another beating—administered with scorn. "You don't earn any income," "Father" told him mockingly, "so how do you think you can look after your sister?"

Yet Vivek found the courage to confront his tormenters again and again, begging for his sister's freedom. In a town where police officers, government officials, Hindu priests, and respectable middle-class citizens all averted their eyes from forced prostitution, the only audible voice of conscience belonged to an eleven-year-old boy who was battered each time he spoke up. His outspokenness gained him nothing, though. Vinod and Pinky locked him up, forced Naina into the new clothes, and the girl's career as a prostitute began.

So I think that is a pretty good place to break for a minute as we talk about "the only audible voice of conscience

belonged to an eleven-year-old boy." I think we have an opportunity in the Senate to be an audible voice of conscience and to move on this bill.

When I came to the floor today, my job was to just manage the bill for 4 hours; then I just decided, after being somewhat disgusted by all of the anger that I have heard in this Chamber, that maybe I would just start reading from this book. I had no plan to do it. I happened to have it with me because I have used it when I have given speeches. This isn't an official filibuster, as I guess we have been asked. I am just going to keep reading from the book. When my colleagues want to come down, I welcome them. But I only ask them one thing—if maybe they could just focus on the issue at hand and stop all of this vengeance and anger, and then maybe we will have an opportunity, if we stop throwing darts, to get this done—and then also to confirm the next Attorney General of the United States, which is completely unrelated to this.

So let me continue on with this story, as we have an 11-year-old boy in the story whose voice was the only voice of conscience.

"My 'mother' was telling me not to get scared, as he is a nice man," Naina remembered. "Then they locked me inside the room with the man. The man told me to lock the room from the inside. I slapped him. . . . Then that man forced me. He raped me."

Once a customer gave Naina a tip, and she secretly passed on the money to Vivek. They thought that perhaps Vivek could use a phone, a technology that they had no experience with, to track down the mysterious woman who claimed to be their real mother and seek help from her. But when Vivek tried to use the telephone, the brothel owners found out and both children were flogged.

Ainul thought that Vivek could be distracted with girls, and so he was told to try to have sex with the prostitutes. He was overwhelmed and intimidated at the thought, and when he balked, Pinky beat him up. Seething and fearful of what would become of his sister, Vivek decided that their only hope would be for him to run away and try to find the person who claimed to be their mother. Somewhere Vivek had heard that the woman's name was Meena and that she lived in Forbesgunge, so he fled to the train station one morning and used Naina's tip to buy a ticket.

"I was trembling because I thought that they would come after me and cut me into pieces," he recalled. After arriving in Forbesgunge, he asked directions to the brothel district. He trudged down the road to the red-light area and then asked one passerby after another: Where is Meena? Where does she live?

Finally, after a long walk and many missed turns, he knew he was close to her home, and he called out: Meena! Meena! A woman came out of one little home—Vivek's lip quivered as he recounted this part of the story—and looked him over wonderingly. The boy and the woman gazed at each other for a long moment, and then the woman finally said in astonishment: "Are you Vivek?"

The reunion was sublime. It was a blessed few weeks of giddy, unadulterated joy, the first happiness that Vivek had known in his life. Meena is a warm and emotional woman, and Vivek was thrilled to feel a mother's love for the first time. Yet now that Meena

had news about Naina, her doggedness came to the surface again: She was determined to recover her daughter.

"I gave birth to her, and so I can never forget her," Meena said. "I must fight for her as long as I breathe. Every day without Naina feels like a year."

Meena had noticed that Apne Aap Women Worldwide, an organization that fights sex slavery in India, had opened an office in Forbesgunge. Apne Aap is based in Kolkata, the city formerly known as Calcutta, but its founder—a determined former journalist named Ruchira Gupta—grew up partly in Forbesgunge. Other aid groups are reluctant to work in rural Bihar because of the widespread criminality, but Ruchira knew the area and thought it was worth the risk to open a branch office. One of the first people to drop in was Meena. "Please, please," Meena begged Ruchira, "help me get my daughter back!"

There had never been a police raid on a brothel in Bihar State, as far as anyone knew, but Ruchira decided that this could be the first. While Ainul Bibi's brothel had warm ties with the local police, Ruchira had strong connections with national police officials. And Ruchira can be every bit as intimidating as any brothel owner.

So Apne Aap harangued the local police into raiding the brothel to rescue Naina. The police burst in, found Naina, and took her to the police station. But the girl had been so drugged and broken that at the station she looked at Meena and declared numbly: "I'm not your daughter." Meena was shattered.

Naina explained later that she had felt alone and terrified, partly because Ainul Bibi had told her that Vivek had died. But after an hour in the police station, Naina began to realize that maybe she could escape the brothel, and she finally whispered, "Yes, you're my mother."

So Apne Aap whisked Naina off to a hospital in Kolkata, where she was treated for severe injuries and a morphine addiction. The brothel had drugged Naina constantly to render her compliant, and the morphine withdrawal was brutal to watch. In Forbesgunge, life became more difficult and dangerous for Meena and her family. Some of the brothel owners there are related to Ainul and Manooj, and they were furious at Meena. Even those in the Nutt community who didn't like prostitution disapproved of the police raid, and so the townspeople shunned Apne Aap's school and shelter. Meena and her children were stigmatized, and a young man working with Apne Aap was stabbed. Threats were made against Meena's two daughters with Kuduz. Yet Meena was serene as she walked about the streets. She laughed at the idea that she should feel cowed.

"They think that good is bad," she scoffed, speaking of the local villagers. "They may not speak to me, but I know what is right and I will stick to it. I will never accept prostitution of myself or my children as long as I breathe." Meena is working as a community organizer in Forbesgunge, trying to discourage parents from prostituting their daughters and urging them to educate their sons and daughters alike. Over time the resentment against her has diminished a bit, but she is still seen as pushy and unfeminine.

Apne Aap later started a boarding school in Bihar, partly with donations from American supporters, and Meena's children were placed there. The school has a guard and is a much safer place for them. Naina now studies at that boarding school and hopes to become a teacher, and in particular to help disadvantaged children.

One afternoon, Meena was singing to her two young daughters, teaching them a song.

This is how it went:

India will not be free,

Until its women are free.

What about the girls in this country?

If girls are insulted and abused and enslaved in this country,

Put your hand on your heart and ask,

Is this country truly independent?

The next part of the chapter: "Fighting Slavery from Seattle." This is a book, "Half the Sky," by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. It is about sex trafficking, and I am reading it, one, because it is a really good book and so people understand the issue, two, so people will refocus on why we have these bills on the floor and work together. We all know some potential ways to resolve this on both sides of the aisle so we can pass this bill and resolve this Hyde amendment provision which should not be on this bill. But there are ways to resolve this, and we know what they are, and then, also, hopefully, pass my safe harbor bill which was the bill that in addition to Senator CORNYN's bill passed through our Committee on the Judiciary unanimously. Every single person voted for it. It is slated to be the first amendment vote on this bill, and it establishes safe harbor incentives so that other States will do what Minnesota and about 15 States have done, which is not to consider these victims as criminals but to consider them as victims. Then not only do we help these girls so they have a chance of turning their lives around but also so that we actually make better criminal cases.

I know as a former prosecutor, running an office of 400 people for 8 years—seeing some of these major cases come in our doors—the best way to make these cases, if you have victims who feel that they are protected, who feel they have another life they can lead, who feel they can do something with their lives between going back to their pimp and going back to the person who has beaten them up and gotten them hooked on drugs, is by doing something like that. So those are two worthy bills that are on the floor.

Again, my colleagues are welcome to come down here and join me. I think it would be nice for a change if people focused on the issue at hand instead of a partisan fight that has been going on, because I think this institution is better than what we have seen in the last week.

The next part of the chapter: "Fighting Slavery from Seattle."

People always ask how they can help. Given concerns about corruption, waste, and mismanagement, how can one actually help women like Meena and defeat modern slavery? Is there anything an ordinary person can do?

That is a good question. I finally decided to start reading this book because I was sick of what was going on here. I think ordinary people around the country can do something about sex slavery by supporting strong laws and making sure Congress gets its job done but also doing work on their local and State level.

The authors say:

A starting point is to be brutally realistic about the complexities of achieving change. To be blunt, humanitarians sometimes exaggerate and oversell, eliding pitfalls. They sometimes torture frail data until it yields the demanded "proof" of success. Partly this is because the causes are worthy and inspiring; those who study education for girls, for example, naturally believe in it. As we'll see, the result is that the research isn't often conducted with the same rigor as is found in, say, examinations of the effectiveness of toothpaste. Aid groups are also reluctant to acknowledge mistakes, partly because frank discussion of blunders is an impediment in soliciting contributions.

The reality is that past efforts to assist girls have sometimes backfired. In 1993, Senator Tom Harkin wanted to help Bangladeshi girls laboring in sweatshops, so he introduced legislation that would ban imports made by workers under the age of fourteen. Bangladeshi factories promptly fired tens of thousands of young girls, and many of them ended up in brothels and are presumably now dead of AIDS.

Again, I am reading from the book "Half the Sky," by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn, which is a great book about sex trafficking in order to refocus this Chamber on what we should be doing, which is getting these bills done and coming up with a way to resolve timeworn disputes which we somehow have been able to do with other bills.

I am trying to make the case here that these girls, as reflected in some of these stories, are just as important as some of the other work that we do in the Senate and deserve our greatest efforts.

Yet many forms of assistance—particularly in health and education—have an excellent record. Consider the work of Frank Grijalva, the principal of the Overlake School in Redmond, Washington, a fine private school with 450 students in grades five through twelve. Annual tuition hovers around \$22,000, and most of the kids are raised in a sheltered upper-middle class environment. Grijalva was looking for a way to teach his students about how the other half lives.

"It became clear that we, as a very privileged community, needed to be a bigger, more positive force in the world," Grijalva recalled. Frank heard about Bernard Krisher, a former Newsweek correspondent who was so appalled by poverty in Cambodia that he formed an aid group, American Assistance for Cambodia. Rescuing girls from brothels is important, Krisher believes, but the best way to save them is to prevent them from being trafficked in the first place—which means keeping them in school. So American Assistance for Cambodia focuses on educating rural children, especially girls. Bernie Krisher's signature program is the Rural School Project. For \$13,000, a donor can establish a school in a Cambodian village. The donation is matched by funds from the World Bank and again by the Asian Development Bank.

Grijalva had a brainstorm. His students could sponsor a school in Cambodia and use it as a way of emphasizing the importance of public service. Initially the response from students and parents was polite but cautious, but then the attacks of 9/11 took place, and suddenly the community was passionately concerned with the larger world and engaged in this project. The students conducted bake sales, car washes, and talent shows, and also

educated themselves about Cambodia's history of war and genocide. The school was built in Pailin, a Cambodian town on the Thai border that is notorious for cheap brothels that cater to Thai men.

In February 2003, the school construction was completed, and Grijalva led a delegation of nineteen students from Overlake School to Cambodia for the opening. A cynic might say that the money for the visit would have been better spent on building another Cambodian school, but in fact that visit was an essential field trip and a learning opportunity for those American students. They lugged along boxes of school supplies, but as they approached Pailin by car, they realized that Cambodia's needs were greater than they ever could have imagined. The dirt-and-gravel road to Pailin was so deeply rutted that it was barely passable, and they saw a bulldozer overturned beside a crater—it had hit a land mine.

When the Americans reached the Cambodian school, they saw a sign declaring it the OVERLAKE SCHOOL in English and Kmer script. At the ribbon cutting, the Americans were welcomed by a sea of excited Cambodians—led by a principal who was missing a leg, a land-mine victim himself. Cambodian men then had an average of only 2.6 years of education, and Cambodian women averaged just 1.7 years, so a new school was appreciated in a way the Americans could barely fathom.

The school dedication—and the full week in Cambodia—left an indelible impression on the American students. So Overlake students and parents decided to forge an ongoing relationship with its namesake in Cambodia. The Americans funded an English teacher at the school and arranged for an Internet connection for e-mail. They built a playground and sent books. Then, in 2006, the American school decided to send delegations annually, dispatching students and teachers during spring vacation to teach English and arts to the Cambodian pupils. And in 2007, the group decided to assist a school in Ghana as well, and to send a delegation there.

“This project is simply the most meaningful and worthwhile initiative that I have undertaken in my thirty-six years in education,” Frank Grijalva said. The Overlake School in Cambodia is indeed an extraordinary place. A bridge has washed out, so you have to walk across a stream to reach it, but it looks nothing like the dilapidated buildings that you see in much of the developing world. There are 270 students, ranging in age from six to fifteen. The English teacher is university educated and speaks good English. Most stunning of all, when we dropped by, the sixth graders were busy sending e-mails from their Yahoo accounts—to the kids at Overlake School in America.

One of those writing an e-mail was Kun Sokkea, a thirteen-year-old girl who would soon be the first in her family ever to graduate from elementary school. Her father had died of AIDS, and her mother was sick with the same disease and needed to be nursed constantly. Kun Sokkea is rail-thin, a bit gangly, with long, stringy black hair. She is reserved, and her shoulders sag with the burdens of poverty.

“My mom encourages me to stay in school, but sometimes I think I should go out and earn money,” Kun Sokkea explained. “I have no dad to support Mom, so maybe I should provide for her. In one day, I could earn seventy baht, [a bit more than two dollars] cutting hay or planting corn.”

To address these financial pressures, American Assistance for Cambodia started a program called Girls Be Ambitious, which in-

fect bribes families to keep girls in school. If a girl has perfect attendance in school for one month, her family gets \$10. A similar approach has been used very effectively and cheaply to increase education for girls in Mexico and other countries. Kun Sokkea's family is now getting the stipend. For donors who can't afford to fund an entire school, it's a way to fight trafficking at a cost of \$120 per year per girl. The approach helps because it is typically girls like Kun Sokkea who end up trafficked. Their families are desperate for money, the girls are poorly educated, and a trafficker promises them a great job selling fruit in a distant city.

Kun Sokkea showed us her home, a rickety shack built on stilts—to guard against flooding and vermin—in a field near the school. The house has no electricity, and her possessions were in one small bag. She never has to worry about choosing what to wear: She has just one shirt, and no shoes other than a pair of flip-flops. Kun Sokkea has never been to a dentist and to a doctor only once, and she gets the family's drinking water from the nearby creek. That's the same creek in which Kun Sokkea washes the family clothes (she borrows someone else's shirt to wear when she has to wash her own). She shares a mattress on the floor with her brother, as three other family members sleep a few feet away. Kun Sokkea has never touched a phone, ridden in a car, or had a soft drink; when she was asked if she ever drank milk, she looked confused and said as a baby she had drunk her mother's milk.

Yet one thing Kun Sokkea has beside her bed is a photo of the American Overlake students on their campus. In the evenings before she goes to sleep, she sometimes picks up the photo and studies the smiling families and neat lawns and modern buildings. In her own shack, with her mother sick and often crying, her siblings hungry, it is a window into a magical land where people have plenty to eat and get cured when they fall ill. In such a place, she thinks, everybody must be happy all the time.

For one thing, we know that is not quite true in our country. As we know, we have these same crimes occurring in our country every single day. Every single day, we have thousands of girls who are victims of sex trafficking. We had it happen in Minnesota. We have had it happen across the country. We have it happen when some girls are brought in from other countries. We know it is going on every day in our own Nation. We have an opportunity to do something about it, to tell the rest of the world that this place is a place where good things get done. But somehow we have gotten bogged down in a political game again with blame going back and forth and back and forth, and I just don't think that is dignified for the Senate.

While we can battle it out—and we should—on issues such as the budget and on issues where we don't have an agreement when it comes to our country's international affairs, this is an issue on which we actually agree, but somehow we found a way to not agree, and I think we need to find our way back. That is why I am going to continue to read from this book.

Someone asked me if this is a filibuster. It is not a filibuster because ob-

viously I don't mind if my colleagues come down. I would like them to come down and talk about this important topic. But I will point out that at least when it comes to this issue of sex trafficking, we can stop going back and forth on who is to blame and who knew what when and what people did wrong and instead just focus on resolving this issue and getting a bill passed and certainly not attaching it to the Attorney General of the United States.

I will say that it is attached to the Attorney General in one way, and that is when it comes to Federal sex trafficking cases. Most of these cases are on the local level, county level, State level, the DA's office, but there are cases that are handled federally. I know from talking to the nominated Attorney General, Loretta Lynch, that she cares very much about these cases. It would be good to have her in place so we can start working on this national sex trafficking strategy. So in that way they are connected, but they certainly are not connected, in my mind, procedurally.

I know some of my colleagues have addressed this. I have spoken out for her several times. Not everyone knows about Loretta Lynch's background. Loretta Lynch is someone who grew up in a neighborhood—her family didn't have a lot of money. Her dad was a pastor at the church.

When she was in elementary school, she took a test and did really well on that test. The teacher came to her and said: You know what, we don't really know if that was really you who took that test or if that was really your score. So she took the test again, and she scored even higher the second time.

When Loretta Lynch graduated from high school, she was actually the valedictorian. The principal of that school came up to Loretta Lynch and said: You know what, it is a bit controversial to have you as our valedictorian, so you will have to share it with a White student. That happened to Loretta Lynn, and she just waited it out, and that is what she is going to do with this Chamber. She is going wait it out, and in the end she will be confirmed as the next Attorney General.

Why is this relevant? Because some of our friends on the other side of the aisle are attaching it to the sex trafficking issue, and I don't think it should be attached to the sex trafficking issue. I think we should get her confirmed.

But most importantly and the reason I am here on the floor reading from this book is just to say, can we just stop going back and forth and the vengeance and get this bill done?

From the very beginning, Senator CORNYN and I have worked on my bill, the safe harbor bill—which is not the bill on the floor—together. While I was not involved in the beginning of the drafting of his bill, I believe that idea of helping victims in some way with some kind of funding with shelters is a really good idea as well.

I hope we can resolve the issue on his bill, the Hyde amendment provision,

and that we can then go on to pass my bill as the amendment. As we know, there is significant support in the House for these bills, and they are very important bills.

I will continue with the book:

Kun Sokkea and her family are not the only beneficiaries. The Americans themselves have been transformed as much as the Cambodians. And that is something you see routinely: Aid projects have a mixed record in helping people abroad, but a superb record in inspiring and educating the donors. Sometimes the lessons are confusing, as Overlake found when it tried to help Kun Sokkea get to middle school after graduating from elementary school. She needed transport because the middle school was far away, and young men in the area often harassed girls on their way to school.

So, at the teacher's suggestion, Overlake bought Kun Sokkea a bicycle, and for several months that worked very well. Then an older woman, a neighbor, asked to borrow Kun Sokkea's bicycle; the girl felt she couldn't say no to an older person. The woman then sold the bicycle and kept the money she received for it. Frank Grijalva and the American students were beside themselves, but they learned an important lesson about how defeating poverty is more difficult than it seems at first. The Americans decided they couldn't just buy Kun Sokkea another bicycle, so the girl returned to walking an hour each way to school and back. Perhaps in part because of the distance involved and the risks of getting to school, Kun Sokkea began to miss a fair number of days. Her grades suffered. In early 2009, she dropped out of school.

America's schools rarely convey much understanding of the 2.7 billion people (40 percent of the world's population) who today live on less than \$2 a day. So while the primary purpose of a new movement on behalf of women is to stop slavery and honor killings, another is to expose young Americans to life abroad so that they, too, can learn and grow and blossom—and then continue to tackle the problems as adults.

"After going to Cambodia, my plans for the future have changed," said Natalie Hammerquist, a seventeen-year-old at Overlake who regularly e-mails two Cambodian students. "This year I'm taking three foreign languages, and I plan on picking up more in college."

Natalie's Cambodian girlfriend wants to be a doctor but can't afford to go to university. That grates on Natalie: A girl just like me has to abandon her dreams because they're unaffordable. Now Natalie plans on a career empowering young people around the world: "All anyone should do is to use their gifts in what way they can, and this is how I can use mine. That is the weight of how valuable seeing Cambodia was for me."

This is now chapter 2 of Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn's book "Half the Sky: Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide." And I noted that really most of the book is about sex trafficking and prostitution and why this is such a major problem worldwide.

Look at what happened that night when those girls were doing nothing but learning at a school and Boko Haram came in and broke into that school and took those girls away. Their parents had nothing but motorcycles and bicycles and bows and arrows to try to chase them. They were never able to get their daughters back, and

now Boko Haram said they sold many of those children into sex slavery.

This should not be happening, but it is going on right now—and not just internationally. It is going on everywhere in this country, and that is why it is important. It is important not just for the victims in America, it is also important because of the victims internationally. We have an opportunity in this country to actually stand up and say: We want to be a leader on this internationally. We are going to cast this dysfunction aside and actually get this done and show the world we can be a leader when it comes to elevating girls and young women, when it comes to holding up half the sky.

Chapter 2, "Prohibition and Prostitution." It starts with a quote by Abraham Lincoln:

Although volume upon volume is written to prove slavery a good thing, we never hear of the man who wishes to take the good of it, by being a slave himself.

After visiting Meena Hasina and Ruchira Gupta in Bihar, Nick crossed from India into Nepal at a border village with stalls selling clothing, snacks, and more sinister wares. That border crossing is the one through which thousands of Nepali girls are trafficked into India on their way to the brothels of Kolkata. There they are valued for their light skin, good looks, docility, and inability to speak the local language. As Nick filled out some required paperwork at the border post, Nepalis streamed into India, without filling out a form.

While sitting in the border shack, Nick began talking to one Indian officer who spoke excellent English. The man said he had been dispatched by the intelligence bureau to monitor the border.

"So what exactly are you monitoring?" Nick asked.

"We're looking for terrorists, or terror supplies," said the man, who wasn't monitoring anything very closely, since one truck after another was driving past. "After 9/11, we've tightened things up here. And we're also looking for smuggled or pirated goods. If we find them, we will confiscate them."

"What about trafficked girls?" Nick asked. "Are you keeping an eye out for them? There must be a lot."

"Oh, a lot. But we don't worry about them. There's nothing that we can do about them."

"Well, you could arrest the traffickers. Isn't trafficking girls as important as pirating DVDs?"

The intelligence officer laughed genially and threw up his hands. "Prostitution is inevitable." He chuckled. "There has always been prostitution in every country. And what's a young man going to do from the time he turns eighteen until he gets married at thirty?"

"Well, is the best solution really to kidnap Nepali girls and imprison them in Indian brothels?"

The officer shrugged, unperturbed. "These girls are sacrificed so we can have harmony in society. So that good girls can be safe."

It is unfortunate. I hope that is not what we are going to be saying in this body—from the Senate to the rest of the world and to trafficked girls and to those groups who are advocating so hard, especially over the last 2 years, in trying to get this done. I hope we will not say: It is unfortunate. We were not able to resolve this. These are major fights, and this person did this,

and this person knew about this, and this person didn't know about that.

That is what has been going on over this past week, and we are better than that. People keep backstabbing and going after each other, but personally I have had it. So if anyone wants to join me here—I know the women in the Senate have always worked together—and at least talk about this issue instead of simply fighting with each other, I think we would really improve our chances of getting it done.

"But many of the Nepali girls being trafficked are good girls, too."

"Oh, yes, but those are peasant girls. They can't even read. They're from the countryside. The good Indian middle-class girls are safe."

Nick, who had been gritting his teeth, offered an explosive suggestion: "I've got it! You know, in the United States we have a lot of problems with harmony in society. So we should start kidnapping Indian middle-class girls and forcing them to work in brothels in the United States! Then young American men could have fun, too, don't you think? That would improve our harmony in society!"

There was an ominous silence, but finally the police officer roared with laughter.

"You are joking!" the officer said beaming.

"That's very funny!"

Nick gave up.

People get away with enslaving village girls for the same reason that people got away with enslaving blacks 200 years ago: The victims are perceived as discounted humans. India had delegated an intelligence officer to look for pirated goods because it knew that the United States cares about intellectual property. When India feels that the West cares as much about slavery as it does about pirated DVDs, it will dispatch people to the borders to stop traffickers.

The tools to crush modern slavery exist, but the political will is lacking. That must be the starting point of any abolitionist movement. We're not arguing that Westerners should take up this cause because it is the fault of the West; Western men do not play a central role in prostitution in most poor countries. True, American and European sex tourists are part of the problem in Thailand, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Belize, but they are still only a small percentage of the Johns. The vast majority are local men. Moreover, Western men usually go with girls who are more or less voluntary prostitutes, because they want to take the girls back to their hotel rooms, while forced prostitutes are not normally allowed out of the brothels. So this is not a case where we in the West have a responsibility to lead because we are the source of the problem. Rather, we single out the West because even though we are peripheral to the slavery, our action is necessary to overcome a horrific evil.

One reason the modern abolitionist movement has not been more effective is the divisive politics of prostitution. In the 1990s, the American left and right collaborated and achieved the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, which was a milestone in raising awareness of international trafficking in the global agenda. The anti-trafficking movement then was unusually bipartisan, strongly backed by some liberal Democrats, such as the late senator Paul Wellstone, and by some conservative Republicans, such as Senator Sam Brownback.

I do want to pause from this book for a second to note that when I was at the McCain Institute out in Arizona, Cindy

McCain and HEIDI HEITKAMP and I spoke about this issue to all of those gathered. At the end, a guy came up to me and said that he was with the State Department under a Republican administration, and he talked to me about how when Paul Wellstone died, they put forward some kind of a scholarship in his honor for students who wanted to work in the area of combating sex trafficking and trying to eliminate sex trafficking.

It was at that moment last spring that I actually found out that Paul Wellstone, the Senator from Minnesota, whom we miss so dearly, who died in that tragic plane crash, had taken on this issue. He had taken on so many other issues, speaking for the voiceless, from mental health to domestic violence, that I did not know—and I think this shows how sometimes this issue gets second shrift—that he was such a hero when it came to sex trafficking.

I think part of that was Paul always believed that there were a lot of causes around this building that had people advocating for them, that keep people busy at meetings all day or that they get called up for that are so important, but, in fact, those who can't afford that kind of help—the victims of domestic violence or those with mental illness or victims of sex trafficking—they don't have a lot of lobbyists coming over here to meet with people and they need someone to stand up for them, and they should not be forgotten or dismissed or marginalized in becoming a political football, that maybe they need someone advocating on their behalf.

The other thing about Paul is he always embraced that immigrant experience. He believed that no matter where one comes from in this country, or no matter what one's roots were, they should be able to rise up. He also believed that everyone should be treated with dignity.

I will never forget when I first came to the Senate, Darrell, the train driver who recently retired, came up to me and I told him I am a Senator from Minnesota, and all he said was, "Paul Wellstone," because he remembered him. Whether it was the cops at the front desk or the secretaries, they remember Paul. So it is no surprise that Paul Wellstone, along with conservative Republican Sam Brownback, actually took this issue on.

In this book, "Half the Sky," Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn continue talking about who worked on this when people were actually working together. They say:

Hillary Rodham Clinton was also a leader on this issue, and no one has been a greater champion than Carolyn Maloney, a Democratic Congresswoman from New York.

In fact, Congresswoman MALONEY, in conjunction with Congressman POE, a Republican Congressman, are sponsoring a bill that is not exactly the same as Senator CORNYN's bill, but similar. They are also cosponsors of

the bill I am carrying, the safe harbor bill that ERIK PAULSEN is carrying in the House. So we can see this work has continued. Some of the people are the same, but somehow back then, we were able to reach some kind of an agreement, and this was treated as a serious issue and a serious bill which we need to do.

They go on to talk about who else worked on this.

They say:

... Paul Wellstone, Sam Brownback, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Carolyn Maloney, a Democratic Congresswoman from New York. Likewise, one of George W. Bush's few positive international legacies was a big push against trafficking. Vital Voices and other liberal groups were stalwart on sex trafficking, as were International Justice Mission, and other conservative evangelical groups. Yet, while the left and the right each do important work fighting trafficking, they mostly do it separately. The abolitionist movement would be far more effective if it forged unity in its own rank.

Now we get back to something I always remember MIKE ENZI talking about, about how we can have disagreement on something like 20 percent of the things, but we have agreement on 80 percent. Maybe that is what we have to remember with this bill. We know how Senator ENZI always worked well with Ted Kennedy, as did Senator HATCH, even with how different they were politically. But they were able to find some common ground.

Certainly this bill should not be devolving into a fight over abortion. There is so much we agree on in this bill. There is also so much we agree on in the safe harbor bill which doesn't contain the Hyde provision.

So this idea that we are going back and forth and dwelling on whose fault this was and how it happened—frankly, I think: Enough. I think we need to resolve this. I know there are ways to resolve this. I hope that is continuing to go on today. We have a lot of things, in addition to passing this bill, we need to get done. We need to get the vote on the next Attorney General of the United States. We have a major budget that we need to get done. The budget needs to be approved. I am looking at our staff and I know they are looking forward to one of those nights where we are going until 3 or 4 in the morning. Maybe we wouldn't have to do that if we could stop these kinds of fights.

This is kind of a practical argument for getting this done. I know that, but one has to be slightly practical as we look at the fights before us on important matters that we need to resolve. One of the fights shouldn't be this. This is a fight against evil. This is a fight against those who are trafficking in little girls. It shouldn't be a fight across the aisle.

The authors talk about the groups that have worked on it and how we would be more effective if we forged unity.

They continue:

One reason for discord is a dispute about how to regard prostitution. The left often re-

fers nonjudgmentally to "sex workers" and tends to be tolerant of transactions among consenting adults. The right . . . refers to "prostitutes" or "prostituted women".

Do my colleagues know what is so interesting about this—let me see when this book was written: 2009. So even since that time, what is sort of a cool thing is that we have gotten some agreement now on the fact that when we see a Republican House of Representatives being able to pass the safe harbor bill—the bill I wrote in the Senate, the bill that is not yet on the floor, to make clear, but the bill that would be considered as the first amendment—we have gotten some agreement here in these two Houses that these younger victims are, in fact, victims. I think that is really important for our country to hear that. Because when we do things such as that—such as when we pass the Violence Against Women Act, it changes the whole way people think about these crimes. Who is committing the crime? It is the people running the ring. It is the johns. It is not the victims.

So I think that is why as we move forward, trying to get these bills passed, it is so important beyond the immediate bills.

OK. So they are talking about this debate. I don't think we should dwell on debate. We have had enough of them in this Chamber, but that is what this part of the book is about.

They continue:

What policy should we pursue to try to eliminate that slavery? Originally, we sympathized with the view that a prohibition won't work any better in prostitution today than it did against alcohol in America in the 1920s. Instead of trying fruitlessly to ban prostitution, we believed it would be preferable to legalize and regulate it. That pragmatic "harm reduction" model is preferred by many aid groups because it allows aid workers to pass out condoms and it permits access to brothels so that they can be more easily checked for underage girls.

Over time, we've changed our minds. That legalize-and-regulate model simply hasn't worked very well in countries where prostitution is often coerced.

This is a change. I think we remember back decades ago where people were talking about legalizing prostitution. I think what we have realized, those of us who have worked as prosecutors, is that so often prostitution is not consensual. So often there are reasons—either the pimp is keeping someone hooked on drugs to keep someone being a prostitute or they are threatening their lives or threatening their family lives—and this is something that we don't want to have be legal.

I am going to finish this paragraph, and then I see we have been joined by the great Senator from New Jersey who I am really happy has come so I can sit down and drink some water.

It continues:

That legalize-and-regulate model simply hasn't worked very well in countries where prostitution is often coerced. Partly, that is because governance is often poor so the regulation is ineffective, and partly it is because the legal brothels tend to attract a parallel

illegal business in young girls and forced prostitution. In contrast, there's empirical evidence that crackdowns can succeed, when combined with social services such as job retraining and drug rehabilitation, and that is the approach we have come to favor. In countries with widespread trafficking, we favor a law enforcement strategy that pushes for fundamental change in police attitudes and regular police inspections to check for underage girls or anyone being held against their will. That means holding governments accountable not just to pass laws but also to enforce them, and monitoring how many brothels are raided and pimps are arrested. Jail-like brothels should be closed down, sting operations should be mounted against buyers of virgin girls, and national police chiefs must be under pressure to crack down on corruption as it relates to trafficking. The idea is to reduce the brothel owners' profit.

With that, I will take a pause from this book. I will say that Senator BOOKER has done not only an amazing job as a Senator, but he also knows a little bit about being a mayor. He knows the struggle of poverty and also understands that to govern, we have to have a change of tone. I have always appreciated the work he has done across the aisle and the tone he brings to the Senate. We are really trying to push today as we try to come together to work on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for those incredibly generous words. I recognize the Presiding Officer, Senator PERDUE. I am grateful to be able to serve with him, and it is great seeing him in the captain's chair, to use my "Star Trek" parlance. I am happy to have the chance to formally welcome the Senator from Georgia to the Senate. It is good to serve with him as well.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, I am honored to stand on the Senate floor to express my strong support for the historic nomination of Loretta Lynch to be the Attorney General of the United States. Our Nation is fortunate to have Ms. Lynch as the nominee for Attorney General. She is seasoned, competent, wise, extraordinarily dedicated, and has already served this Nation for many years, receiving accolades from across the country. She is historic in and of herself and exceptionally well qualified. I wish to tell everyone a little bit more about her.

First, though, I want to ask—and this should not be necessary, but I want to ask: Why do we almost have a double standard for Ms. Lynch's nomination? She is the first African-American woman appointed to head the Department of Justice. She has had her nomination pending on the Senate floor longer than any nominee for Attorney General going back three decades. Ms. Lynch has had to wait 81 days for a hearing in committee—longer than any of President George W. Bush's nominees for Attorney General had to

wait; more than twice as long for Attorneys General John Ashcroft and Michael Mukasey; and 24 days longer than Alberto Gonzalez. She waited 27 days for a committee vote after her hearing, again longer than any of George Bush's nominees to be Attorney General. Now her nomination has lingered on the Senate floor without a vote for 20 days, which is again longer than the wait for any of the last five Attorneys General combined. Her historic nomination has now been pending in the Senate for more than 130 days since the President first nominated her. I have not heard a single good reason germane to her qualifications, to her values, to her views, and to the kind of service she has rendered or will render, as to why she should not be promptly confirmed.

She comes before the Senate having been twice appointed by two different Presidents and twice unanimously confirmed by this very body, to be a U.S. attorney. She has been a career Federal prosecutor for almost a decade, a partner at a prestigious law firm, and led one of the finest Federal prosecuting offices in the country, the Eastern District of New York.

Her nomination has the support of dozens of law enforcement organizations, civil rights organizations, and outspoken citizens from across the country.

So, again, I wonder why are we here today still waiting? Why does this President's exceptionally well-qualified nominee deserve such unfair treatment?

Attorneys General are important because they lead the Department that keeps us safe and secure and protects our rights. From securing the right to vote to combating the violence of organized crime, to bringing terrorists to justice, this position is too important for any kind of political games and for any kind of delay.

Seventy-five years ago, another Attorney General, Robert H. Jackson, spoke eloquently about the qualities of a good Federal prosecutor and hence a good Attorney General, when he said: "The citizen's safety lies in the prosecutor who tempers zeal with human kindness, who seeks truth and not victims, who serves the law and not factional purposes, and who approaches her task with humility."

This is the type of prosecutor Ms. Lynch has always been and the type of Attorney General she will be.

This appointment is historic. Once confirmed, Ms. Lynch will be the first Black woman to serve in the Nation's highest law enforcement position. She will be only the second woman and second African American to be Attorney General. Her story is our story. It is an American story. It reflects a long history of our Nation, the distance we have traveled as a country.

It is a story of a Black woman who grew up in the Jim Crow South, the daughter of a fourth-generation minister and segregation-fighting mother who overcame discrimination and

achieved the American dream despite the early obstacles she faced. Once, while a student at a predominantly White elementary school, her standardized test scores were so high that the disbelieving school demanded she retake her test. The great thing about that story is she retook the test and got a higher score. On one other occasion, she was named the valedictorian of her high school class which was a predominantly White high school, but the White administrators in the school did not think it was appropriate to have a Black girl as the top student, so they asked her to share that honor with a White student, and she did so with dignity and grace.

She would go on to earn an Ivy League education, climb the highest ladders of her profession, and stand today nominated by the President of the United States of America, and when confirmed by the Senate, she will be our 83rd Attorney General. Only in this great Nation can a story such as this be possible, can a story such as this be told.

Today, we continue our efforts. All of us—Republicans and Democrats—in this body are committed to building a more perfect Union. I know this confirmation will inspire people all across our country—people who may have lost their faith in law enforcement or in our government's ability to get things done, to know that despite the odds or challenges, we are still a great nation, that we are devoted to overcoming our challenges.

We celebrate someone who has broken glass ceilings, who has broken barrier after barrier, and now as a qualified candidate will hopefully soon ascend to this position. It is a reaffirmation of the American dream.

While history is important, I don't want to overshadow those qualifications. I want to reiterate them.

She is a well-qualified nominee. She graduated with Harvard College and Harvard Law School degrees, and went on to gain exceptional experience as a prosecutor and as a manager. As U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she led one of the Nation's most challenging prosecutorial offices. I know this. I live right across the river from where she works. Her tough approach to fighting crime became almost legendary. She won acclaim throughout our metropolitan region as well as in the law enforcement community.

In that office she established a record that would make any prosecutor proud. She led an office that had the tenacity to take on violent criminals, to confront political corruption, and to disrupt organized crime.

At a time when the Senate is considering legislation to combat human trafficking, we need an Attorney General who will vigorously, unapologetically, and courageously prosecute traffickers. Ms. Lynch has been a leader on that very issue. Her

office prosecuted over 100 child exploitation cases and brutal global trafficking cases. Her office tried more terrorism cases since 9/11 than any other office in the country.

I was impressed when she first came to my office. She was candid, straightforward, and down to earth. What is clear from Ms. Lynch's record is not just that she is a tough prosecutor but that she is a leader with a vision and the right values to be Attorney General.

Too many Americans distrust the ability of law enforcement to fairly enforce our laws. Ms. Lynch believes in the principles of equality and justice first and foremost, and she will restore even more faith in our system. In her committee testimony she articulated a vision about how in a great time of tension in our country we can rebuild the trust between dedicated, committed law enforcement officers on the streets and the communities they serve. Too many Americans, as I said time and again, go to prison for far too long. The majority of people incarcerated today in Federal prisons are there for nonviolent offenses. We have a nation that leads the globe in incarcerating people, and we do it often in a way that is discriminatory against poor people and minorities.

Ms. Lynch has a vision of alternatives to incarceration for nonviolent offenders that are based on facts and based on her experience. She supported her district's drug court with a diversion program taking first-time nonviolent offenders out of the prosecution system and giving them access to drug treatment. Her innovation and successes speak volumes about her commitment to saving taxpayer dollars and addressing our swelling prison population while also driving down crime.

So I say in conclusion, she has sterling character. She has incredible credentials. She has unflappable integrity. I am confident that as Attorney General she will ensure that the Department leads in a way that will make us proud.

The road to building a more perfect Union in this country has been long, and the work still continues. We are at a time in this Nation when cynicism with government is at an all-time high. One of the highest-ranked concerns that Americans have right now—issues of employment and education are now being caught up to by concerns that Americans have about whether their very government will work together to do what is right.

The delay in her nomination undermines the integrity of this body. It gives a signal to all those who are cynical to further surrender to that emotion. This great candidate passed through committee in bipartisan fashion. She is a great woman, a great African American, and most of all a great American and she should not be delayed on the sidelines when there is work to be done, when her very delay begins to undermine what we say this

body can do when we all work together and put petty partisan politics aside and stand up for something far more important, which is the work to make this country a more perfect Union.

We can do that together, all of us in the Senate, by confirming Ms. Lynch who will use that post to do the very same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly echo the passionate and cogent presentation that my colleague from New Jersey has just given, that this body can be well served—very well served—for us to go immediately to the confirmation of Loretta Lynch. The delay in this critical position is unacceptable, does a disservice to the individual, a disservice to the office, a disservice to the executive branch, and a disservice to justice in America.

Let's have that vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the committee-reported amendment to S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the committee-reported amendment to S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton, Ron Johnson, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Pat Roberts, Bill Cassidy, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Ayotte	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blunt	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Gardner	Perdue
Burr	Graham	Portman
Capito	Grassley	Risch
Casey	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kirk	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Reid
Blumenthal	King	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Boxer	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Shaheen
Cardin	McCaskill	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Mikulski	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Franken	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Nelson	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NOT VOTING—2

Alexander	Brown
-----------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 41.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is rejected.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity in the 40 years I have been in the Senate to lead with others of both parties many efforts to help support victims—crime victims, domestic violence victims, victims of child abuse, and human trafficking victims.

One of the things I have learned during that time is we have to pay attention to what the survivors tell us when they tell us what they need. None of us have walked in their shoes.

We can offer advice, but we can't second-guess them. We can't assume we know best. Our job is to listen and try to help them rebuild their lives.

If we would all just stop the political rhetoric and listen, the message from these survivors is clear.

Earlier this week, the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women—this, incidentally, is a coalition of thousands of organizations representing millions of survivors of domestic and sexual violence—wrote:

We write today to express our deep concern about the controversy of inserting the Hyde provision into the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. The House passed a version of that Act that did not include this new Hyde provision and we ask the Senate to do the same.

I agree with them. I worked very closely with this group for more than 2 years as we drafted the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. They are some of the most dedicated advocates I have ever worked with and I listen to what they say. I believe they are showing us the way forward.

The House version of the very bill we are debating today does not contain the unnecessary destructive provision that wrecks such havoc here. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER found a way to bring the House together—Republicans and Democrats—and passed a bill without injecting abortion politics into the discussion. Now, if that deeply divided body can do it, I would assume we can do it here in the Senate.

Some are being very casual about the divisive partisan provision that Senate Republicans injected into this Senate bill. They call it boilerplate. Well, it is not. It places limitations on the health care services victims can use as they access money collected from the very people who trafficked them.

We are not talking about taxpayers' money. We are not talking about taxpayers' dollars. We are talking about traffickers' money. This is the money traffickers would pay in fines.

Criminals have already taken away so many choices for these young women and girls, and we shouldn't be taking away their right to make their own health care choices. We certainly should not require these survivors to have to prove they were raped. That is offensive. It is wrong.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for coming to the floor. I know how much he supports this bill to end human trafficking, sex trafficking, and what a frustration he must feel—and which I share—that we have been unable to bring a bill before us that has strong bipartisan support and with few amendments is likely to be considered and would pass very quickly in the Senate.

I thank him for pointing out what I tried to point out this morning. In this 112-page bill, there is one sentence related to the Hyde amendment, which changes what we have been doing here for more than 30 years and which is holding up the passage of this important bill. What we have been pleading with the Republican leaders to do is to remove this sentence, and then let's pass this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. I say to the Senator from Illinois, that the Republican House of Representatives passed this Act without this provision, and Democrats and Republicans here in the Senate should do the same.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, there may be partisan differences over this one sentence, but there is bipartisan support for ending the trafficking and helping the victims.

Thank you, because I know you want to offer another amendment about run-arounds, which is very important. I have met so many of them, as you have. It is a heartbreaking story how so many are abused and exploited. Thank you for your leadership and for bringing this issue to our attention today.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from Illinois, who has worked on this throughout his career, both in the House and in the Senate. It means a lot. I will state what one survivor, Tina Frundt, a survivor of human trafficking who now helps counsel other young trafficking victims, said:

It is not for us to judge the type of services a survivor of sex trafficking needs. We need the basic rights of medical services without judgment.

I think, instead of our trying to be political about this, we should listen to survivors such as Tina. We can't pass a bill that ignores the requests of the various survivors it is designed to help.

Experts across the political spectrum who treat survivors of trafficking are telling us to remove the language.

I heard, for example, from a group called HEAL Trafficking, an organization of health care professionals who treat survivors. These are physicians, nurses, and counselors. They wrote a letter to me and said: "We implore the Senate to pass S. 178 without the inclusion of Hyde amendment language, which would place limits on trafficking survivors' access to vital health services."

I also heard from the service providers, whom I know and respect, at the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth. They work with young people who are exceptionally vulnerable to becoming victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation. They wrote: "There should be no doubt that legislation involving the well-being of individuals who have been victimized by the most base of human behavior should be free of partisan wrangling."

It is time to listen to the people this bill is supposed to help. They say: Take out the provision; pass the bill.

I hope that we will.

I can only imagine what these victims of trafficking go through. I have said several times on the floor—I remember so vividly; I remember as though it were yesterday, listening to some of the victims when we were trying to prosecute the people who trafficked them or harmed them or exploited them. I thought, wouldn't it be great if we had some help to stop this horrible crime from happening in the first place.

But at least we did not have politicians telling us: Well, you can offer this service, but you cannot offer that service. They simply said: Find the best experts you can and use their advice.

The experts are there day by day by day. Let them do their work. Don't play politics with them.

I have said before, when we considered the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, a victim is a victim is a victim. We ought to do what we can to help them.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. President, on another matter which goes into an interesting area, each year, Sunshine Week reminds us we cannot take for granted our democratic system of government. Our Nation's Founders understood that to maintain a true democracy, we have to have an open government. Only an open government can be truly accountable to the people.

But pulling back the curtain on the internal workings of governmental agencies is not always easy. Sometimes, it is not even popular. In some cases, it generates great controversy, as was the case of Senator FEINSTEIN's hard-fought efforts last year to declassify the executive summary of the Senate Intelligence Committee's historic torture report.

This extraordinary report thoroughly reviewed the CIA's use of torture during the Bush administration and revealed that it was far more brutal than we knew. Now, shedding light on the CIA's actions demonstrates to the world that America is different. We acknowledge our mistakes, so that we can learn from them. We do not sweep them under a rug and pretend they never happened. But some seem to want just that.

When Senator FEINSTEIN publically released the executive summary, she also provided the full report, which totaled, I am told, more than 6,700 pages. She provided the full report to the President and the relevant executive branch agencies. The report details the failures that allowed this program to happen. She rightly put these details in the hands of those officials who had appropriate clearances who could learn from the mistakes and ensure that they do not happen again—whether it is a Republican or a Democratic administration.

Unfortunately, some of the program's defenders will stop at nothing in an effort to erase this ugly history. Immediately after the report was issued, there was an unabashed campaign to discredit it and an attempt to portray what happened as something other than what we all know it was—torture.

I have had enough of the disingenuous euphemisms and acronyms used to mask the truly brutal nature of what was done to other human beings. We should acknowledge what it was. It was torture. The President has acknowledged that. And Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch did during her hearing, when she stated clearly and unequivocally that waterboarding is torture. Instead, defenders of this brutality call it something else. They claim it was justified, but then they

offer no evidence to support their assertions and insist outright that they would do it again. Even though they have no evidence that it helped, they imply as much.

But if that wasn't bad enough, some now want to make the report itself disappear. In January, the incoming chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee asked the President and the agencies to return the full report to the Senate.

That is essentially saying: let us pretend we made no mistakes. Let us erase history. Let us be able to open the history book and just see blank pages. We did nothing wrong.

Well, that is outrageous. Neither this historic Senate report nor the shameful truths it reveals can be wiped out of existence.

It is also appalling to learn that several of the agencies that received the full report in December haven't even opened it. In a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuit seeking release of the full report, Justice Department and State Department officials submitted declarations stating that their copies remain locked away in unopened, sealed envelopes. So they can say: I see nothing. It is locked up. It is sealed.

I don't know if this was done in an attempt to bolster the government's position in the FOIA lawsuit or to otherwise avoid Federal records laws. I certainly hope not. But regardless of the motivation, it was a mistake that should be rectified.

The executive summary of the torture report, which they have seen, makes clear that both the State Department and the Justice Department have much to learn from the history of the CIA's torture program. Both agencies were misled by the CIA about the program. Both should consider systemic changes in how they deal with covert actions. Yet neither agency has bothered to open the final, full version of the report or, apparently, even those sections most relevant to them.

The fight for government transparency and accountability is never complete. I have joined with the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, over the years to write and pass tougher provisions in FOIA. I think the importance of the public release of this report's executive summary cannot be overstated. It is one of the most important oversight achievements of this body. Now we must ensure the full report, containing the results of years of painstaking work, is put to good use by those within the executive branch.

So today, as we recognize Sunshine Week, I send this message to the executive branch agencies who received the full Intelligence Committee torture report: Do not return your copy to the Senate. Ensure that the appropriate people in your agencies, with appropriate clearances, have access to it and learn from it. Initiate a process to consider the lessons your agency should learn from this experience. Follow the example of FBI Director Comey, who

last week testified he would designate appropriate people to consider the report and what improvements could be made, because there are no instances when torture is acceptable.

The Convention Against Torture does not make exceptions. There is no doubt that if these actions were committed against American soldiers, by a hostile government, we would immediately condemn them as torture and a violation of international law. We have to make clear to the rest of the world we follow international law. We don't torture. We have to ensure that America never allows this to happen again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, again today, just like yesterday, we saw all but four Senate Democrats filibuster a bill that passed the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously, including nine Democratic Senator votes. This is a bill that is cosponsored by 12 Democrats and a bill that came to the floor by unanimous consent of the Senate—all 100 Senators. Any single Senator could have barred that from happening and forced us to go through procedural hoops. I would like to believe they did so because all of us agree—Democrat and Republican alike—that helping the victims of human trafficking should be our sole and solitary focus in this legislation. And that is what this bill does.

This bill is probably the last bill you would imagine would be controversial—certainly one that people would be loath to politicize—but, indeed, that is exactly what has happened. I just can't explain it. Maybe some of our colleagues who have done this can. How can you cosponsor a bill, how can you vote for it and then come to the floor of the Senate on two occasions and vote to kill it?

Well, as I said earlier, we have four Senate Democrats who have joined with Republicans to pass this piece of legislation, then reconcile it with the House bill, and send it on to President Obama, where I am confident he would sign it. I am confident he would sign it because this is an issue where, if we can't do a bill to help victims of human trafficking, I wonder what we can possibly accomplish. If politics and the divisiveness here in Washington so polarizes people on this bill, how are we going to do the other things we need to do, such as pass a budget? How are we going to take care of our national security needs? How will we deal with the immigration issue? How will we deal with other things that are far more controversial?

Just to reiterate what this bill does, it focuses on the people on the demand side of sex trafficking and the sex

trade. In other words, the people who actually pay for the services provided by these 12-to-14-year-old girls and the pimps that basically manage them.

This takes the money from the people who create the demand. Once they have been convicted and penalized, they pay into a crime victims compensation fund. We estimate, if our calculations are correct, that could generate as much as \$30 million a year—\$30 million a year. That money would then be subject to grants to help organizations that are set up to help the victims of human trafficking.

So not only are we interested in trying to rescue these children from the grasp of these criminal organizations that run human trafficking rings, we want to find a way to help them heal and get better. We have all heard story after story about the tragedy of human trafficking. I have talked to the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, who, as a former prosecutor, understands this issue and the human wreckage left in the wake of the people who purchase these services and help facilitate these criminal organizations. So somehow, some way, we need to find a way to help the victims. Our focus ought to be on them and them alone.

We have heard a lot of, to my mind, phony excuses about this bill. I actually had some Senators tell me they didn't know of this provision that limits the use of the fines and penalties. This is a rule that has prevailed for 39 years, known as the Hyde amendment. They say they didn't know it was there. They didn't read the bill, apparently.

I don't actually quite believe that. I know that staff on both sides in the Judiciary Committee and generally the staff in the Senate are highly professional people. They are not going to let something slip by. But if there is a reason why they did, I believe it is because this language has become routine. It has become routine. It has been in literally every appropriations bill since 1976. It had been in things such as the Children's Health Insurance Program. It has been in Defense authorization bills. It has been in ObamaCare. All of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have voted for this sort of language over and over and over again.

I happen to be proudly pro-life, but we have many colleagues who consider themselves pro-choice who have said: Well, I don't think we ought to appropriate tax dollars to pay for abortions. I agree with the Hyde amendment. So they have clearly had an opportunity to read and understand the bill. I don't believe 12 Senators on the other side would cosponsor a bill they hadn't read and didn't understand. I don't believe nine members of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the other side would vote for it, including the distinguished ranking member, without knowing what was in the bill.

The reason why this was so unremarkable is because, as I said, it

has become routine, and virtually all the legislation that touches on this area has passed since 1976. So why here and why now? Why are we threatening to kill this important piece of legislation to help the most vulnerable victims that exist in America?

It is estimated that about 100,000 children are sex trafficked a year in the United States. It happens in Texas, sadly; it happens in Vermont; and it happens everywhere. The fact of the matter is, most Americans are simply unaware of it because this is an underbelly of life, a criminality that is really unbeknownst to most of us because it happens outside of our view and outside of our experience. But we have thousands of scared and abused children who need our help.

By killing this bill, as our friends across the aisle have done, with the exception of four brave exceptions, instead of our helping hand we are giving them a shrug of indifference. We are saying: You know what. Our political fights here in Washington are more important than your future and your life and the fact that you have been treated as human baggage.

I happen to believe—and I know many share this belief—that we are all created in the image of God, and it is a terrible sin and it is an evil thing to treat a human being created in the image of God as a commodity, as a thing to be bought and sold.

We went through a terrible period in our Nation's history where we had African Americans treated as less than human. We fought a civil war, where 600,000 people died, and then we passed a constitutional amendment and other important legislation to try to heal those wounds that existed from the very beginning of our Nation. Indeed, it has not yet finished healing even today.

Knowing what we know about human slavery and what that has been in our history, why in the world wouldn't we want to do something about modern-day human slavery to try to rectify, to try to rescue, to try to help heal these victims, which is what this legislation does?

To summarize: We have a piece of legislation that contains a provision that has been the law of the land for 39 years. We have a bill on the floor that was cosponsored by 12 Democrats on the other side of the aisle. Unfortunately, most of them have voted to filibuster this bill now that it has come to the floor because of this provision they said they didn't know about or they weren't aware of or they object to.

We have a piece of legislation that will not cost taxpayers anything because it is financed by the fines and penalties assessed against people who demand and purchase these illicit services. That is why this is the sort of bipartisan consensus legislation I think the American people would like to see us pass.

We need to overcome this obstacle. I know the majority leader, Senator

McCONNELL, is determined to give those who are filibustering this bill a chance to change their mind and a chance to let us finish this piece of legislation. Indeed, we need two, maybe three more Senators on that side. I would think that among the 12 people who cosponsored the bill, among the 9 who voted for it already in committee, we could find at least 3 more who would vote for this legislation and allow us to finish it.

I know the distinguished ranking member from Vermont has an amendment he wants to offer on the bill, and he has that right. He should have that right. But we can't do it unless we get past this hurdle of the filibuster. This bill is simply too important to let politics get in the way of helping the innocent victims who need our support.

So the Senate being the way it is, which is somewhat broken these days, how in the world do we get to the point where we can actually help the victims of human trafficking, given the filibuster? Well, Senator McCONNELL has said he is going to keep bringing this bill back again and again—and, indeed, this is now the second vote we have had on this—until we can recruit at least two more Democrats to vote to close off debate to allow us to finish the bill. He has also said we are not going to be able to get to the confirmation of Attorney General Loretta Lynch, which has been voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, until we finish this bill. I agree with that. I think the majority leader has made the right call, because, apparently, if the cries and the needs of the innocent victims of human trafficking aren't enough to move our friends across the aisle to let us finish this bill, then we are going to have to look for whatever leverage we can.

Indeed, I would say this does not bode well for the future of the 114th Congress if this is the way we are going to be operating. I don't know how many nominations will be voted out of committee and be eligible for floor action that will not be considered on the Senate floor because we are stuck in situations such as this—where we know what the right thing to do is, all of the Senators know what the right thing to do is, but somehow we can't quite seem to get it done. We have to get it done. We have to get all of the Senate's business done, including considering the President's nominees.

So I hope we do. I look forward to having another opportunity, perhaps tomorrow, to vote to close off debate. My hope is that overnight, sometime during the next 24 hours, at least 2 more of our colleagues—we would be glad to have more—can examine their conscience, can think about why it is they actually ran for the Senate, why it is they are here. Is it to try to actually do something good to help people who can't help themselves? I believe it is. I think that is why all of us came here, to try to do that. But somehow, some way, we have gotten off track,

and some people think that political games and obstruction are more important than actually doing what we got elected to do and the reason why we actually volunteered to serve in the United States Senate.

So I hope we have at least two more Senators on the other side examine their conscience and reconsider their "no" vote and decide to close off debate by providing the votes. We need to do that tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I totally agree with the senior Senator from Texas that the Hyde amendment has been in a number of bills that spend tax dollars. I have been in the Appropriations Committee for nearly 40 years. I am aware of that. But as the distinguished senior Senator from Texas just stated, there are no tax dollars in this matter. The way he has drafted this bill, it would take moneys from fines levied against those who are convicted of sex exploitation.

This would be the first time, to my knowledge—and I would stand corrected if I am wrong, but I cannot think of a time in the past 40 years that we have applied the Hyde amendment to such funds. I think that is probably why—because there are tax dollars in the House companion bill—that the House of Representatives did not include the Hyde amendment.

I have voted for appropriation bills with the Hyde amendment in it so we could move them to the floor. But to go to this expansion when all these different groups who have written in to us tell us please don't do this, and the groups who actually work with victims—they say don't include it. I agree with them.

I think there can be a way forward. We came together in this body to pass the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, with the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act as an amendment. We worked for some time, but we passed it.

I also want to say that—again, based on my experience here—I cannot think of a time, whether the Senate was under Democratic control or Republican control, that a piece of legislation has been used like this to hold up a key member of the President's Cabinet. Loretta Lynch has been held up longer than the past four Attorney General nominees—four men—put together. She is still being held up. I think that is unfortunate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend and colleague, the Senator from Vermont, whom I have worked with closely on a number of pieces of legislation and whom I would love to be able to work with to find a solution to the current impasse that we have on this legislation—I would say to my friend that if the objection is

that this fund is not subject to the appropriations process, then that is something we ought to discuss and talk about.

Why the fund is so important to me is because the fines and penalties that go into this save the taxpayers money. It actually takes the money from the people who create the demand and uses that to help heal and save and rescue the victims.

I guess I would have a little difference of opinion—and maybe it is just semantics—that once the fines and penalties are paid to the Treasury, my view is they become public dollars although they technically aren't derived from taxes, per se. But beyond that point, I would say once this money is paid into the fund, I think we could come up with a mechanism that would then allow the Appropriations Committee to play its traditional role in directing the money to the purposes for which Congress designates. And I know, as a long-time member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator believes—and I respect—that is an important part of the process.

It is important, though, to note that this would still be subject to the same rule which has prevailed for 39 years, and that is the Hyde amendment. Here is where I don't understand the principle of the objection—because the Hyde amendment has an exception, as the Senator knows, for the physical health and mental health of the mother, as certified by a physician, and also in cases of rape. I can't imagine any case where a potential beneficiary of this fund would be excluded from services that would be allowed under the legislation as written. But I would say if the Senator thinks that might be a fruitful area for us to continue conversations and to figure a way to structure this so that it would be subject to an annual appropriation process—subject to those limitations that have prevailed now since 1976—I think there might be some room for discussion.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Ms. WARREN pertaining to the introduction of S. 793 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. WARREN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I was here for nearly 3 hours this morning when there was some spare time on the floor to get us refocused on the issue at hand, which is the issue of the victims of sex trafficking.

As I noted this morning, this is now the third biggest criminal enterprise in the world. The first is illegal drugs, the second illegal guns, and the third is the illegal sale of children. The average age of a victim of sex trafficking is 12 years old—not even old enough to go to their first prom or not even old enough to get a driver's license. That is what we are talking about here.

As I said, we have seen it in every part of the country. Just last week, there was a case out of Rochester, MN, of a 12-year-old girl who was charged by the U.S. Attorney's office. She got a text and went to a McDonald's parking lot. She thought she was going to go to a party. She got shoved in a car and got brought up to the Twin Cities, got raped. Sexually explicit pictures were taken and posted on Craigslist by the pimp. She was sold for sex to two men, raped by two men. Finally, the guys got caught and they have charged the case. So that is what we are talking about here.

I know there are disagreements on the issues of our time, whether they are the issues of our economy and the budget fight that is going to be coming up next week, or whether it is the issues of foreign relations, but there shouldn't be a disagreement about this. This is a bipartisan bill. There is a provision in this bill that I don't believe needs to be in this bill. There are some potential solutions here and I hope my colleagues are talking about them.

We have to refocus our efforts on what matters. That is what we have to remember. I am tired of looking back at who is blaming who and whose fault it is and now, somehow, it has gotten tied to the confirmation of the next Attorney General of the United States. This makes no sense at all. If these issues are connected at all, it is simply because the Attorney General of the United States helps to enforce the sex trafficking laws. Their office sometimes takes on Federal cases such as we saw in the oil patch of North Dakota. They enforce our other laws, such as what we care about right now in Minnesota where we have had a number of people indicted for going to help ISIS, or we have had 20 people indicted and 9 convictions for helping al-Shabaab, and here we have an Attorney General who is immensely qualified and who literally has the highest number out of her office of terrorism prosecutions in the Nation. So let's just get Loretta Lynch confirmed. That is for starters.

As to this bill, I would like to see a different tone as we discuss it. I would like to see people on both sides of the aisle talk about solutions and remember what we are dealing with here. We have been able to deal with this issue on other bills. I don't understand why

we can't deal with it on this bill. Are these girls less important? Is this something that can just be a political football back and forth? I don't think so.

I want to remind people that in addition to the bill that is on the floor, Senator CORNYN's bill, which sets up a victims fund, there is another bill, and that is the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. That is my bill. Senator CORNYN is the cosponsor. There are 19 bipartisan cosponsors. It is a bill that went through the Judiciary Committee a few weeks ago—unanimously on the vote. Every single Senator voted for it. A similar version led by Representative ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota has gone through the House. I like ours a little better because it includes a national sex trafficking strategy. Those two bills will be easily resolved to get this done.

My hope is—my bill is supposed to be the first amendment once we can go on to this bill, once we get the fix of the bill—the provision of the bill that is in controversy. I want to remind people that this bill is equally important. It sets a standard—the safe harbor bill—so other States will start looking at Minnesota and what about 15 other States have done. It says these 12-year-olds are not criminals; they are victims.

How can you say a 12-year-old is a criminal? They are victims. Once you start thinking like that, it changes the way you handle the cases. As a former prosecutor, what matters to me is that when you change the way you look at the case, you have a better case because then you have a victim who feels they have some place to go—a shelter. They can get a job. They can get an education. They are much more likely to turn on the pimp and to turn on the perpetrator that is running the sex ring.

In Minnesota, last year we got a 40-year sentence against a guy. John Choi, the chief attorney for Ramsey County, got a guy that was running one of these rings. That is what is going on here when we talk about this bill and the importance of passing this bill.

We have the 20 women Senators who came together and asked for a hearing on sex trafficking. We got that done. Now is the time where I hope we can come together and resolve this.

So one of the things I have taken to doing is reading Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn's great book "Half the Sky."

"Half the Sky" refers to women holding up half the sky. It refers to the fact that we have countries and systems that marginalize women and don't treat them as equal. This is not good for our world.

We have seen countries that do it the worst, that treat them as sex slaves, that allow that to happen. Those countries tend to have very poor human rights records. They tend not to be good partners for our country. If we

want to lead the way for the world, we have to start on our own turf, where 86 percent of the victims in sex trafficking in the United States are from the United States.

If we are going to reach out to other countries, such as HEIDI HEITKAMP, Cindy McCain, and I did last spring—we went down to Mexico to work with them on some of the issues of cases on which they have actually helped in the United States with the U.S. attorney's office. We need to be able to show that our country is doing the right thing, and this is an opportunity to do that.

So I have been reading from this book in part in the hope that we can change the tone and remember who we are here to protect. It is also a great book. They have actually written another book as well that is focused on domestic sex trafficking that I will be reading from tomorrow as well.

I note this is not an official filibuster, but whenever I have time and there is time on the floor, I am simply going to come down here to remind people of the importance of getting this bill done.

So we are talking in the book—I was in the chapter on “Prohibition and Prostitution.” I talked about the fact that “the tools to crush modern slavery”—I am reading from the book—“but the political will is lacking.”

That seems to be what is going on in this Chamber when extraneous bills are in the way of getting this done. When my Republican coauthor over in the House has said that these kinds of politics don't belong on these bills, I agree.

The tools to crush modern slavery exist, but the political will is lacking. That must be the starting point of any abolitionist movement. We're not arguing that Westerners should take up this cause because it's the fault of the West; Western men do not play a central role in prostitution in most poor countries. True, American and European sex tourists are part of the problem in Thailand, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Belize, but they are still only a small percentage of the johns. The vast majority are local men. Moreover, Western men usually go with girls who are more or less voluntary prostitutes, because they want to take the girls back to their hotel rooms, while forced prostitutes are not normally allowed out of the brothels. So this is not a case where we in the West have a responsibility to lead because we're the source of the problem. Rather, we single out the West because, even though we're peripheral to the slavery, our action is necessary to overcome a horrific evil.

So that is my argument here, that by doing something here in this Chamber and by showing that we care about these girls in the United States, then we show we care internationally and it should be a major tenet of our foreign policy.

One reason the modern abolitionist movement hasn't been more effective is the divisive politics of prostitution.

I talked about this earlier today. The issue that we have is that a number of people way back—including the late great Senator Paul Wellstone of Minnesota, Senator Brownback of Kansas,

Hillary Rodham Clinton, CAROLYN MALONEY, whom I just left on the Joint Economic Committee, and George W. Bush—showed great leadership in this area. So we have seen time and again people being able to come together across party lines to get this done.

So they talk about how things have changed, and they say that “over time, we've changed our minds” about how we look at this. They talk about the fact that it used to be: Well, let's legalize prostitution and regulate. That will really work. I think we have learned that it will never really work. It doesn't work in those countries that have tried it, and it certainly doesn't work for these young girls who are victims of the sex trade. So they talk about how we, in fact, through law enforcement, need to go after the profits and we have to take this on. That is what the bills we are considering help to do. They give State and local prosecutors and shelters the tools that they need.

They say:

We won't eliminate prostitution. In Iran, brothels are strictly banned, and the mayor of Tehran was a law-and-order hard-liner until, according to Iranian news accounts, he was arrested in a police raid on a brothel where he was in the company of six naked prostitutes. So crackdowns don't work perfectly, but they tend to lead nervous police to demand higher bribes, which reduces profitability for the pimps. Or the police will close down at least those brothels that aren't managed by other police officers. With such methods, we can almost certainly reduce the number of fourteen-year-old girls who are held in cages until they die of AIDS.

This is happening in our world.

“It's pretty doable,” says Gary Haugen, who runs International Justice Mission. “You don't have to arrest everybody. You just have to get enough that it sends a ripple effect and changes the calculations. That changes the pimps' behavior. You can drive traffickers of virgin village girls to fence stolen radios instead.”

Many liberals and feminists are taken aback by the big stick approach we advocate, arguing that it just drives sex establishments underground. They argue instead for a legalize-and-regulate model based on empowerment of sex workers, and they cite a success: The Sonagachi Project.

Sonagachi, which means “golden tree,” is a sprawling red-light district in Kolkata. In the 1700s and 1800s, it had been a legendary locale for concubines. Today it has hundreds of multistory brothels built along narrow alleys, housing more than six thousand prostitutes. In the early 1990s, health experts were deeply concerned about the spread of AIDS in India, and in 1992 they started [this project]. . . . A key element was to nurture a union of sex workers . . . which would encourage condom use and thus reduce the spread of AIDS through prostitution.

DMSC seemed successful in encouraging the use of condoms. It publicized its role as a pragmatic solution to the public health problems of prostitution. One study found [this project] increased . . . condom use by 25 percent.

They go on to explain it.

But then they say—and this is key to our approach to trying not to allow prostitution to continue:

As we probed the numbers, however, we saw that they were flimsier than they at

first appeared. HIV prevalence was inexplicably high among new arrivals . . . 27.7 percent among sex workers aged twenty or younger. Research had also shown that, initially, all sex workers interviewed . . . claimed to use condoms nearly all the time. But when pressed, they admitted lower rates. . . .

This goes on and they talk about the problem with this. What we are talking about here is underage girls and what is really going on.

I am going to quote from one story they told when they went to this brothel.

While the madam spoke with others in the room, gushing about the group's success, the three of us on the bed asked the prostitute in Hindi to tell us if those things were true. Afraid and timid, the prostitute remained silent until we assured her that we wouldn't get her in trouble. Barely audible, she told us that almost none of the prostitutes . . . came with aspirations of being a sex worker. Most of them like herself were trafficked. . . . When I asked her if she wanted to leave Sonagachi, her eyes lit up; before she could say anything, the DMSC official put her hand on my back and said that it was time to move on. . . .

These are stories about how it doesn't really work to have this model of allowing the prostitution to continue and regulate.

In the developing world, however, this difficult, polarizing debate is mostly just a distraction. In India, for example, brothels are technically illegal—but, as we said earlier, they are ubiquitous—the same is true in Cambodia. In poor countries, the law is often irrelevant, particularly outside the capital. Our focus has to be on changing reality, not changing laws.

Congress took an important step in that direction in 2000 by requiring the State Department to put out an annual Trafficking in Persons report—the TIP report.

I will remind again that this was done on a bipartisan basis. We didn't see the kind of fights we are having now because people decided that here is one thing that we could agree on—from Paul Wellstone to Sam Brownback—and that perhaps without having outside political debates, we can agree that we do not want young girls aged 12 to be sex trafficked.

What did this report do?

The report ranks countries according to how they tackle trafficking, and those in the lowest tier are sanctioned. This meant that for the first time U.S. embassies abroad had to gather information on trafficking. American diplomats began holding discussions with their foreign ministry counterparts, who then had to add trafficking to the list of major concerns such as proliferation and terrorism. As a result, the foreign ministries made inquiries of the national police agencies.

Simply asking questions put the issue on the agenda. Countries began passing laws, staging crackdowns, and compiling fact sheets. Pimps found that the cost of bribing police went up, eroding their profit margins.

This approach can be taken further. Within the State Department, the trafficking office has been marginalized, even relegated to another building. If the secretary of state publicly and actively embraced the trafficking office—

I think we see this has happened since this book was written—since 2009

under Secretary Clinton and Secretary Kerry.

. . . that would elevate the issue's profile. The President could visit a shelter . . .

And, by the way, that is something that HEDI HEITKAMP, Cindy McCain, and I did when we went to Mexico.

Europe should have made trafficking an issue in negotiating the accession of Eastern European countries wishing to enter the European Union, and it can still make this an issue for Turkey in that regard.

The big-stick approach should focus in particular on the sale of virgins. Such transactions, particularly in Asia, account for a disproportionate share of trafficker profits and kidnappings of young teenagers. And the girls, once raped, frequently resign themselves to being prostitutes until they die. It is often rich Asians, particularly overseas Chinese, who are doing the buying—put a few of them in jail, and good things will happen: The market for virgins will quickly shrink, their price will drop, gangs will shift to less risky and more profitable lines of business, the average age of prostitutes will rise somewhat, and the degree of compulsion in prostitution will diminish as well.

This is from "Half the Sky," written by New York Times reporter Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. They have a more recent book that they have written called "A Path Appears," and this is about domestic prostitution, which I will also be reading from. But I thought I would start that tomorrow, as we continue to focus on this, so people understand what we are really talking about.

As we all know, the bills before the Senate today are about domestic trafficking. They are about what is happening in the United States right now in every town in this country.

We talked earlier this morning about why this is happening, why we are seeing this kind of increase, and we are talking about it more. The reason is that more and more because of the Internet people can anonymously advertise. They can send instant messages and texts. It is just more hidden, and it is harder to track down for law enforcement. That is part of why we are seeing this going on right now and why this is such a major issue in our country.

I would tie it into our international theme, because, again, first of all, we have a percentage of these victims—mostly girls—who come from foreign countries. So it matters to us what goes on in foreign countries with their law, which is the focus of "Half the Sky."

But it also matters to us because we want a better world, and we want these countries to do better. We don't want to put all our money in military spending. We want these countries to become democracies, to become trading partners, to become places that we can work with. Instead, if we allow these girls to be subjugated and we allow them to be chattel and we allow them to be treated like slaves, they are never going to get the kind of democracy that we want them to get to and that will allow for a better country. You are not going to have a woman

elected to the Senate in one of these countries if they believe that women can be treated as chattel, as we are seeing in so many of these places.

So I am going to go to the next part of the chapter, which is called "Rescuing Girls Is the Easy Part."

We became slave owners in the twenty-first century the old-fashioned way: We paid cash in exchange for two slave girls and a couple of receipts. The girls were then ours to do with as we liked.

Rescuing girls from brothels is the easy part, however. The challenge is keeping them from returning. The stigma that the girls feel in their communities after being freed, coupled with drug dependencies or threats from pimps, often lead them to return to the red-light district. It's emotionally dispiriting for well-meaning aid workers who oversee a brothel raid to take the girls back to a shelter and give them food and medical care, only to see the girls climb over the back wall.

That is what I talked about earlier. That is why, when we look at it from a U.S. perspective, what these bills focus on is trying to turn these girls' lives around and trying to set that standard. We are not mandating it in other States; we are simply creating some incentives and giving them some funding so that States can start doing these cases in a different way and start seeing them as victims and making it easier to go after the people who are running the ring.

Back to the book:

Our unusual purchase came about when Nick—

Referring here to Nick Kristof—

traveled with Naka Nathaniel, then a New York Times videographer, to an area in northwestern Cambodia notorious for its criminality. Nick and Naka arrived at the town of Poipet and checked into an \$8-a-night guest house that doubled as a brothel. They focused their interviews on two teenage girls, Srey Neth and Srey Momm, each in a different brothel.

Neth was very pretty, short and light-skinned. She looked fourteen or fifteen, but she thought she was older than that; she had no idea of her actual birth date. A woman pimp brought her to Nick's room, and she sat on the bed, quivering with fear. She had been in the brothel only a month, and Nick would have been her first foreign customer. Nick needed his interpreter present in the room as well, and this puzzled the pimp, who nevertheless accommodated.

Black hair fell over Neth's shoulders and onto her tight pink T-shirt. Below, she wore equally tight blue jeans, and sandals. Neth had plump cheeks, but the best of her was thin and fragile; thick makeup caked her face in a way that seemed incongruous, as if she were a child who had played with her mother's cosmetics.

After some awkward conversation through the interpreter, as Nick asked Neth about how she had grown up and about her family, she began to calm down. She stopped trembling and mostly looked in the direction of the television in the corner of the room, which Nick had put on to muffle the sound of their voices. She responded to questions briefly and without interest.

Now we have been joined—I am going to stop reading from the book for a while. Senator FEINSTEIN has come to the floor. Senator FEINSTEIN has been a true leader on this issue of sex traf-

ficking. She is a senior member of the Judiciary Committee—the only other woman on the Judiciary Committee besides me, with, I think, 20-some guys. She knows how important this issue is. I know she is going to talk a little bit about that as well as some other things. I welcome her to the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as I may consume.

As Senator KLOBUCHAR stated, I come to the floor to speak on the sex trafficking bill. I know it is now held up by certain language, which I will go into in the details of my remarks, but briefly, I would like to begin by describing the bill's highlights. The bill clarifies that a person who buys a sex act from a minor or other trafficking victim can be prosecuted under the Federal commercial sex trafficking statute. The bill authorizes block grants for State and local governments to develop programs to rescue trafficking victims and investigate and prosecute traffickers. The bill also includes nearly all of the provisions from the Combat Human Trafficking Act which Senator PORTMAN and I introduced in January.

I am very grateful to the authors—Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator CORNYN—for adding these. Those provisions establish a minimum period of 5 years of supervised release for a person who conspires to violate the commercial sex trafficking statute.

It would require the Justice Department to train on investigating and prosecuting buyers, on seeking restitution, and on connecting victims with health services. It would require reporting on sex trafficking prosecutions. It would expand wiretap authority to cover all human trafficking offenses. It would expand the rights of crime victims—something I have been interested in since Senator Kyl and I did the Crime Victims' Bill of Rights.

The bill, which is not controversial, should pass, except for the surreptitious inclusion—I use this word considered—of a provision that is known as the Hyde amendment. The provision was not included by language but by cross-reference to provisions in another previously enacted appropriations bill.

Here is what it says:

Limitations. Amounts in the Fund, or otherwise transferred from the Fund, shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending of amounts described in sections 506 and 507 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 409) to the same extent as if amounts in the Fund were funds appropriated under division H of such Act.

This provision was not included in the bill Senator CORNYN introduced last Congress, which I cosponsored. His staff approached my staff and staffs of other Senators early in 2015. They asked if I would cosponsor again. My staff asked whether the bill was identical to last year's bill and for an explanation of any changes that were

made. Senator CORNYN's staff then sent back an email with a list of changes—seven changes in all. That list did not include the Hyde amendment language that had been added. That language was not mentioned to my staff at any point.

In other words, an important and sensitive change was made to the bill and was not disclosed upon request. That does not excuse us for not catching this, but if you see the complicated and sort of obfuscated nature of this—I am not saying it is intended obfuscation, but all of the numbers that are in there—I think it makes it understandable.

If the Hyde amendment—which is what this is—if that language comes out, this bill will pass easily.

Let me address for a moment the enormous problem we are trying to address with this bill. Today, high demand and easy access fuels a huge amount of sex trafficking. Human trafficking today is the second largest criminal industry in the world. It is only behind illegal drugs.

In 2005, human trafficking was a \$32 billion criminal enterprise. Today, some 9 years later, it is a \$150 billion estimate of illegal gains. Two-thirds of the proceeds from human trafficking come from sex trafficking.

Children as young as 12, 13, and 14 can be found on the street or over the Internet. It is not an exaggeration to say that this is modern-day slavery. Those victims are moved against their will to cities throughout the country and even to other countries, wherever demand is high.

Trafficking rings are also run by gangs. In San Diego, for example, profits are so great and the risk of being caught so minimal that rival gangs do not fight each other over sex trafficking, as they do when drugs are involved.

Some traffickers make as much as \$33,000 per week. These are numbers gathered by the Urban Institute: Atlanta, gross take per trafficker per week, \$32,833; Denver, \$31,200; Seattle, \$18,000; Miami, \$17,741; Dallas, \$12,025; Washington, DC, \$11,588; and San Diego, \$11,129. This is weekly gross cash intake per individual trafficker.

Traffickers lure victims through promises of love and money or sometimes use an older trafficked girl as a recruiter. Those criminals prey on the most vulnerable children in our society, including those who are homeless or in the foster care system. They target children who have been victims of sexual abuse. Once they have a victim under their control, they may traffic him or her from city to city based on demand.

For example, this is a slide of California. It is from the Orange County Human Trafficking Task Force, and it shows the route traffickers take to move victims around the State of California to meet demand. You can see these circles from Oakland to Sacramento and then down into the Inland

Empire and then from Los Angeles all the way around into the Inland Empire. So you can actually track various routes. Orange County did this. The orange center here is meant to be Orange County.

This particular task force is comprised of a number of Federal and local law enforcement agencies in Orange County, including Anaheim and Huntington Beach police departments, the U.S. Attorney's Office, the FBI, and the District Attorney's Office.

Now, here it comes: Regardless of how children are first trafficked, one thing is almost universal—victims will be advertised on the Internet. By one estimate, 76 percent of child sex trafficking victims—76 percent of them are sold over the Internet.

My staff and I have spoken with a number of law enforcement officials in California about the Internet's role in connecting sellers of underage children with buyers. Nearly every single official we spoke with said the Internet is the primary means to connect sellers with buyers. So this is where we next must take decisive steps to stop sex trafficking. Purveyors of these online ads must be held accountable. Senator KIRK and I have an amendment that will do that.

There are at least 19 distinct Web sites that accept ads relating to trafficking underage boys and girls. Here they are: Backpage.com; EscortAds.xxx; ErosAds.com; EscortsInCollege.com; AsianEscortSF.com; EscortsInThe.us; LiveEscortReviews.com; MyProviderGuide.com; EroticMugShots.com; NaughtyReviews.com; EscortPhoneList.com; RubAds.com; Eros.com; TheEroticReview.com; RubMaps.com; APerfectSin.com; EscortDater.com; MyRedBook.com; and NightShift.com. Nineteen Web sites act as purveyors of child sex trafficking in this country. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

This site I am going to show you, Backpage.com, allows a purveyor to post an advertisement for an escort or a body rub. In fact, nearly all of these ads are for commercial sex acts; many of them depict minors. When you view an ad for an escort or a body rub, you will see pictures of young girls, often with few or no clothes on.

Now I am going to show you two girls. The first is a missing 17-year-old girl. She is here as a runaway. This is a listing of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, a very legitimate organization which I am fully in support of. It is entitled "Endangered Runaway," and it is information about her, her date of birth, her age, her sex, her race, and all of it, and where you can get in touch if you have any information.

I wish to show how this is also used. This is the same girl on Backpage, and this essentially says:

Hello Texas,
Are you looking for an unforgettable experience? Look no further!

I am 100% Great service provider!
I am very down to earth, warm, sensitive, passionate,
and genuinely interested in giving you a great experience.

And it goes on and on.

This is the same picture of this same girl.

We blocked out the image, and it is shocking. It is simply shocking that this is going on to the extent it is in our country, right in a ribald way on the Internet.

Law enforcement officials and anti-trafficking organizations say there are a number of key indicators that allow them to identify ads that are likely for trafficking victims.

In this advertisement we see three of those key indicators. First, the title states the victim is "New to your City." Anti-trafficking organizations say this is code for being underage. You may also see girls in ads described as "new," "fresh," or "new in town" to indicate they are underage. Second, we see a victim is listed from outside the area. Here she is listed as from Miami for a posting that is in the Houston area.

Third, the victim also has an out-of-area phone number.

Those are three indicators of what this ad is for—to sell sex with children. Law enforcement and experts confirm this point.

The Cook County Sheriff's Office in Illinois found that 100 percent of women claiming to be massage therapists or platonic escorts on one Web site, Backpage, were being sold for sex. This isn't mine, this is the Cook County Sheriff's Office.

The sheriff's office set up so-called dates with 618 girls via Backpage. All 618 agreed to provide sex for money.

The sheriff's office concluded: "This presents irrefutable evidence that Backpage is indeed a haven for pimps and sex solicitors who are victimizing women and girls for their own gain. Any notion that Backpage employs a legitimate business model simply does not stand up to the facts."

This is a direct letter from Sheriff Tom Dart, Cook County, IL.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum to Sheriff Tom Dart.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOK COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE MEMORANDUM
Date: 6/9/2014.
To: Sheriff Thomas J. Dart.
From: Deputy Chief Michael Anton, Cook County Sheriff's Police.
Subject: Backpage.com Arrests.

Per Sheriff Dart's direction, the Cook County Sheriff's Police Vice Unit has utilized Backpage.com as its primary forum for recovering victims of human trafficking in Cook County. Please find our year-to-year Backpage arrest statistics

Cook County Sheriff's Police Arrests Off of Backpage:
2009: 142
2010: 108
2011: 63

2012: 121
 2013: 135
 2014 (through the end of May): 49
 Total: 618

Additionally, the Cook County Sheriff's Police Vice Unit has made 42 arrests for Involuntary Servitude, Human Trafficking or Prostitution since 2007, with many of those investigations originating from responses to Backpage ads.

It is important to note that 100% of the women claiming to be massage therapists or platonic escorts on Backpage have accepted the offer of money for sex from our undercover male officers. Our team has set up "dates" with 618 via this website—all 618 have turned out to be prostitutes. This presents irrefutable evidence that Backpage is indeed a haven for pimps and sex solicitors who are victimizing women and girls for their own gain. Any notion that Backpage employs a legitimate business model simply does not stand up to the facts.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. A study of ads placed in this year's Super Bowl in Phoenix concludes that 65 percent of the ads placed on Backpage's Phoenix Web site around the weekend of the game had indicators that the ad was for a victim of sex trafficking.

Simply put, there are Internet companies that are profiting off the rape and abuse of children. This must stop.

One way we can combat sex trafficking over the Internet is to make it a crime for a person such as the owner of a Web site to knowingly advertise a commercial sex act with a minor. As I said, Senator KIRK and I have introduced such an amendment. It would create a new offense of knowingly advertising a commercial sex act with a minor on the Internet.

The amendment is identical to a House bill that has 52 cosponsors and passed that Chamber by voice vote.

If we come to a point where we are voting on amendments to Senator CORNYN's bill, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I know Senator KIRK and I would bring it to the floor.

Last October, 53 attorneys general offered a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of the bill that Senator KIRK and I introduced last June that is similar to the amendment. This is the list of the attorneys general.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of 53 attorneys general.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
 ATTORNEYS GENERAL,
 Washington, DC, October 20, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
 Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
 Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: We, the undersigned state and territorial attorneys general, urge you to join us in the fight against human trafficking in the United States. We commend your recent action to pass legislation to increase federal penalties and victim restitution and encourage you to act to protect

children from being trafficked on the Internet by passing S. 2536, the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act (SAVE Act).

Human trafficking is tied as the second largest and is the fastest growing criminal industry in the world, generating roughly \$150 billion each year. According to a study of Department of Justice human trafficking task force cases, 83 percent of sex trafficking victims identified in the United States were U.S. citizens. Shockingly, there are numerous cases nationally of children being used in prostitution as young as 12.

Every day, children in the United States are sold for sex. The use of the "adult services sections" on websites such as Backpage.com has created virtual brothels where children are bought and sold using euphemistic labels such as "escorts." The involvement of these advertising companies is not accidental—these companies have constructed their business models around income gained from those participating in commercial sex. In just one week this June, law enforcement arrested 281 alleged sex traffickers and took 168 children out of prostitution in a nationwide FBI crackdown where many child victims were offered for sale on "escort" and other "adult services" websites. Organized crime groups as well as street gangs are involved with human trafficking, and many of these perpetrators use the Internet to sell their victims.

The undersigned attorneys general respectfully request that the Senate Judiciary Committee pass the SAVE Act so that these websites that are facilitating trafficking through their very business model will have to take steps to verify the identity of individuals posting advertisements and the age of those who appear in these advertisements.

We thank you in advance for your continued dedication to the eradication of human trafficking.

Greg Zoeller, Indiana Attorney General; Luther Strange, Alabama Attorney General; Tom Horne, Arizona Attorney General; Kamala Harris, California Attorney General; George Jepsen, Connecticut Attorney General; Irvin Nathan, District of Columbia Attorney General; Robert W. Ferguson, Washington Attorney General; Michael Geraghty, Alaska Attorney General; Dustin McDaniel, Arkansas Attorney General; John W. Suthers, Colorado Attorney General; Joseph R. "Beau" Biden III, Delaware Attorney General; Pamela Jo Bondi, Florida Attorney General; Samuel S. Olens, Georgia Attorney General; David Louie, Hawaii Attorney General; Lisa Madigan, Illinois Attorney General; Derek Schmidt, Kansas Attorney General; James "Buddy" Caldwell, Louisiana Attorney General; Douglas F. Gansler, Maryland Attorney General.

Bill Schuette, Michigan Attorney General; Lenny Rapadas, Guam Attorney General; Lawrence Wasden, Idaho Attorney General; Tom Miller, Iowa Attorney General; Jack Conway, Kentucky Attorney General; Janet Mills, Maine Attorney General; Martha Coakley, Massachusetts Attorney General; Lori Swanson, Minnesota Attorney General; Jim Hood, Mississippi Attorney General; Tim Fox, Montana Attorney General; Catherine Cortez Masto, Nevada Attorney General; John Jay Hoffman, New Jersey Attorney General (Acting); Eric T. Schneiderman, New York Attorney General; Wayne Stenehjem, North Dakota Attorney General; Michael DeWine, Ohio Attorney General; Chris Koster, Missouri Attorney General; Jon Bruning, Nebraska Attorney General;

Joseph Foster, New Hampshire Attorney General.

Gary King, New Mexico Attorney General; Roy Cooper, North Carolina Attorney General; Gilbert Birnbrich, Northern Mariana Islands Attorney General (Acting); Scott Pruitt, Oklahoma Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; César R. Miranda Rodriguez, Puerto Rico Attorney General; Alan Wilson, South Carolina Attorney General; Herbert H. Slatery, III, Tennessee Attorney General; Sean Reyes, Utah Attorney General; Mark R. Herring, Virginia Attorney General; Peter K. Michael, Wyoming Attorney General; Kathleen Kane, Pennsylvania Attorney General; Peter Kilmartin, Rhode Island Attorney General; Marty J. Jackley, South Dakota Attorney General; Greg Abbott, Texas Attorney General; William H. Sorrell, Vermont Attorney General; Patrick Morrissey, West Virginia Attorney General.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The attorneys general wrote:

The use of the "adult services sections" on websites such as Backpage.com has created virtual brothels where children are bought and sold using euphemistic labels such as "escorts."

This is a quote from a letter to this effect—I don't want anybody to think this is what I am saying, it is what they are saying.

The use of the term "adult services sections" on websites such as Backpage.com has created virtual brothels where children are bought and sold using euphemistic labels such as "escorts."

Put simply, if you have knowledge that an advertisement placed on your Web site is for commercial sex with a minor, then you should be prosecuted. That is what our amendment would do.

I have no doubt that prohibiting misconduct by a Web site owner is constitutional. As the Supreme Court has held on several occasions: "Offers to engage in illegal transactions are categorically excluded from First Amendment protection."

In fact, the Supreme Court in 1973 wrote: "We have no doubt that a newspaper constitutionally could be forbidden to publish a want ad proposing a sale of narcotics or soliciting prostitutes."

This amendment targets illegal conduct—commercial sex with minors—that would not be protected by the First Amendment.

It imposes liability on Web sites that know that their sites are being used to advertise minors for sex.

In conclusion, the Internet has made this industry what it is, the second largest criminal industry in the world, second only to drugs, and it is up to us to do something about it.

One of our duties in this body is to protect the most vulnerable of individuals. That includes children, and this is what this amendment does.

Some say other parts of the bill will help stop sex trafficking, and we don't need to touch the Internet. That makes no sense to me. Seventy-six percent of sales of sex trafficking victims begin on the Internet. So you can just touch

a small part of it—this touches 76 percent of victims.

We cannot allow these Web sites to continue to operate with impunity. It is time to take a stand, stop the ads, and stop the exploitation of children.

I look forward to Senator KIRK coming to the floor, presenting our amendment, assuming we can get past this block. This is so much more important than putting the Hyde amendment, cloaked in difficult language, in this bill, when the House bill doesn't contain it. The House understands that it is going to have difficulty passing it with this in the bill. Why isn't that recognized in this House? If they take that out, this bill swims through.

Mr. CORNYN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CORNYN. I was in my office and watching the Senator on TV, so I thought I would come to the floor and maybe we could get to the bottom of this. There seems to be a ship passing in the night, it seems to me.

I know the Senator from California cares passionately about this issue, and I don't question that for a moment. It is very clear to me. But I ask the Senator from California, she graciously agreed to cosponsor this legislation?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I did.

Mr. CORNYN. She voted for it in the Senate Judiciary Committee that passed unanimously. It does contain, on page 50 and 51 of this bill, the language that the Senator referred to. I saw it on my TV screen in my office, which incorporates the limitation that was contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. It incorporates that into the bill by reference.

Not only—I believe the Senator voted for the bill in committee and cosponsored it. The Senator also voted for that limitation in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. This is the same or similar language of what was contained in the Affordable Care Act, contained in the Defense authorization bill, and contained in literally every appropriations bill since 1976.

This is what I would love to have my friend, the Senator from California, explain to me: Why is it that it all of a sudden becomes objectionable on this legislation—when you care and I care so passionately about getting help for these victims—that this is the reason to derail the legislation?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Because of what this legislation is. This legislation is the raping and the misconduct, sexually, with young girls, girls 14, 15, and 16. What if they are impregnated? Should they be entitled to be able to go and get an abortion? Does this body really want them to be forced to bear somebody else's child?

So this offers the opportunity for some funding. These aren't wealthy girls. They don't live in Beverly Hills, Hyde Park, or any of these places that are prominent. They are on the streets. They are lost, maybe lost mentally,

lost physically. They may have been abused, and now they are caught up in an industry where they are held hostage in the night.

I have read of some in a neighborhood in my city being handcuffed at night, stripped, so they don't have clothes and can't run away. They are put out on the streets, they are watched. They are moved around. If it becomes too hot in one area, they are moved to another. They are moved to another State, and they come from other countries.

It just seems to me to have this in this bill—and, Senator, I have great respect for you. I have wanted to work with you on this. I know you are sincere.

It is not in the House bill. So maybe the House understands this. I can't speak for the House.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am pleased to do so.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Otherwise, we are going to have to keep addressing questions through the Chair and keep asking for permission. I think it is great to have an honest conversation with my friend.

So it is clear that the Senator from California has voted for this restriction on use of taxpayer funding for abortions previously, correct?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Not to my knowledge. Let me put it that way. Now you can blame me and say I should have known—I am not the only one on our committee, Senator, who is in this position, either, who communicated with your staff and was under the impression that the bill was identical to last year, with the exception of seven pieces, which are not this. The seven were detailed to us.

Mr. CORNYN. I am not going to engage in a debate about whether the Senator should have known or how she voted in the past. I believe the record would demonstrate that she and others voted for the Affordable Care Act, which actually National Abortion Rights Action League says is an expansion of the Hyde amendment.

I ask the Senator, you rightly point out that these child victims of sexual assault will have been raped, either statutory rape—they are below the age of consent—or they are adults and they have been assaulted, criminally assaulted.

Isn't it your understanding of the Hyde amendment that the exclusion to the Hyde amendment would still allow them to gain access to the services that you believe they need or deserve?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Yes. I think that is correct. I suppose we could change this to have a rape implication, but the gauntlet has been thrown down. And it is not up to me alone to remove it.

There was no open discussion in our committee when we discussed this that there was a highly sensitive issue in it, Senator.

Now, I will plead *mea culpa*. And guess what. I will wave a whip and get my staff and say: Look henceforth at every code change. But my colleague and I both know that occasionally things slip through. I will plead *mea culpa* on that. But once I found out, I had an obligation to do something about it.

So I am pleading with my colleague, let's just take it out. Let's just pass this bill. Let's put the Kirk-Feinstein amendment in. Let's go after the Internet purveyors. Let's go after 19 sites that put pictures of girls 12, 13, and 14 to be sold all around the United States, to be sold after big football games in various areas of the country. Let's go after them. Isn't that more important?

I would like to ask my colleague a question.

Mr. CORNYN. That is the reason I am so confused by the filibuster of this legislation by people, including my friend, who are cosponsors of the legislation and who already voted for it.

I am not about pointing fingers in terms of what staff or Members should have read or understood about the legislation, but I believe the reason it was not debated at the Judiciary Committee level is because it had become a routine matter since 1976, when the Hyde amendment was passed. Every appropriation of Labor-HHS or other funding that could arguably use tax dollars for abortions has been limited by the Hyde amendment language.

I had a couple of Senators in my office yesterday afternoon who are proudly pro-choice. I am proudly pro-life. But even my pro-choice friends said we still believe taxpayer funds should not be used for abortions except in the case of rape or to protect the health of the victim.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Well, why then, if I may ask a question, respectfully.

Mr. CORNYN. Sure.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Why isn't it in the House language?

Mr. CORNYN. I would say to my friend that I can't vouch for the House's product. I can just say what the Congress as a whole has done since 1976, and it has limited the expenditure of funds for this purpose under the terms of the Hyde amendment.

That was the reason we referred in the legislation, on page 50, which my colleague has blown up here, referring to the language in the Committee on Appropriations, which I am confident my friend, the Senator from California, voted for, just as she did in the limitation that was contained in the Affordable Care Act and all the other times that Hyde has been part of our process. This has become so unremarkable and so routine that it hardly seems like something someone would point out because this language doesn't change the status quo at all.

So we have talked about ways to get past this impasse, and I would just

have to say I think abandoning the Hyde amendment would be a dramatic mistake and something I am not willing to be a part of. It has become this one area, in a divisive area of abortion, where there has been bipartisan consensus for 39 years, at least to the point it has remained the law of the land effectively. To take it out and say somehow we are going to depart from that today or this week would, to me, be a dramatic expansion of taxpayer funding for this purpose that I can't support.

So I would say, if there are ways we can deal with this fund, as a fund that can be appropriated on an annual basis subject to the normal restrictions—that is something I talked about with the ranking member, our friend from Vermont, that possibility—I think there are ways we might be able to get to a solution. But stripping out this limitation, which has been the law of the land for 39 years, is not acceptable because it would represent a huge expansion on the use of taxpayer funding for abortions in ways many of my pro-choice friends don't support.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Well, I guess I disagree with that. Those of us who believe a woman should control her own reproductive system, in concert with her family and her doctor, have objection to the government getting involved and telling us what to do. It is actually not your reproductive system—and I say “you” generically, as a man—it is our reproductive system. In a sense this has been a battle for our identity.

I sat on a term-setting and paroling authority in California in the 1960s, when abortion was illegal. I sentenced women to State prison for abortion. It had then an indeterminate sentence of between 6 months and 10 years. I saw abortionists come back to prison. I asked one, when I was setting the sentence: Why do you keep doing this? Her first name was Anita. And she said: Because I feel so sorry for the women.

That was the way it was. I remember passing the plate at Stanford for a young woman to go to Tijuana for an abortion. The morbidity that was done to women through back-alley abortions, this has opened a Pandora's box of big emotional issues for women.

As to the Hyde amendment, if there is rape and you can prove it, that is right; and then there is a 12-year-old, a 13-year-old who is out on the streets as a prostitute, which is a different thing—sort of the same but sort of different. The overwhelming evil of this trade overcomes any of this, because you take a young woman, and you probably change their life for the worse for the rest of her life.

Imagine your daughter being out on the street; my daughter, my granddaughters being out on the street like this and what it would do to them being handcuffed and moved and traded around the country and girls brought from Nepal through India, all over Europe. This is what is going on in the

world today, and we are sitting here arguing essentially about the availability of an abortion in this area. To me, that is so secondary to the enormous harm that is being done.

I have great respect for my colleague. He has been a very distinguished jurist in his State. He makes sense when he speaks on the Judiciary Committee. We have listened to each other for more than a decade now. Let this drop. Let us get on with the work of this bill—and the work of this bill isn't completed until we get some of the amendments that relate to the bill—and then I think we can debate this another day.

I would say I plead a mea culpa. I wish I had known. All I can say is I did not know. Is that my fault? Probably. But I didn't know. So if you don't know, and you make a mistake, isn't the right thing to try to set that right? That is what we have tried to do, and women on our side, and some on my colleague's side, feel very strongly about this.

My colleague knows over the years we have lost virtually every battle that has been on this floor and we are tired of it. So we are taking a stand and we are going to hold that stand.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I obviously don't agree with my friend from California, but I respect her for answering the questions I have posed here today. I just find it a terrible shame we are going to relitigate what has been the law of the land for 39 years on this bill in a way that would block help to the very people I know the Senator from California cares so passionately about.

If we are going to undo the Hyde amendment, which the Senator has voted for in some form or another repeatedly over the years, then we are not going to make any progress. If we can find some other way to structure the funds so the appropriators will have a more direct role in appropriating the fines and penalties paid into this fund on an annual basis, I think maybe there is some room to talk. But I thank the Senator for her courtesy in answering my questions. I am sorry we find ourselves at this log-jam, but I hope at some point that can be resolved.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. May I say one more thing? It is my understanding—breaking news coming here—that there is no language in Federal statute on sex trafficking that defines a trafficking survivor as a victim of rape. So the victim would have to prove she is a victim of rape.

Now, look at what happens. I don't know if in my colleague's legal career it took him close to very young victims of this who cover up and who don't want to let people know. I am sure my colleague knows all of the vicissitudes, the hard life. We are asking someone to prove it.

Mr. CORNYN. I would say to my friend that when I was attorney general of Texas for 4 years, I had respon-

sibility for administering the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund as part of my duties of office, and we worked very directly with victims groups, including those who took care of very young children who had been sexually assaulted, sometimes by members of their own family—just the worst, the most reprehensible sorts of crimes.

But if I can ask the Senator just one last question. Of course, we have had the procedural vote on the floor, twice now, where Democrats have blocked our ability to both vote on amendments, including amendments the Senator may have with the Senator from Illinois, Mr. KIRK. Why is there an objection to processing those amendments and allowing the Senate to work its will? Why can't we vote on them? Why can't the Democratic minority take up the majority leader's offer for a vote to strip the language out that your side objects to?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Can I answer that as honestly as I feel?

Mr. CORNYN. I wish the Senator would.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Because there are many of us who believe this is one small step for womankind. It is one battle we can win, and we have had loss after loss after loss.

You know, many of us ran on the right to choose. I was one of them. I am old enough to have seen the way it was before, to have sentenced women who committed illegal abortions with coat hangers. That is sort of the systemic root of all of this. It is our history, Senator. We are trying to change that history, and we keep losing. So there is one small thing in this.

My colleague is right, we didn't see it, and we have to live with that. I understand that. But now we see it and we are trying to do something about it and, thankfully, our party is standing up with us. So we say make that small change and we pass this bill, and maybe we can even strengthen it with amendments.

My colleague has done a superior job in putting the bill together. Let it go.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would just say, in conclusion, that I think it is a terrible shame that my colleague's side of the aisle has decided to take this bill hostage to try to litigate something that has been the law of the land for 39 years. I understand she feels passionately about it. I don't question that for a minute—the sincerity of my colleague's deeply held personal views.

But why in the world would my colleagues take as a hostage a piece of legislation that is going to help those 100,000 children who are sex-trafficked each year? Why should they suffer so my colleagues can make a point on this particular piece of legislation?

I don't understand that and I think it is a terrible shame.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Well, let me answer a question with a question. Why doesn't my colleague just take it out? It is not in the House bill. Then we don't have to conference it, we don't

have to have another fight, we can get the amendments in the bill to strengthen the bill, and we can move on, with the two parties together doing something that is right for the Nation. Why don't we do it?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend, I don't blame her for asking, but why in the world would we change settled law for 39 years in order to accommodate the minority's view on this bill, and to change, as I said, what has been the law of the land?

Since the Senator voted for this very language previously this year in the Judiciary Committee—since she co-sponsored it, I don't really understand it since she voted for the legislation that is referred to here that has that amendment. Does the Senator see this as breaking new ground? Is she trying to expand or eliminate the Hyde amendment?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I see it for standing up for a principle. I know something about these girls. I know something about the history of abortion in this country. I am old enough to have gone through it and know that I don't want to go back to those days. I don't want young women who take the law now so much for granted to have to return back.

This is just one small step. There is nothing wrong with accommodating the minority on what is a relatively small point. In the House, 435 people over there didn't want it in. So why not accommodate the minority? The Senator just comes out a bigger person.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend I appreciate her courtesy and her indulgence in having this conversation. I also feel on principle this limitation on tax dollars is an appropriate one. I understand the Senator disagrees and she would like to eliminate this from this point forward. But I am simply unable on principle to accommodate the Senator in that request.

As I said, I do appreciate her courtesy.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I appreciate it, too. And I appreciate the discussion. Principle doesn't know minority and majority. Principle is deeply held.

I thank the Senator very much.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

DEMOCRACY RESTORATION ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I support the Democracy Restoration Act. This important legislation would re-

store a voice in our democracy for millions of Americans who cannot vote simply because they have a criminal conviction. I thank Senator CARDIN for his leadership on this issue. I am honored to be an original cosponsor of this important criminal justice reform legislation.

The right to vote for all is a principle that goes to the very heart of all democracy. Voting is a fundamental right because it is the right from which all other rights derive. Participation in the political process is about giving a voice to the voiceless. It is about who we are as a Nation and whether we want citizens that contribute to our society to have a say in who represents them in the Federal Government.

The road to extend voting rights to all Americans has been long and not without bumps. Our country was founded at a time when African Americans were denied the right to vote. For over a hundred years, we silenced entire populations of Americans and deemed them unworthy of participating in the political process merely because of their race.

During his famous Gettysburg Address, President Lincoln called for the country to have a "new birth of freedom." After the Civil War, the States ratified the Civil War Amendments to the Constitution to honor President Lincoln's promise. One of those amendments, the Fifteenth Amendment, gave African Americans the right to vote. Decades later, the Nineteenth Amendment gave women suffrage.

Despite this progress, many States passed laws during the Jim Crow era to disenfranchise African Americans, including literacy tests, poll taxes, and grandfather clauses. These States also passed laws that banned people with certain convictions from voting. With the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, many of these State disenfranchising laws were outlawed. But the ban on voting for people with certain convictions was not touched and it remains the law in many States.

Today, 35 States restrict voting rights of persons who were formerly incarcerated. In fact, felony disenfranchisement laws prevent 5.85 million Americans from voting. This is a staggering number of Americans that do not have a say in our political process.

Punishment is a legitimate goal of our justice system. But once someone has served their time and been released, we must help our fellow citizens get back on their feet. As President George W. Bush said in his State of the Union Address in 2004, "America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life." To further punish people who are back in the community by denying them the right to vote counters the expectation that citizens have rehabilitated themselves after a conviction.

The Democracy Restoration Act would restore voting rights in Federal elections to millions of disenfranchised

Americans who have been released from prison. It would require prisons receiving Federal funds notify people about their right to vote in Federal elections upon leaving prison or being sentenced to probation. It would empower the Department of Justice and former offenders harmed by a violation of this legislation with the right to sue.

This bill corrects a civil rights wrong. It would sweep away the last vestige of Jim Crow laws. It would outlaw State disenfranchisement laws that have a disparate impact on racial minorities. It would provide a uniform standard to govern the restoration of voting rights.

This bill reforms the criminal justice system. Every year, over 600,000 people leave prison. We must find ways to reintegrate them back into the community. Civic participation gives ex-offenders a stake in government, which motivates law-abiding behavior and reduces the likelihood of future crimes. No evidence exists that denying voting rights to people after release from prison reduces crime. To the contrary, it makes sense that people who have paid their debt to society should reclaim their rights.

This bill builds off of the progress in the States. Recently, 8 States have either repealed or amended lifetime disenfranchisement laws. Two states expanded voting rights to persons on probation or parole. Ten States eased the restoration process for people seeking to have their right to vote restored after the completion of their sentence. The Federal Government should follow their lead.

Nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come. This Congress can remedy the barriers to full citizenship faced by millions of formerly incarcerated people in our country, if this bill is enacted into law. Restoring the right to vote is good public policy.

To protect basic public safety and strengthen the core of our democracy, I urge my fellow Senators to support the Democracy Restoration Act and quickly pass this important legislation.

CONGRATULATING NANCIE ATWELL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the inspiring accomplishments of Nancie Atwell from Southport, ME, who was awarded the first Global Teacher Prize by the Varkey Foundation. This international, nonprofit organization is committed to improving the quality of education worldwide. Nancie's selection as the foundation's first ever prize recipient is a testament to her outstanding contributions to the teaching profession and her effect on countless students and teachers. The \$1 million prize was awarded at a ceremony in Dubai attended by former President Bill Clinton and Sheikh Mohammed

bin Rashid Al Maktoum, Prime Minister of the United Arab Emirates.

Heralded as the “Nobel Prize of Teaching,” the prestigious Global Teacher Prize shines a spotlight on the critical role that teachers play in our society. Nancie was selected from more than 5,000 nominations received from 120 countries. The candidates were evaluated based on their innovative teaching practices, including their ability to prepare students to be global citizens.

The pool of thousands was narrowed down to a group of 10 remarkable nominees, including teachers from Afghanistan, India, Kenya, Haiti, Malaysia, Cambodia, and the United States. Within this elite group, Nancie Atwell rose above the rest. Nancie has been a teacher since 1973. In 1990, she used money from her own pocket to found the Center for Teaching & Learning, an independent demonstration school that educates students from kindergarten through eighth grade in the small town of Edgecomb. Her vision was to foster a more meaningful education for Maine students. The center serves a close-knit population of approximately 75 students who travel from several surrounding towns because they are attracted to the school’s small class sizes, research-based curriculum, and teacher outreach programs.

In a gesture that exemplifies her deep commitment to her students, Nancie announced that she intends to donate every last penny of the \$1 million prize back to her school to support its resources, scholarships, library, and to replace its worn out furnace.

Nancie, who has authored many books and articles about education and hosted 140 education workshops, embodies a teaching philosophy based on student engagement, not just assignments. She encourages her pupils to identify and pursue their passions. By enabling students to choose to read and write about what interests them, the center has created an environment where children are excited to learn and eager to demonstrate their knowledge.

In addition to teaching students, the center does remarkable work teaching teachers. Educators from other schools regularly visit the center for professional development. Once there, they observe school-wide morning meetings, libraries in every classroom, and student-driven writing workshops. The center facilitates a teacher internship program that pairs visiting educators with teachers at the school. These intern-teachers observe and confer about instruction methods and leave equipped to make substantive changes back in their own schools.

In her acceptance speech, Nancie said:

When children are engaged, when learning is joyful, those are the lessons that stick. Those are the lessons that are worthwhile and meaningful and hang around.

This philosophy has inspired teachers and students alike. In fact, it was one of Nancie’s former students who nominated her for the prize.

Under Nancie’s leadership, the Center for Teaching & Learning has earned national praise. How wonderful it is that Nancie’s work has now earned global recognition. The people of Maine—and especially its students—are fortunate to have such a pioneering and driven educator fighting for a brighter future. Nancie is a remarkable ambassador for both the State of Maine and our country, and I congratulate her on this outstanding accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING TONY ALEXANDER

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Tony Alexander, executive chairman of the board of FirstEnergy Corporation. Tony’s 43-year career at FirstEnergy and its predecessor companies was characterized by a commitment to superior customer service, greater value to shareholders, and more opportunities for employees. As FirstEnergy’s longest serving chief executive officer, Tony’s vision, drive, and leadership helped propel the company to the forefront of the energy industry.

Through Tony’s management, Akron-based Ohio Edison quadrupled in size to become today’s FirstEnergy. Over the course of his career, he guided the company through significant mergers, acquisitions, and divestitures; complex regulatory and environmental challenges; and a wide range of operational and financial issues. His willingness to push hard for important ideas and policies made him a strong advocate during one of the most challenging periods in the history of the electric industry.

Tony’s principled leadership has also shown through his tireless work to improve his community. As a recognized leader in his community, he currently serves as an advisor to the boards of trustees for Akron Tomorrow, Team NEO, and the University of Akron. Additionally, he serves on the board of directors and President’s Advancement Council of the Austen BioInnovation Institute.

Tony’s service has not gone without notice. He has been awarded the Dr. Frank L. Simonetti Distinguished Business Alumni Award from the University of Akron—a testament to his community leadership.

I congratulate Tony, his wife Becky, and their four sons for the profound impact he has made throughout his community and the energy industry.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:09 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1029. An act to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1191. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1029. An act to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1191. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-941. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9923-59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-942. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9921-01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-943. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Professional Standards for State and Local School Nutrition Programs Personnel as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010” (RIN0584-AE19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-944. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Minnesota, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin” (Docket No. APHIS-2014-0023) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-945. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense and Global Security), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a consolidated

budget justification display that includes all programs and activities of the Department of Defense combating terrorism program (OSS-2015-0286); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-946. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James L. Huggins, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-947. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report describing activities under the Secretary of Defense personnel management demonstration project authorities for Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories (STRs) for calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-948. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-949. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-950. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-951. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to South Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-952. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Obsolete Section 8 Rental Assistance Certificate Program Regulations" (RIN2577-AC93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-953. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-954. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of all extensions granted by Congress regarding the requirements of Section 13 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-955. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Low Emission Vehicle Program" (FRL No. 9915-05-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-956. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9923-07-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-957. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Steam Generating Units" (FRL No. 9923-98-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-958. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties, Issuance of Compliance or Corrective Action Orders, and the Revocation, Termination or Suspension of Permits; Correction" (FRL No. 9922-62-OECA) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-959. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Region 4 States; 2008 Lead, 2008 Ozone and 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide Prevention of Significant Deterioration Infrastructure Plans" (FRL No. 9924-47-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-960. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Minor NSR for Title V and FESOP Sources" (FRL No. 9924-22-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-961. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Amendments to Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements for Illinois" (FRL No. 9922-71-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-962. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New Residential Wood Heaters, New Residential Hydronic Heaters and Forced-Air Furnaces" (FRL No. 9920-50-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-963. A communication from the Chief Counsel for Administrative Law, Office of the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy United States Trade Representative, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-964. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, In-

ternal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reporting for Premium; Basis Reporting by Securities Brokers and Basis Determination for Debt Instruments and Options" ((RIN1545-BL46 and RIN1545-BM60) (TD 9713)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-965. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Empowerment Zone Designation Extension" (Notice 2015-26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-966. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beginning of Construction for Sections 45 and 48" (Notice 2015-25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-967. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rulings and Determination Letters" (Rev. Proc. 2015-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-968. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2015 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures" (Notice 2015-23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-969. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice Under Section 529A" (Notice 2015-18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-970. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safe Harbor Method for Determining a Wagering Gain or Loss from Slot Machine Play" (Notice 2015-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-971. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "User Fees and Change of Address for Submission of Applications for Approval of Section 403(b) Pre-approved Plans" (Rev. Proc. 2015-22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-972. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Health Insurance Providers Fee" ((RIN1545-BM52) (TD 9711)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-973. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alternative Simplified Credit Election" ((RIN1545-BL78) (TD

9712)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-974. A communication from the Chair of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-975. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0274); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-976. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0275); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-977. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2014, through November 30, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-978. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the waiver of the restrictions contained in Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act of 1992; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-979. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-143); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-980. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0026—2015-0028); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-981. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for the Handling of Retaliation Complaints Under Section 806 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, as Amended" (RIN1218-AC53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-982. A communication from the Director of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: Transmission of Documents and Information" (RIN1240-AA09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-983. A communication from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chairperson, National Endowment for Humanities, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-984. A communication from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled "Official Symbol, Logo and Seal" (45 CFR Part 18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-985. A communication from the Chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 FAIR Act Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-986. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Examination of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Receiving Local District Funds to Provide Homeless Services in fiscal year 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-987. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Executive Summary of the 2014 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts" and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Office's 2014 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 792. An original bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 768. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 769. A bill to streamline the permit process for rail and transit infrastructure; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 770. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 771. A bill to emphasize manufacturing in engineering programs by directing the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in coordination with other appro-

priate Federal agencies including the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and National Science Foundation, to designate United States manufacturing universities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 772. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 773. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 774. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BARASSO):

S. 775. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 776. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 777. A bill to permit employees to request, and to ensure employers consider requests for, flexible work terms and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 778. A bill to prohibit the provision of certain foreign assistance to countries receiving certain detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 779. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 780. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 781. A bill to improve knowledge about the best practices for teaching financial literacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 782. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 783. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 784. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish microlabs to improve regional engagement with national laboratories; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 785. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to repeal a certain exemption for hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 786. A bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 787. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 788. A bill to require the termination of any employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who is found to have retaliated against a whistleblower; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 789. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues related to recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 790. A bill to provide for the establishment of free market enterprise zones in order to help facilitate the creation of new jobs, entrepreneurial opportunities, enhanced and renewed educational opportunities, and increase community involvement in bankrupt or economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 791. A bill to free the private sector to harness domestic energy resources to create jobs and generate economic growth by removing statutory and administrative barriers; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 792. An original bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr.

LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 793. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 794. A bill to enhance whistleblower protections for defense contractor employees to employees of contractors of the elements of the intelligence community; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 795. A bill to enhance whistleblower protection for contractor and grantee employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 103. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 104. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the success of Operation Streamline and the importance of prosecuting first time illegal border crossers; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BARR), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 319

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali.

S. 396

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 396, a bill to establish the Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 565

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 565, a bill to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Utah

(Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 616

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 616, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 677

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a limitation on certain aliens from claiming the earned income tax credit.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 751, a bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of

marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 87, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

AMENDMENT NO. 300

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 300 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 779. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 779

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government funds basic and applied research with the expectation that new ideas and discoveries that result from the research, if shared and effectively disseminated, will advance science and improve the lives and welfare of people of the United States and around the world;

(2) the Internet makes it possible for this information to be promptly available to every scientist, physician, educator, and citizen at home, in school, or in a library; and

(3) the United States has a substantial interest in maximizing the impact and utility of the research it funds by enabling a wide

range of reuses of the peer-reviewed literature that reports the results of such research, including by enabling computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF FEDERAL AGENCY.

In this Act, the term "Federal agency" means an Executive agency, as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL RESEARCH PUBLIC ACCESS POLICY.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each Federal agency with extramural research expenditures of over \$100,000,000 shall develop a Federal research public access policy that is consistent with and advances the purposes of the Federal agency.

(2) COMMON PROCEDURES.—To the extent practicable, Federal agencies required to develop a policy under paragraph (1) shall follow common procedures for the collection and depositing of research papers.

(b) CONTENT.—Each Federal research public access policy shall provide for—

(1) submission to the Federal agency of an electronic version of the author's final manuscript of original research papers that have been accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and that result from research supported, in whole or in part, from funding by the Federal Government;

(2) the incorporation of all changes resulting from the peer review publication process in the manuscript described under paragraph (1);

(3) the replacement of the final manuscript with the final published version if—

(A) the publisher consents to the replacement; and

(B) the goals of the Federal agency for functionality and interoperability are retained;

(4) free online public access to such final peer-reviewed manuscripts or published versions as soon as practicable, but not later than 6 months after publication in peer-reviewed journals;

(5) providing research papers as described in paragraph (4) in formats and under terms that enable productive reuse, including computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies;

(6) production of an online bibliography of all research papers that are publicly accessible under the policy, with each entry linking to the corresponding free online full text; and

(7) long-term preservation of, and free public access to, published research findings—

(A) in a stable digital repository maintained by the Federal agency; or

(B) if consistent with the purposes of the Federal agency, in any repository meeting conditions determined favorable by the Federal agency, including free public access, interoperability, and long-term preservation.

(c) APPLICATION OF POLICY.—Each Federal research public access policy shall—

(1) apply to—

(A) researchers employed by the Federal agency whose works remain in the public domain; and

(B) researchers funded by the Federal agency;

(2) provide that works described under paragraph (1)(A) shall be—

(A) marked as being public domain material when published; and

(B) made available at the same time such works are made available under subsection (b)(4); and

(3) make effective use of any law or guidance relating to the creation and reservation of a Government license that provides for the reproduction, publication, release, or other uses of a final manuscript for Federal purposes.

(d) EXCLUSIONS.—Each Federal research public access policy shall not apply to—

(1) research progress reports presented at professional meetings or conferences;

(2) laboratory notes, preliminary data analyses, notes of the author, phone logs, or other information used to produce final manuscripts;

(3) classified research, research resulting in works that generate revenue or royalties for authors (such as books) or patentable discoveries, to the extent necessary to protect a copyright or patent; or

(4) authors who do not submit their work to a journal or works that are rejected by journals.

(e) PATENT OR COPYRIGHT LAW.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect any right under the provisions of title 17 or 35, United States Code.

(f) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1 of each year, the head of each Federal agency shall submit a report on the Federal research public access policy of that Federal agency to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives;

(D) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate; and

(F) any other committee of Congress of appropriate jurisdiction.

(2) CONTENT.—Each report under this subsection shall include—

(A) a statement of the effectiveness of the Federal research public access policy in providing the public with free online access to papers on research funded by the Federal agency;

(B) the results of a study by the Federal agency of the terms of use applicable to the research papers described in subsection (b)(4), including—

(i) a statement of whether the terms of use applicable to such research papers are effective in enabling productive reuse and computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies; and

(ii) an examination of whether such research papers should include a royalty-free copyright license that is available to the public and that permits the reuse of those research papers, on the condition that attribution is given to the author or authors of the research and any others designated by the copyright owner;

(C) a list of papers published in peer-reviewed journals that report on research funded by the Federal agency;

(D) a corresponding list of papers made available by the Federal agency as a result of the Federal research public access policy; and

(E) a summary of the periods of time between public availability of each paper in a journal and in the online repository of the Federal agency.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—A Federal agency shall make the statement under paragraph (2)(A) and the lists of papers under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (2) available to the public by posting such statement and lists on the website of the Federal agency.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 780. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 780

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Cameras in the Courtroom Act”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“§ 678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings

“The Supreme Court shall permit television coverage of all open sessions of the Court unless the Court decides, by a vote of the majority of justices, that allowing such coverage in a particular case would constitute a violation of the due process rights of 1 or more of the parties before the Court.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings.”.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 783. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this week is Sunshine Week, when we affirm the public’s right to know how their government is run. Sunshine Week, which began as Sunshine Sunday in 2002, emphasizes the importance of transparency and accountability in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In the spirit of government transparency, we are pleased to introduce the Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2015. This important piece of bipartisan legislation furthers the public’s access to court proceedings by permitting federal judges at all federal court levels to open their courtrooms to television cameras and radio broadcasts.

Openness in our courts improves the public’s understanding of what happens inside our courts. Our judicial system remains a mystery to too many people across the country. That doesn’t need to continue. Letting the sun shine in on Federal courtrooms will give Americans an opportunity to better understand the judicial process. Courts are the bedrock of the American justice system. Granting the public greater access to an already public proceeding will inspire greater faith in and appreciation for our judges who pledge equal and impartial justice for all.

For decades, States such as my home State of Iowa have allowed cameras in their courtrooms with great results. As a matter of fact, all 50 States and the District of Columbia now allow some news coverage of proceedings.

The bill I am introducing today, along with Senator SCHUMER and a number of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, including Judiciary Committee Ranking Member LEAHY, will greatly improve public access to federal courts by letting federal judges open their courtrooms to television cameras and other forms of electronic media.

The Sunshine in the Courtroom Act is full of provisions that ensure that the introduction of cameras and other broadcasting devices into courtrooms goes as smoothly as it has at the state level. First, the presence of the cameras Federal trial and appellate courts is at the sole discretion of the judges—it is not mandatory. The bill also provides a mechanism for Congress to study the effects of this legislation on our judiciary before making this change permanent through a 3-year sunset provision. The bill protects the privacy and safety of non-party witnesses by giving them the right to have their faces and voices obscured. The bill prohibits the televising of jurors. Finally, it includes a provision to protect the due process rights of each party.

We need to open the doors and let the light shine in on the Federal Judiciary. This bill improves public access to and therefore understanding of our Federal courts. It has safety provisions to ensure that the cameras won’t interfere with the proceedings or with the safety or due process of anyone involved in the cases. Our States have allowed news coverage of their courtrooms for decades. It is time we join them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

S. 783

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL APPELLATE AND DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRESIDING JUDGE.—The term “presiding judge” means the judge presiding over the court proceeding concerned. In proceedings in which more than 1 judge participates, the presiding judge shall be the senior active judge so participating or, in the case of a circuit court of appeals, the senior active circuit judge so participating, except that—

(A) in en banc sittings of any United States circuit court of appeals, the presiding judge shall be the chief judge of the circuit whenever the chief judge participates; and

(B) in en banc sittings of the Supreme Court of the United States, the presiding judge shall be the Chief Justice whenever the Chief Justice participates.

(2) APPELLATE COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term “appellate court of the United States” means any United States circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States.

(b) AUTHORITY OF PRESIDING JUDGE TO ALLOW MEDIA COVERAGE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) AUTHORITY OF APPELLATE COURTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), the presiding judge of an appellate court of the United States may, at the discretion of that judge, permit the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising to the public of any court proceeding over which that judge presides.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The presiding judge shall not permit any action under subparagraph (A), if—

(i) in the case of a proceeding involving only the presiding judge, that judge determines the action would constitute a violation of the due process rights of any party; or

(ii) in the case of a proceeding involving the participation of more than 1 judge, a majority of the judges participating determine that the action would constitute a violation of the due process rights of any party.

(2) AUTHORITY OF DISTRICT COURTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided under clause (iii), the presiding judge of a district court of the United States may, at the discretion of that judge, permit the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising to the public of any court proceeding over which that judge presides.

(ii) OBSCURING OF WITNESSES.—Except as provided under clause (iii)—

(I) upon the request of any witness (other than a party) in a trial proceeding, the court shall order the face and voice of the witness to be disguised or otherwise obscured in such manner as to render the witness unrecognizable to the broadcast audience of the trial proceeding; and

(II) the presiding judge in a trial proceeding shall inform each witness who is not a party that the witness has the right to request the image and voice of that witness to be obscured during the witness' testimony.

(iii) EXCEPTION.—The presiding judge shall not permit any action under this subparagraph—

(I) if that judge determines the action would constitute a violation of the due process rights of any party; and

(II) until the Judicial Conference of the United States promulgates mandatory guidelines under paragraph (5).

(B) NO MEDIA COVERAGE OF JURORS.—The presiding judge shall not permit the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising of any juror in a trial proceeding, or of the jury selection process.

(C) DISCRETION OF THE JUDGE.—The presiding judge shall have the discretion to obscure the face and voice of an individual, if good cause is shown that the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising of the individual would threaten—

(i) the safety of the individual;

(ii) the security of the court;

(iii) the integrity of future or ongoing law enforcement operations; or

(iv) the interest of justice.

(D) SUNSET OF DISTRICT COURT AUTHORITY.—The authority under this paragraph shall terminate 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS BARRED.—The decision of the presiding judge under this subsection of whether or not to permit, deny, or terminate the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising of a court proceeding may not be challenged through an interlocutory appeal.

(4) ADVISORY GUIDELINES.—The Judicial Conference of the United States may promulgate advisory guidelines to which a presiding judge, at the discretion of that judge, may refer in making decisions with respect to the

management and administration of photographing, recording, broadcasting, or televising described under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(5) MANDATORY GUIDELINES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall promulgate mandatory guidelines which a presiding judge is required to follow for obscuring of certain vulnerable witnesses, including crime victims, minor victims, families of victims, cooperating witnesses, undercover law enforcement officers or agents, witnesses subject to section 3521 of title 18, United States Code, relating to witness relocation and protection, or minors under the age of 18 years. The guidelines shall include procedures for determining, at the earliest practicable time in any investigation or case, which witnesses should be considered vulnerable under this section.

(6) PROCEDURES.—In the interests of justice and fairness, the presiding judge of the court in which media use is desired has discretion to promulgate rules and disciplinary measures for the courtroom use of any form of media or media equipment and the acquisition or distribution of any of the images or sounds obtained in the courtroom. The presiding judge shall also have discretion to require written acknowledgment of the rules by anyone individually or on behalf of any entity before being allowed to acquire any images or sounds from the courtroom.

(7) NO BROADCAST OF CONFERENCES BETWEEN ATTORNEYS AND CLIENTS.—There shall be no audio pickup or broadcast of conferences which occur in a court proceeding between attorneys and their clients, between co-counsel of a client, between adverse counsel, or between counsel and the presiding judge, if the conferences are not part of the official record of the proceedings.

(8) EXPENSES.—A court may require that any accommodations to effectuate this Act be made without public expense.

(9) INHERENT AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall limit the inherent authority of a court to protect witnesses or clear the courtroom to preserve the decorum and integrity of the legal process or protect the safety of an individual.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 793. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to announce the introduction of the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act of 2015. This bill will allow student loan borrowers to take advantage of today's lower interest rates, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Last Congress, Democrats pressed for a similar bill which has strong support from the Senate and from the public.

Every Democrat, every Independent, and three Republicans voted to move this bill forward. More than 700,000 people signed petitions in support of student loan refinancing, but Republicans filibustered the bill, so it didn't pass. It is time to try again, because a problem that was bad last year has gotten worse—much worse.

Since last year, nearly 1 million more borrowers have fallen behind in their payments. Nearly 1 million more are watching their balances get bigger, not smaller. Nearly 1 million more people are sweating out how they are ever going to repay their student loan debt.

Last year, student loan debt was an economic emergency. Now, 1 year later, the emergency is getting worse. Just look at the numbers. Students are now struggling with \$100 billion more debt than 1 year ago. Since last year, total student loan debt has jumped to \$1.3 trillion, and the debt is crushing young people.

Last year, experts at the U.S. Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau all sounded the alarm on student debt. This year, the alarm bells are sounding even louder. One year ago, the Federal Government was projected to take in tens of billions in profits on the backs of our kids as a result of artificially high interest rates. One year later, interest rates on new loans are even higher, and even with millions of people struggling to pay, even after accounting for administrative and other costs, the Federal Government is still raking in huge profits on its student loan program.

Despite overwhelming public support for cutting the interest rates on student loans, Republicans last year refused to even debate this bill. Republicans said there were other, better ways to tackle student debt, but Republicans did nothing, nothing except filibuster the only student loan bill on the table. So tens of millions of borrowers got nothing, no help at all. Today, millions of borrowers are left with interest rates of 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, and even higher. Nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind, and the Republicans have done nothing. Nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind, and they are watching their debt load get bigger. Nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind, paying interest rates that produce obscene profits for the U.S. Government, and the Republicans will not even debate refinancing student loans.

Why can't people refinance their student loans? When interest rates are low, homeowners can refinance their mortgages to reduce their payments. Businesses can refinance their debts. Even governments can refinance their debts. But student loan borrowers are stuck with their loans, sometimes at 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, and even higher.

Our proposal is simple: refinance outstanding loans down to 3.9 percent for

undergraduates, and a little higher for graduates and PLUS loans. This single change would give borrowers across this country a chance to save hundreds—and for some, thousands—of dollars a year. That’s real money—money they can put toward paying down the balance on their debt, saving for a home, buying a car—money they can put toward building a solid future.

This bill doesn’t add one dime to the deficit. It is fully paid for by closing up a tax loophole that allows millionaires and billionaires to pay a lower tax rate than middle class families.

If Republicans don’t like that way to pay for the student loan bill, here’s another idea. Senators REED and BLUMENTHAL have advanced a bill that would close a different tax loophole. They want to end the tax breaks for executive bonuses that are bigger than a million dollars.

I say to my Republican colleagues, if you don’t like that way to pay for the student loan bill, there are other options as well. Let’s sit down and talk about it, but don’t close your eyes and pretend this isn’t happening. Don’t turn your backs on the 40 million Americans with student loan debt. Don’t do nothing.

Refinancing student loans will not fix everything that is wrong in our higher education system. We need to cut the price of college. We need to reinvest in public universities. We need to shore up financial aid, crack down on for-profit colleges, and provide better protections on student loans, but let’s start by allowing people to refinance their student loans. Let’s start by cutting back on the interest payments that are sinking young people and holding back this economy.

We could have refinanced student loan debt 1 year ago, but Republicans said no. Now Americans owe \$100 billion more than they did. Now nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind. Now more people than ever are choking on student loan debt.

By refusing to act, Republicans are sinking the hopes of an entire generation. It is time for Congress to step up and fix this problem, before it drags down another million Americans and another and another. It is time to refinance student loan debt.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 103—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 103

Whereas the primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic needs of all people, especially the most vulnerable in society;

Whereas social work pioneers have helped lead the struggle for social justice in the United States and have helped pave the way for positive social change;

Whereas social workers are key employees at the Federal, State, and local levels of government and work to expand policies and practices that promote equity and social justice for all people;

Whereas social workers stand up for individuals and support diverse families in every community;

Whereas social workers continue to work to improve the rights of women, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (“LGBT”) community, and communities of color;

Whereas social workers know from experience that discrimination of any kind limits human potential and must be eliminated;

Whereas social workers know from experience that poverty and trauma can create lifelong social and economic disadvantages;

Whereas social workers help people in every stage of life function better in their environments, improve relationships with others, and solve personal and family problems;

Whereas all children have the right to safe environments and quality education;

Whereas dignity and caregiving for older adults help define the character of a nation;

Whereas veterans and the families of veterans need community support to ensure successful transitions after service;

Whereas access to mental health treatment and health care services saves millions of lives;

Whereas research has shown that all people, no matter the circumstance, may at some point in their lives need the expertise of a skilled social worker;

Whereas social workers celebrate the courage, hope, and strength of the human spirit throughout their careers;

Whereas March is recognized as Social Work Month; and

Whereas World Social Work Day is recognized on March 18, 2015; Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups who promote the importance of social work and observe Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages individuals to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote further awareness of the life-changing role that social workers play; and

(4) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

SENATE RESOLUTION 104—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE SUCCESS OF OPERATION STREAMLINE AND THE IMPORTANCE OF PROSECUTING FIRST TIME ILLEGAL BORDER CROSSERS

Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 104

Whereas the Border Patrol’s Yuma Sector has long grappled with the crossing of undocumented aliens and has seen illegal traffic decline precipitously from the early 2000s to the present;

Whereas a combination of increased manpower, technology implementation, and the

delivery of appropriate consequences have resulted in gains in border security in the Yuma Sector;

Whereas a key to the success in the Yuma Sector has been the implementation of Operation Streamline, a program established in 2005 that was described by former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano as “a DHS partnership with the Department of Justice, . . . a geographically focused operation that aims to increase the consequences for illegally crossing the border by criminally prosecuting illegal border-crossers.”;

Whereas known for its “zero-tolerance” approach, the Yuma County Sheriff’s Office cites 100 percent prosecution of illegal border crossers as a shared goal of a partnership including Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies;

Whereas among the various consequences delivered to illegal crossers by the Department of Homeland Security, Operation Streamline is associated with a recidivism rate that is well below average and has seen a steady decrease in recidivism in recent years;

Whereas the United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Arizona will reportedly no longer be prosecuting those apprehended crossing the border illegally for the first time; and

Whereas according to the Sheriff of Yuma County, Operation Streamline “had a deterrent effect in Yuma County, which gained a reputation as an area to avoid crossing into because if caught, you were assured to go to court and possibly face penalties”, but now the program has been “has been severely diluted.”.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) gains made in border security in the Yuma Sector and positive trends in recidivism rates are of critical importance to those living and working in the border region and to the Nation as a whole;

(2) refusing to prosecute first time illegal border crossers under Operation Streamline will jeopardize border security gains;

(3) the border security steps that have led to some measure of improvement on the border, such as the historical implementation of Operation Streamline, should be preserved; and

(4) the Executive Branch should immediately remove any issued or related prohibition, policy, guidance, or direction to cease prosecuting first time illegal border crossers under Operation Streamline.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 319. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 319. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . REVOCATION OF IMMIGRATION BENEFITS FOR ALIENS CONVICTED OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a covered alien is convicted of human trafficking or any conspiracy related to human trafficking, the

Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of State, as appropriate, shall—

(1) revoke any immigration benefit granted to the covered alien;

(2) revoke any relief from removal provided pursuant to policies implemented under, or substantially similar to policies implemented under, an Executive action or memorandum set out under subsection (c) granted to the covered alien; and

(3) place the covered alien in expedited proceedings for removal from the United States after the covered alien completes any term of imprisonment for such a conviction.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED ALIEN.—The term “covered alien”—

(A) means an alien present in the United States; and

(B) does not include an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—The term “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(c) EXECUTIVE ACTIONS.—The Executive actions and memoranda set out under this subsection are the following:

(1) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Civil Immigration Enforcement: Priorities for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens” dated March 2, 2011.

(2) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion Consistent with the Civil Immigration Enforcement Priorities of the Agency for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens” dated June 17, 2011.

(3) The memorandum from the Principal Legal Advisor of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Case-by-Case Review of Incoming and Certain Pending Cases” dated November 17, 2011.

(4) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children” dated June 15, 2012.

(5) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Civil Immigration Enforcement: Guidance on the Use of Detainers in the Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Criminal Justice Systems” dated December 21, 2012.

(6) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Southern Border and Approaches Campaign” dated November 20, 2014.

(7) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies for the Apprehension, Detention and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants” dated November 20, 2014.

(8) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Secure Communities” dated November 20, 2014.

(9) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents” dated November 20, 2014.

(10) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Expansion of the Provisional Waiver Program” dated November 20, 2014.

(11) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies Supporting U.S. High-Skilled Businesses and Workers” dated November 20, 2014.

(12) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Families of U.S. Armed Forces Members and Enlistees” dated November 20, 2014.

(13) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Directive to Provide Consistency Regarding Advance Parole” dated November 20, 2014.

(14) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies to Promote and Increase Access to U.S. Citizenship” dated November 20, 2014.

(15) The memorandum from the President entitled “Modernizing and Streamlining the U.S. Immigrant Visa System for the 21st Century” dated November 21, 2014.

(16) The memorandum from the President entitled “Creating Welcoming Communities and Fully Integrating Immigrants and Refugees” dated November 21, 2014.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission.”

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act.”

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 18, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The Impact of Abusive Parent

Litigation Practices on the American Economy.”

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 10 a.m. in room SD-G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Sirvat Tokatlian, be allowed privileges of the floor throughout the day.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1191

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Thursday, March 19; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 178, with the time until the

cloture vote at 12 noon equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Senators should expect up to two rollcall votes at noon.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Sen-

ate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:24 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 19, 2015, at 11 a.m.