

crafting the bill. But I am fearful that, once again, we are at risk of basically being cast aside because of political concerns.

I ask the majority leader to reconsider his view that relevant amendments are too difficult to vote on. We have to return to regular order. We have to have a fair and healthy debate on legislation—especially legislation such as this that has not gone through the committee process, has good, strong support, but needs to have further input from Members all over the country.

I appreciate the consideration of the body here in trying to advance a measure that will help us not only when it comes to access for our fishermen and our sports men and women, provides for further conservation measures, but also helps us to advance a process in this body that at this time we so desperately lack.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise to speak about a very troubling issue—to speak about innocent lives being stolen from communities and neighborhoods across our country and around the globe. I speak of the issue of human trafficking.

Last month, in more than 100 U.S. cities—just last month—168 children were rescued from sex trafficking and 281 pimps were arrested on Federal and State charges.

The weeklong campaign known as Operation Cross Country was conducted by the FBI, law enforcement officials, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It underscores a heartbreaking reality: Human trafficking is not a far-away problem. It is happening right here in America, in all 50 States.

Each year thousands of men, women, and children are robbed of their basic freedom to live as they choose. They become victims of a rampant and evil crime, coerced through intimidation and even through violence to work as laborers or prostitutes. According to estimates from the Polaris Project, a nonprofit organization dedicated to fighting human trafficking, there were more than 5,000 potential trafficking cases in America last year. However, the precise number of domestic victims is unknown.

It should be noted that sex trafficking affects individuals of all backgrounds and races, but it disproportionately impacts women, both domestically and internationally. According to the Polaris Project, 85 percent of sex trafficking victims in the United States are women. Although news headlines often glibly refer to a “war on women” in political terms, we as policy makers might well devote more of our energy to the issue of sex trafficking—a real war, a daily war, a

nightmarish war—faced by the most vulnerable among us—young women who are bought and sold against their will for sex.

I stand with colleagues from both political parties in calling for an end to this nightmare. We must not ignore the horror stories on our doorsteps. Earlier this year 16 children ranging in age from 13 to 17 years old were rescued from a sex trafficking operation at the Super Bowl, one of our most celebrated events—the scenario of horror for these 13- to 17-year-olds. These young Americans deserve justice and they deserve rehabilitation.

Our friends in the House of Representatives have recently passed a package of bills on antitrafficking, and I hope we will soon consider similar efforts in the Senate. To highlight a few, Senator RUBIO has introduced a bill to help protect children in foster care from becoming victims of trafficking; Senator CORNYN has introduced legislation for increasing federal resources available to trafficking victims; and Senator KLOBUCHAR has introduced legislation to help ensure that minors who are sold for sex are not prosecuted as perpetrators but properly treated as the victims they really are.

This week I have introduced the End Trafficking Act of 2014. Similar to the legislation put forward by my colleagues, my bill would ensure victims of trafficking receive the treatment they need to lead healthy, free, and productive lives. One proposal in my bill would be a court-based pilot program modeled after Hawaii’s girls courts, similar to the Federal drug court system. Rather than being correctly treated as victims, trafficked juveniles are often charged with a delinquency offense and detained. Many do not receive the counseling or support they need while in detention and some even return to the trafficker who abused them.

My bill supports a specialized court docket and integrated judicial supervision that would put the well-being of the victim first. Detention does not amount to rescue, and these victims need to be rescued. They should have an opportunity to return home and receive treatment.

Human trafficking is a complex problem that demands multifaceted solutions. Supporting the victims is only one part of the equation. We must also target those who perpetuate these atrocious crimes. The legislation I have introduced also seeks to punish those responsible for trafficking—the providers and the buyers—the pimps and the johns. First, there should be strict enforcement of laws already on the books that prohibit the purchase of sex with minors. Second, child victims should have a longer statute of limitations period during which to file civil lawsuits against their traffickers. Finally, those who distribute or benefit financially from commercial advertising that promotes prostitution should face criminal charges also. My bill would do all three.

We have seen the value of coordination among local, State and Federal agencies to fight trafficking. This was certainly true in Operation Cross Country. Working together, agencies and law enforcement partners can improve the ways they target traffickers to help victims.

We all need to realize that in the United States—the freest, most prosperous nation in the world—traffickers still find and transit victims. Our efforts to fight trafficking within our borders are important to fight against trafficking worldwide. There are some 21 million people around the world who endure this cruel form of modern day slavery. There is no other way to put it. Although the United States cannot single-handedly eradicate the problem, we can serve as a model for other countries to follow by preventing trafficking and supporting victims here at home.

Again, the title of the bill is the End Trafficking Act of 2014—introduced this week. I am looking for cosponsors. I am looking for Republicans, Democrats, and Independents to come forward and say with a unified voice that this Senate, this Congress, this Federal Government, intends to put the full weight of our efforts toward combating this serious national and international problem.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and, following procedure, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between Republicans and Democrats for the remaining period of morning business.

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

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### PROTECTING WATER AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I rise in support of Barrasso amendment No. 3453 to the underlying bill. This amendment actually has 36 cosponsors—36 of my fellow colleagues have cosponsored legislation called the Protecting Water and Property Rights Act of 2014, and this legislation is identical to the amendment we have on the floor today.

The amendment restricts the expansion of Federal authority by this administration’s EPA to encompass all the wet areas on farms, ranches, and suburban homes all across America. More specifically, the amendment eliminates the administration’s proposed rule—a rule to implement this

expansion of Federal authority, an expansion which I don't think the Federal Government should have or does have. But we do have a recently proposed rule, and through this proposed rule, Federal agencies are attempting to expand the definition of waters of the United States. They want to expand the definition—it is a specific term, waters of the United States—to now include ditches and other dry areas where water does flow, but only flows during a short duration, basically after a rainfall. Federal regulations have never defined ditches and other upland drainage features as waters of the United States. So this is an expansion of the way we view waters of the United States.

This proposed rule does and will have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers, and small businesses needing to put a shovel into the ground to make a living. The rule, in a sense, amounts to a user's fee for farmers and ranchers to use their own land after it rains. It forces suburban homeowners to pay the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to use their backyards after a storm.

To me this is one of the worst things we could ever do to Americans, let alone during this poor economy. That is why the Protecting Water and Private Property Rights Act is endorsed by the American Farm Bureau and the National Cattlemen's Beef Association. It is endorsed by the National Federation of Independent Business and by the American Land Rights Association. They have endorsed this amendment because they know how devastating the rule is to farmers, ranchers, small business owners, and even to homeowners.

This administration claims it is providing flexibility for farmers and ranchers in the proposed rule, but farmers and ranchers across the country who read this are not deceived.

Bob Stallman, president of the American Farm Bureau, released a statement on June 11 of this year stating that "the rule would micro-manage farming via newly-mandated procedures for fencing, spraying, weeding and more. Permitting meanwhile, could delay time-sensitive tasks for months, potentially ruining crops in the process."

According to the June edition of the publication *National Cattleman* in an article entitled "EPA's Ag Exemptions for WOTUS," waters of the United States, the article states: "Although agriculture exemptions are briefly included, they don't come close to meeting the needs of cattlemen and women across the country."

The president of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Bob McCan, stated in an article:

For example, wet spots or areas in a pasture that have standing water, under this rule, could potentially be affected. We'd now need permission to travel and move cattle across these types of areas.

The article lists some of the major areas of agriculture which are not ex-

empted by the EPA's proposed rule. The article states:

Activities not covered by the exemptions include introduction of new cultivation techniques, planting different crops, changing crops to pasture, changing pasture to crops, changing cropland to orchard/vineyard and changing cropland to nurseries.

Those activities are not included.

The rule also provides no flexibility for investments by small businesses across the country.

According to the National Federation of Independent Business:

Unfortunately, despite claims by the Agencies, the proposed rule will only increase uncertainty.

The proposed rule still requires the Agencies to determine on a case-by-case basis whether many common land formations fall under federal jurisdiction.

Often, this determination does not occur until after substantial investments and planning by a small business have taken place—thus chilling investment and expansion. Small businesses cannot be speculative with their resources and capital.

Private property owners would also face no flexibility. My own constituent, Mr. Andy Johnson, Uinta County, WY, has been threatened by the EPA with penalties calculated to reach an estimated \$187,000 a day for building what he believes is a stock pond on his property. In a month's time, he could be liable for more than \$5 million in penalties.

What are homeowners to do when faced with this kind of threat? They could choose to fight city hall with limited resources or give in to strong-arming by the Federal Government. Given the Agency's plans to expand the jurisdictional limits of the Clean Water Act, the EPA could easily use the proposed rule to bankrupt small landowners for something as simple as building a pond or a ditch anywhere near a wetland or stream.

Congress never intended for the Clean Water Act to be used this way. To me it defies logic to think this proposed rule will benefit anybody but bureaucrats in Washington who are far removed from the communities between the coasts.

I think it is time for the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers to keep out of the lives of our constituents' backyards, and it is time to do it by opposing the proposed rule.

I wish to end with a broader point about how the Senate operates these days.

Today the Washington Post had an editorial specifically about the legislation, and it is entitled "Clear rules for clean water," which is the proposal I have here today. The editorial board of the Washington Post writes: "If lawmakers don't like the call the EPA is making"—and I don't like the call the EPA is making—"they should clarify the terminology themselves."

In an ideal world, I agree with them. If we don't like something, we should be able to propose a better idea and then we should be allowed to vote on it in the Senate. The reality is the major-

ity leader, Senator REID, has essentially shut down the Senate and refuses to allow us to vote on new ideas that would actually solve challenges such as this one.

In fact, Republicans and Democrats have proposed hundreds and hundreds of amendments, and we have only been able to vote on a very small number of those—and very select ones at that. The truth is the majority leader, HARRY REID, refuses to allow any votes on almost any amendment and is enforcing a gag order on real debate, discussion and, most importantly, on votes. He has imposed a gag order on important issues that impact the lives of all Americans.

To prove my point, I put together a chart. I wish to take a moment to review the voting record over the past full year in this body. This calendar has the headline "Reid Blocks Votes." The Republican votes are in red. We have the last full year of calendar months, and July is down here as the 13th month because we started last year on July 1.

The red Xs are days when there were votes on Republican amendments, and votes on Democratic amendments are in blue. Over the past 12 months—from July of 2013 to July of 2014—Majority Leader REID has allowed Republicans to vote on their amendments a total of 8 days—8 days out of the entire 12 months there have been votes on Republican amendments. There have been a total of 11 amendments which Republicans have had a chance to offer and have votes on even though we have introduced hundreds of amendments.

It is interesting. HARRY REID has actually been tougher on his own party. The Democrats have been more restricted and more limited. If you look at this calendar, you will see the days in blue. HARRY REID has only allowed Democrats to vote 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 days over this past year that Democrats have had votes on their own amendments on the floor of the Senate. Over that time Democrats have proposed hundreds and hundreds—over 500—of amendments, and there have only been 7 Democratic amendments over the course of 5 days that have had a vote. Democrats have not had a vote on an amendment proposed by a Democratic Senator since March 27. It has been 103 days and counting since the Democrats have had an amendment that one of them has proposed and offered here in the Senate for a vote.

It is so interesting because as I look at the Presiding Officer—of the Democrats newly elected to the Senate in 2012, Members of the Presiding Officer's entire class have not had a single roll-call vote on one of their own amendments on the floor of the Senate—ever. It is an astonishing display of what the majority leader has done to muzzle an entire legislative body of both parties.

I will tell the Presiding Officer I think it is an embarrassing record. It is

an embarrassing record for the majority leader, and I think it is an embarrassing record for the Democrats—who control the Senate—to tolerate.

I think it is important for Americans to pay close attention to not just what Senators say when they go home, but actually what happens and what they do and what they stand for and what they vote on. So I would say the next time Democrats go home and tell their constituents they are introducing legislation to solve a problem, the constituents ought to ask, when? When is the vote? That is what I want to know. When is the vote? When is the vote, Mr. President? When is the vote, Senate Democrats? When is the vote, Majority Leader REID? When is the vote?

As usual, when the question is asked, silence. That is all we get in return.

So I actually believe we have a majority of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, who would actually vote to pass my amendment. This amendment I have to this bill on the floor—a majority of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, bipartisan, would vote to pass this amendment to stop the EPA's extreme takeover of waters across America. But under Senator REID's command-and-control style of leadership, I don't think we will ever know. I don't think we will have that vote, and I think Senator REID will block it.

So I would say that if my colleagues agree with the editorial board of the Washington Post, "Clear rules for clean water"—today's Washington Post editorial—then they should be able to stand and be counted. Democrats should demand it. In the recent history of the United States, if that history is any indication, as we can see by this embarrassing vote calendar, I am not at all confident that this body will ever be given the opportunity to stand and be counted, and the reason is because Majority Leader REID won't allow Republicans or Democrats to vote on my amendment or hardly anyone else's amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Republicans control the time from 2 p.m. until 3 p.m. and the majority leader control the time from 3 p.m. until 4 p.m. today.

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

#### AFGHANISTAN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have just returned from Afghanistan, where

I met with the two Presidential candidates, Dr. Ashraf Ghani and Dr. Abdullah. Both Dr. Ghani and Dr. Abdullah are impressive men who have committed to reformist agendas and campaigned throughout the country. Afghanistan is fortunate to have two such capable Presidential candidates.

In the course of my meetings with the two candidates last Sunday and indeed during many meetings over the years, each has told me that he appreciates the support the United States has provided to their country, and each will sign a bilateral security agreement with the United States as soon as possible after the next President is inaugurated.

This is a particularly sensitive time for Afghanistan, which has not had a peaceful transition of power in the 50 years since Zahir Shah was overthrown in a coup. More than 7 million ballots were cast in the first round of the Presidential election back in April, and more than 8 million ballots were recorded in the runoff election last month. All agree there was an impressive turnout in a country where the Taliban has repeatedly threatened violence against those who vote.

There have been dramatic improvements in Afghanistan over the last decade in the number of schools and universities, in the number of students and teachers—particularly female students and female teachers—in Afghan life expectancy, in average income, and in many other areas. The Afghan Army and the Afghan National Police, who have taken over security responsibility from U.S. and coalition forces, have shown great capability by successfully securing two rounds of elections and repelling a concerted Taliban attack in the Helmand region of the country.

If the ongoing dispute about the outcome of the Afghan Presidential election is not resolved in a fair and credible manner, however, these achievements would be at risk. The Taliban does not have the ability to defeat the Afghan Army or to take over Afghan cities and population centers. However, if a disputed election were to lead to infighting or to the establishment of parallel governments, the army could be severely weakened and divided, providing new opportunities for the Taliban.

The United States and our coalition allies would be much less likely to provide the continued military and economic assistance that Afghanistan needs if that country's leaders cannot pull together and resolve their disputes through the existing election process.

The State Department stated on Monday:

The continued support of the United States for Afghanistan requires that Afghanistan remains united and that the result of this election is deemed credible.

Both candidates told me personally on Sunday that they believe a comprehensive audit of the election results is necessary and appropriate and that they will abide by the results of such

an audit. They also stated that they understand the outcome of the election will not be final and will not be credible until such an audit has been completed.

The two campaign teams have been working with the United Nations and other international elections experts over the last few days to develop an appropriate audit scope to recommend to the elections commission. I had hoped that an agreement on this review could be announced at the same time that a preliminary vote count was released on Monday. While that did not happen, the head of the Independent Election Commission said the following:

The announcement [of] preliminary results does not mean the winner has been announced. The investigation of votes could have impacts on the final results.

The two campaigns have already agreed on audit triggers that will result in the review of nearly half of the ballots cast, but they have not yet reached full agreement on the measures to be taken. I hope they will be able to do so in the very near future. But this is the bottom line: Whether or not they are able to reach agreement in full, the Electoral Complaints Commission, working with the Independent Election Commission, has a responsibility to decide how many ballots to audit, and they have that responsibility on their own initiative. The Independent Election Commission must then announce a winner.

The path to resolution of the matter is not unclear. On the contrary, the Afghan Constitution and election law are very clear. There is no uncertainty about this path. The Independent Election Commission and the Electoral Complaints Commission have the responsibility to proceed on their own to determine how many ballots need to be audited and to conduct an audit with or without the agreement of the candidates. Indeed, the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan has already called on the election commissions to do just that.

I said to the two candidates on Sunday that the Afghan people and the Afghan security forces have shown great bravery in standing up for their country and that it is now time for the country's leaders to do the same. It would be truly unfortunate if the great progress made in Afghanistan at the expense of so much Afghan, American, and coalition blood and treasure were to be jeopardized by political infighting and the failure of political leadership.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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