

of the Senate is a budget that represents the needs of the rich and large corporations and their wealthy campaign donors, or whether we produce a budget which represents the needs of working families and the middle class and the millions and millions of families who are struggling economically to keep their heads above water.

I hope we make the right choice. I hope we stand with the working families of this country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am on the floor to discuss the Human Trafficking Survivors Relief and Empowerment Act, which is legislation I introduced last week to aid the recovery of survivors of human trafficking.

This bill, which I have also filed as an amendment to Senator CORNYN's Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, will make important strides toward helping survivors of human trafficking free themselves from the social stigma that is associated with their victimization and help them rebuild their lives as productive members of society.

I wish to start by sharing the story of a young woman who was featured on NPR several weeks ago. She is a human trafficking survivor. Her story is far too common.

She was raped for the first time at age 11. At 13, she was lured away from her family and eventually forced into engaging in commercial sex. She talked about the physical trauma she endured at the hands of her captor—her skull was cracked, all of her ribs broken, and she endured regular beatings and black eyes.

For roughly 7 years, her entire teenage life—a life she should have been spending in school and among friends—she endured the worst kinds of physical and emotional torture. Finally, at age 20, she was rescued by a thoughtful police officer nearly 1,400 miles from her home.

Fortunately, this young woman is now in the process of rebuilding her life. She has moved home near her family, she has a young son, and she is hoping to go to school for nursing and to make a better life for herself and her family. However, she is constantly confronted by the reality of the criminal record she accumulated as the result of being a trafficking victim. Every application she fills out, every job interview she attends, she is forced to relive and explain the most painful moments of her life.

As this victim told NPR, "I'm not ever going to forget what I've done, but at the same time, I don't want it thrown in my face every time I'm trying to seek employment."

Human traffickers use force, fraud, and coercion to compel their victims to engage in criminal activity, particularly prostitution, yet it is often the trafficking victims who are arrested, detained, prosecuted, and convicted.

My legislation is simple. It provides an incentive for States to enact laws that allow human trafficking survivors to clear their State criminal records of prostitution and other low-level, non-violent crimes that result from being trafficked.

Specifically, these vacatur statutes allow trafficking survivors to file a motion in court to expunge their criminal record for crimes they can reasonably demonstrate were the result of being trafficked.

My colleague Senator GILLIBRAND has filed a similar amendment that would address this issue at the Federal level or in Federal court. Her amendment would ensure that victims charged with Federal crimes have the opportunity to clear their record of the most serious types of charges associated with trafficking.

My amendment would encourage States to provide a remedy for the most common types of charges that trafficking victims face.

I urge my colleagues to support my legislation and my amendment. I hope we can get trafficking legislation done in a way that will help the victims in the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 5 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:01 p.m., recessed until 5 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LEE).

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks Senator ISAKSON be recognized.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, there are a lot of people—scientists, doctors and health professionals, our military and security leaders, the insurance and reinsurance industry, most of our major utilities, even faith leaders—who agree that climate change is a serious problem and an important priority.

In the private sector, many corporate leaders see climate change as both a moral challenge and a financial opportunity. Indeed, as I rise today for now the 92nd time to urge my colleagues in Congress to wake up to the urgent threat of climate change, major American companies have already begun to take action. They are not waiting around for Congress.

Ceres, for instance, is a nonprofit organization that helps to mobilize investors and business leaders to build a sustainable global economy. Ceres reports that nearly half of Fortune 500 companies now have their own clean energy targets.

Institutional investors are also committed to fighting climate change. In 2003, there were just 10 of them. Ten years later, by 2013, there were 110, holding \$13 trillion in assets. Walmart uses about 25 percent renewable energy, Google is at 35 percent, and Apple nearly 75 percent. More and more companies are seeing the benefit of cleaning up their energy sources and investing in the future, and it is not just out of the goodness of their hearts. These are our most profitable corporations. They have made a successful business model of saving money by reducing their carbon footprint.

Coca-Cola, for instance, knows how disruptive climate change can be to the water supply that is the most basic need of its bottling facilities. Apparel giant VF Corporation understands the threat of changing conditions to agricultural commodities such as cotton. And, yes, these companies also know that four out of five Americans support action on climate change. In other words, climate-friendly corporate practices are a hit with consumers, particularly younger consumers.

Since consumers want climate friendliness, there are also companies that try to have it both ways. They try to look like good actors on climate change without really being good actors. It is called green washing, and the major oil and gas companies are classic green washers. Look at their public statements and their ad campaigns, and we might think they were helping to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels. But what they say and what they do, do not match up. Look at the green ad campaigns that have been run by the big oil companies. Some of these multimillion dollar campaigns still run today.

Here is Chevron saying, "We agree," it is time for oil companies to get behind renewable energy. This campaign started in 2010 and is still around. For years Chevron said renewable energy

was part of its business plan. It actually once built utility-scale solar and geothermal projects, and it even made money doing it. But in the end, Chevron's core business of drilling up oil and gas prevailed, and last year Chevron sold off almost all of its renewable energy business, but they still pretend they are green. They still say "We agree," but in real life they don't.

Not too long ago, BP styled itself "Beyond Petroleum" and told us to think outside the barrel. The company made industry-leading investments in wind farms and solar power in the billions of dollars. But BP, too, has exited the solar business and has attempted to sell its U.S. wind farms in what a company spokesperson called "part of a continuing effort to become a more focused oil and gas company." They were just pretending to be green. Here is their logo. Look at this ridiculous little green and flower/sunshine thing from oil extractors. It is a total phony.

The pick of the fossil fuel industry litter is actually Shell. Public pronouncements from Shell Oil have been sensational. Shell ads told us of the effort to "broaden the world's energy mix." Well, in 2012, Shell reported investing about \$400 million into low-carbon alternatives, which seems like a lot until we realize that was out of nearly \$23 billion that year spent by Shell—less than 2 percent. Comparing that \$400 million in 2012, Shell has spent at least \$5 billion in recent years to expand oil and gas drilling operations in the Arctic. Shell is one of the largest holders of filthy tar sands rights in Canada.

But here is the champ when it comes to climate doublespeak. ExxonMobil excels. Since at least 2008, the oil giant has run ads such as these, with scientific formulas and Lucite molecules and all these technological-looking things. I remember one with folks in lab coats. Exxon executives and engineers tell us about the need to protect the environment and to move toward cleaner, more diverse energy sources such as wind and solar, as images behind them of wind turbines swirl in the distance.

Exxon does not report transparently enough for a solid case to be proven, but there is at least a reasonable inference that could be drawn that they spend more on advertising their green research than they spent on their green research. The Wall Street Journal wrote: "Exxon's ads are part of a growing effort by the industry to counter a political backlash against rising oil prices and global warming worries."

Faking it is not a solution, and this campaign is still running. The latest ads are right there on Exxon's Web site, where the public is watching. The Exxon Web site also tells us "rising greenhouse gas emissions pose significant risks to society and ecosystems"—again, for public consumption.

But when they filed comments with the regulators, in 2009, Exxon wrote:

"Support for the effects of climate change on public health and welfare is almost nonexistent and engulfed in an extremely high degree of uncertainty."

For years Exxon has been devoted to propping up climate denial and climate deniers. The Union of Concerned Scientists found that between 2002 and 2010 ExxonMobil contributed to and lobbied anti-climate Members of Congress over pro-climate Members at a ratio of 10 to 1. Recent disclosures show that even after vowing that it would no longer bankroll groups that deny climate change, Exxon continued for years to fund the work of climate skeptic Willie Soon, an astrophysicist whose research is under investigation for failure to divulge his oil industry backing.

Which Exxon are we supposed to believe? Remember the words of the Exxon vice president who testified before Congress in 2008 that "the pursuit of alternative fuels must not detract from the development of oil and gas."

ExxonMobil's ads boast that the company is "taking on the world's toughest energy challenge." The toughest challenge we face is finding a way to fuel the global economy without driving the climate to the breaking point with our limitless, endless carbon pollution. ExxonMobil is committed to an oil economy that has no future. If only Exxon and the other oil giants would devote more of their advertising budget to research and to the development of renewable fuels, we might be better off.

If you don't think that the big oil companies are bad enough on their own, once they get together they are downright dirty. These companies—Chevron, BP, Shell, and ExxonMobil—are all members of the American Petroleum Institute, the oil and gas industry trade association. As we all know around here, the American Petroleum Institute is dedicated to obstructing action on climate change and even to spreading false doubt about its existence, and API in turn funds some of the worst and most irresponsible climate denial front organizations.

Chevron, BP, Shell, and ExxonMobil also support something called the American Legislative Exchange Council or ALEC. ALEC is an organization which works to undercut climate science and undermine climate progress at the State level, interfering in our State legislatures. ALEC has tried to roll back State renewable fuel standards and has handed out model State legislation to obstruct and tie up the President's Clean Power Plan.

So which way are they going to have it, the way they sell themselves in the ads with funny little sunbursts and Lucite molecules or their real presence in State legislatures and in Congress spending money to shut down the climate debate and keep pumping the oil?

Major companies such as Google, eBay, Facebook, Yahoo, and even Occidental Petroleum have disassociated themselves from ALEC because of its destructive position on climate.

Google's CEO Eric Schmidt has said "they are literally lying about climate change." But they keep getting funding from Chevron, BP, Shell, and ExxonMobil.

The reality is these major fossil fuel companies are dedicated to a fossil fuel future that puts basic operating systems of our planet at risk. All these ad campaigns and all these public statements to make the companies look good are just a way to paper over that basic, dirty, continuing fact. It is a sham. It is a false front. It is phony PR, and all the green washing in the world shouldn't be able to cover it up.

But I will conclude by saying it does seem to be having its effect. We have seen recently in the news in Florida that Florida Department of Environmental Protection officials have been ordered not to use the terms "climate change" or "global warming" in any official communications, emails or reports. That is according to DEP employees, DEP consultants, DEP volunteers, and State records, all dug out by the Florida Center for Investigative Reporting.

Governor Scott of Florida has repeatedly said he is "not convinced that climate change is caused by human activity," despite the scientific evidence to the contrary. It is apparently a gag order about climate change that was well known and distributed verbally statewide.

I guess Governor Scott has told reporters that he had not been convinced about climate change and that he would need something more convincing than what I have read. I would be interested to know what his reading list was. So here we are in a world of fantasy in which the big oil polluters put on this pretense that they are clean, that they care about clean energy, that they are interested in a nonfossil fuel future, while they are supporting the very organizations that undercut that work here in Congress and they are able to get behind people such as the Governor, apparently, in Florida—certainly his administration—who are so paralyzed about climate change that they not only won't say the words, but they won't allow State employees to even say the words. That is a pathetic state of democracy.

I yield the floor, and I now turn to my friend from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I have nine grandchildren. Seven of them are 11 or under; two of them are in college. Those 7 who are 11 or under represent the joy of my life and the life of my children. But tonight when you and I go to bed and each Member of this Senate goes to bed, somewhere back in our State, young women and young children the same age as my grandchildren will be bought and sold into slavery. They will be trafficked as human beings for sex workers, for pornography workers, and for workers themselves. It is wrong for the greatest Nation on

the face of this Earth and the richest Nation on the face of this Earth to have the crime of human trafficking take place day in and day out.

I am so proud of Senator CORNYN and others from this Senate who brought forward the bill that is before us today. I want to appeal to those who are holding it up to go to cloture to ask themselves this question when they go to bed tonight: When you put your head on that pillow, some child somewhere in your State is going to be trafficked for sex purposes or pornography. Some young life, some life of innocence is going to be ruined. I think it is time for us to put aside any differences we may have on this legislation and move it forward so that we have for the first time the focus on human trafficking and the abuse of kids.

This is a serious problem in my State of Georgia. Atlanta has one of the highest rates of trafficking of any city in the United States, I am told. Our attorney general, Sam Olens, has said the following:

Human trafficking is a modern day slavery, plain and simple. It robs children of their innocence and dignity.

We must combat this evil, and it is appropriate that the most deliberative body in the world, the U.S. Senate, begin to put together a framework where we confront child slavery, sex trafficking, and the targeting of our children in multiple ways. We need to provide them with benefits to be able to be protected. A lot of that is in terms of housing and safe havens, but it also concerns other things. We need to increase the resources for victims of trafficking, No. 1. A lot of kids who are trafficked and can get out of trafficking and get out of possession end up having serious problems with PTSD and TBI. The problem of being abused as a child is as rough as the battleground in Afghanistan or Iraq. We must provide the safe havens and the therapy and the mental health care that is necessary to help them bring back their life.

I gave a graduation speech 5 years ago to a young lady who was 22 years old and just graduating from high school. She had dropped out of high school pregnant at the age of 15. She had come under the spell of a trafficker who took her in, made her a sex worker, and she ended up having three additional children. She was almost lost for life. But finally some good person found her. They brought her into the county school system. They found her a way to go to the alternative school. She ended up graduating No. 1 in her class and going to the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. A life was saved, but it was only saved because people reached out to her. We need to encourage that and produce that.

Back in my home State of Georgia in my hometown of Roswell, GA, there is a guy by the name of Dave McCleary. Dave McCleary is a Rotarian who 2 years ago took this project on as his

passion—to be a spokesman for those who are abused, those who are trafficked, and those who are thrown into prostitution and pornography. He has made a major difference in Rotary clubs in Georgia, and now they are activating themselves to pay attention to this terrible disease and this terrible affliction.

We need to recognize child pornography as a form of human trafficking so victims have access to support, and we need to require that traffickers be treated as violent criminals to protect the victims and witnesses. Most important of all, we need to help State and local governments fight human trafficking through increased shelters, law enforcement, task forces, and problem-solving cures for people with these problems.

We also need to get to the floor for another reason. Senator CORKER in the Foreign Relations Committee has a bill which would be an amendment to this bill which expands our human trafficking response. We can't get to that until we get to cloture, and we can't get to cloture until we get 60 votes.

So I appeal to Members of the Senate to find common ground to let this debate come to the floor, so that when you lay your head on the pillow tonight, instead of thinking about a child that is being abused, you think about the abuse that you are avoiding because the Senate took action on human trafficking.

COMMENDING JOHN LEWIS

MR. ISAKSON. Mr. President, 2 years ago, on the 48th anniversary of the crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge by a bunch of brave citizens who challenged the United States to do what was right and make voting rights equal for everybody, I walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with Congressman JOHN LEWIS from my State.

JOHN LEWIS is 75 years old this year, and he continues to be a leader for civil rights and for passion. This past weekend in Selma, AL, he led the President of the United States, Barack Obama, the past President of the United States, George W. Bush, and over 100 Members of Congress across the Edmund Pettus Bridge for us to reflect and remember over the last 50 years what has happened in this country, where voting rights have gone from being a dream to a reality, where equality for men and women and people of all races now exists. It would not have happened were it not for a few good men and a few good women who at their time in history responded to history's call.

JOHN LEWIS was one of those people. I am proud to serve with him in the Georgia delegation to the Congress, and I am proud of all he has done to make America a better place to live.

So on this year when he celebrates his 75th birthday anniversary and on the 50th anniversary of the crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge, I pay tribute to a great citizen of Georgia, a great American, and a great humani-

tarian—JOHN LEWIS, the Congressman from the city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MR. LEAHY. Mr. President, while the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia is on the floor, I wish to associate myself with what he had to say about Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Congressman LEWIS has been a friend, a colleague, and a mentor to all of us on both sides of the aisle on the issues of civil rights. He is one of the true heroes. We sometimes overuse the word "hero." But I think the Senator and I would both agree that this is a man who deserves the word "hero."

LYNCH NOMINATION

MR. President, we are talking about human trafficking. We have heard horrific stories. Certainly those of us who are parents or grandparents have to think how horrible it would be if these things had happened to our children or our grandchildren.

I am usually the only person on the floor who has prosecuted child molesters—and I still have nightmares over some of the cases I have prosecuted—I wish we would never have another one of these awful cases.

So as we consider legislation about human trafficking and exploitation, we could take immediate action to show support for protecting our Nation's most vulnerable from human trafficking by confirming Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General. I say this because Ms. Lynch has a proven track record in prosecuting human trafficking and child rape cases.

Ms. Lynch's record in pursuing these cases is so well established that even prominent FOX News hosts have praised her. One host at FOX News called her a "hero" for the prosecution of a child rapist. Another has described Ms. Lynch as a "straight shooter" for her overall service as a Federal prosecutor. And a third host on FOX News has called for a vote on her nomination "this week", saying there should be "no more slow walking" by the Senate. I couldn't agree more.

As we go into this debate, I think about the fact that Ms. Lynch was recently named one of "New York's New Abolitionists" by the New York State Anti-Trafficking Coalition. Why? Because of her leadership in combatting human trafficking. She has emphasized anti-trafficking programs at the U.S. Attorney's office that she leads. Over the course of the last decade, her office has not just talked about why they oppose human trafficking, they have indicted over 55 defendants in sex trafficking cases. They have rescued over 110 victims of sex trafficking.

I will give you a couple of examples. In one case, her office obtained convictions against three brothers for sex trafficking. What did they do? These brothers were sentenced to double-digit prison terms for running a trafficking

ring that enticed victims as young as 14 and 15 years old. They had them transported illegally into the United States. Then they forced them to work as prostitutes in New York City and elsewhere. The defendants beat and sexually assaulted the victims to compel them to work and then punished them for not earning enough money.

In another case her office obtained a conviction against an owner of several New York bars for his role in sex trafficking and forced labor ring. The evidence at the trial established that the defendants recruited and harbored scores of undocumented Latin American immigrants and forced them to work as waitresses at the owner's bars.

How did they compel them to work? His accomplices used violence, beatings, and rape, as well as fraud and threats of deportation, to compel the victims to work and to prevent them from reporting the illegal activity to the police. Because of Loretta Lynch, this monster was arrested and sentenced to 60 years in prison. That is one way you stop this.

She has similarly prosecuted those who exploit children for sexual abuse to the fullest extent of the law. During her tenure, she has directed prosecutors in her office to bring 173 prosecutions for child exploitation and child pornography in coordination with the Department's Project Safe Childhood. In one case, the office prosecuted and obtained a guilty plea from a pediatrician who sexually exploited three of his patients under the guise of providing medical treatment. That predator now faces 30 years in prison.

I am saying this because no Member of this body—Republican or Democrat—no Member is in favor of sex trafficking. No Member is in favor of the exploitation of children in this fashion. Why don't we show we believe that, by confirming this highly qualified woman to be attorney general? She goes out and gets the people, she prosecutes them, she convicts them, and she sends them to prison.

I sometimes think of those exploited children I represented in the past. In the better cases, we could tell the child that he or she was safe and that we locked up the person who did this to them. But I also think of one of the very first cases I had—within weeks of becoming a 26-year-old State's attorney. I will never forget that case for as long as I live. We prosecuted the man. I convicted him. It was appealed to the Vermont Supreme Court, and I argued and won that appeal. He was convicted and went to prison for the rest of his life. But that does not help his victim. I can only go to the grave of his 2-year-old victim and say: We convicted the man who did this to you, but we can't bring you back to life.

Let's take the steps we need to stop this. We can do it. We stalled at one point on this bill. Let's find our way around that, and let's get this done. Let's give prosecutors the tools not just to prosecute criminals when we

find them—let's take the steps necessary to stop this from happening in the first place.

When I think of that 2-year-old boy, if better steps had been in place to stop the abuse from happening, he would have lived. The abuser was prosecuted after the fact. There was no case in which I wanted to get a conviction more than I did in that case, but it didn't bring the 2-year-old victim back to life. Some victims in the cases I worked on were alive, and I saw how scarred the abuse left them.

We can prosecute those who commit these heinous crimes. Let's stop the crimes from happening. Let's ensure that these homeless kids, instead of going with anybody who will offer them a warm place and food—where the warm place and food turn into a hell on Earth for them—let's make sure there are shelters, people, and counselors who can help.

Mr. President, I see our distinguished chairman is here, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss what I discussed earlier in the day. In fact, I think it was this morning when I spoke to the reason why this legislation is not moving along. I am not going to repeat what I said then, but since then the minority leader came to the floor and gave reasons for this bill not moving along, and so I will once again bring up some important issues about this legislation and rebut the other side on why we are not moving forward with this bill.

As we all know, this bill was unveiled in January after weeks of negotiation among our respective staff. It has been in the public domain since it was introduced in January. Since that time, we have followed regular order with respect to this legislation. We had a hearing on this bill. We scheduled a markup in February, and amendments were offered to the bill at that markup. The ranking member offered an amendment to the very same section of the bill that included this language.

Numerous committee members took the opportunity to speak about the bill during the hearing and markup. The markup offered a prime opportunity for any member—including the minority members of the Senate—to ask questions and make changes and strip out language to which they might have objected. We promised regular order during floor consideration as well, just as we have on practically every other piece of legislation that has been before the Senate since the new majority has taken over.

The language which they now object to on the floor, weeks after a committee markup took place—I remind everyone that this bill passed without a single dissenting vote in committee—is referred to as the Hyde amendment. We are talking about language that has been standard for the last 39 or 40 years. It is included virtually every time Congress appropriates taxpayer

dollars for health services. The Hyde amendment has been and currently is the law of the land.

Hyde amendment language has been added to appropriations bills every year for decades. We have heard: Well, it has been added to appropriations bills, but it has not been on authorization bills. That is not true because it has been included in more than one authorization statute. I will give some examples, including laws authorizing the SCHIP program and programs in the Department of Defense. We negotiated this bill and this language in good faith.

I urge the Members of this body not to impede passage of a measure that over 200 groups have reviewed and endorsed. Yesterday I put letters from some of those groups or maybe even all of those groups in the RECORD so everyone can see the wide support this bill has not only in the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee by being voted out unanimously, but also outside groups support it as well. The 200 outside groups who participated in the hours of helping us reach a consensus on this bill have made it clear that ending human trafficking is an important priority for all of them. We need to put aside partisan politics. We need to pass this bill for their sake and the sake of trafficking survivors who are being subjected to degradation every day while we wait to act.

My asking that politics be put aside in order to get this legislation passed is not something new. Those politics were put aside in the Judiciary Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hate to see this held up over just the Hyde amendment. In somewhat similar legislation, the Republican House of Representatives was wise enough not to create this illusory "special assessment fund." The House-passed bill is an authorizing bill and does not contain the Hyde amendment.

I will yield the floor in a moment, but first I wish to quote from a statement by ATEST, Alliance To End Slavery and Trafficking. They urged the Senate, as I have, to reach a bipartisan compromise on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

For well over a decade, the work to combat modern slavery and human trafficking has been an example of Congress's ability to put partisanship aside in the interest of tackling a difficult and seemingly intractable problem. That willingness to be thoughtful, practical, and balanced in approach has proven successful in this work, and made tremendous contributions to the fight against this heinous crime. The debate that is emerging over the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, S. 178, and the application of the Hyde amendment to funds collected from perpetrators of human trafficking jeopardize this pragmatic balance in favor of a partisan confrontation that undermines the achievement of our joint goal of ending modern slavery in the United States and around the world.

For these reasons, we urge all members of the Senate to turn away from this divisive

debate and find a bipartisan approach to this new initiative to protect and serve the needs of survivors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALLIANCE TO
END SLAVERY AND TRAFFICKING,
Washington, DC.

ATEST URGES SENATE TO REACH BIPARTISAN
COMPROMISE ON JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF
TRAFFICKING ACT

For well over a decade, the work to combat modern slavery and human trafficking has been an example of Congress's ability to put partisanship aside in the interest of tackling a difficult and seemingly intractable problem. That willingness to be thoughtful, practical, and balanced in approach has proven successful in this work, and made tremendous contributions to the fight against this heinous crime. The debate that is emerging over the Justice of Victims of Trafficking Act, S. 178, and the application of the Hyde Amendment to funds collected from perpetrators of human trafficking jeopardize this pragmatic balance in favor of a partisan confrontation that undermines the achievement of our joint goal of ending modern slavery in the United States and around the world.

For these reasons, we urge all members of the Senate to turn away from this divisive debate and find a bipartisan approach to this new initiative to protect and serve the needs of survivors.

Mr. LEAHY. I agree that we should get away from the divisiveness the Hyde amendment has created and find a way to go to the basic legislation.

Mr. President, I see my friend from Tennessee in the Chamber, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, I come to the floor to offer an amendment to the legislation, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am sorry, I didn't hear what the request was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I sent an amendment to the desk.

Mr. LEAHY. Did the Senator ask to set aside the pending amendment?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I did not.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. President, I withhold that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Then I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, am I correct that the Senator from Tennessee

is not asking the Senate to set aside the pending amendment but wishes to file an amendment? Is that correct?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Vermont through the Chair that the answer is yes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I will not object.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment entitled the Stop Sexual Abuse by School Personnel Act of 2015. It is sponsored by me and Mr. KIRK, the Senator from Illinois.

In summary, what the amendment does is the following:

It requires States to have a criminal background check for all school employees.

It allows States and local school districts to use Federal funding authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures on background checks for school employees. Our amendment accomplishes this through the following: providing States with the flexibility and resources to conduct searches of State and Federal criminal registries as determined by the State; empowering States to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures concerning the timely disclosure, notice, and appeal of background check results; supporting the development, implementation, or improvement of mechanisms for assisting in the identification of and response to incidents of child abuse, including by providing training and development for school personnel; and any other activities determined by the State to protect student safety.

In addition, the Alexander-Kirk amendment adopts the 2014 General Accountability Office report which recommended establishing the U.S. Department of Education as the lead agency to inform States of best practices. It also authorizes the U.S. Education Secretary to make reporting of student sexual abuse by school personnel a part of the annual Secretary's report card. Finally, it protects schools and school districts from being sued if they are in compliance with State regulations and requirements.

This is an enormously important subject and one of interest to every single Member of the United States Senate. There is at least one other amendment on the subject by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia. I expect there may be more amendments on the same subject. They all have the same goal—preventing sexual abuse of the 50 million children in our 100,000 public schools by school personnel.

These amendments are all under the jurisdiction of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, of which I am the chair. As chair of that committee, I believe there is a right way and a wrong way to reach this

laudable goal. The right way is for the Federal Government to enable States and local governments to do a better job. The wrong way is for the Federal Government to set itself up as a national school board or as a human resources department to override State laws and dictate how to hire and fire six million teachers or other school personnel.

We have 6 million school personnel that could be affected by background check proposals. The question is, Can the local school board or can Washington, DC, do a better job of helping make children safe in Utah, in Iowa, in Tennessee, or in Vermont?

Senators TOOMEY and MANCHIN deserve our thanks and great credit for putting the spotlight on this issue that every single Senator cares about. But, I am afraid their solution for background checks will try to accomplish this purpose the wrong way. It would override State laws in at least 46 States to dictate policies and procedures for 100,000 public schools. Their approach and their amendment, if enacted, would be the most extensive Federal takeover of local school personnel decisions in our country's history.

Let me say that once more. Their amendment, if enacted, would be the most extensive Federal takeover of local school personnel decisions in our country's history.

Now, I see on the floor the Senator from Iowa. I have spent some time in Iowa over the years and I know what a good education system they have in Iowa. In fact, Iowans are very particular about their education system. I don't know of a State that was more upset with No Child Left Behind than Iowa when it passed because it dictated education policies from Washington. Iowans asked, "Does Washington cherish the children of Iowa more than we do in Des Moines or in any other community in Iowa? Why do the people in Washington think they can tell us what to do about how to educate our children better than we do?" That is the issue here: whether it is Washington imposing academic standards such as Common Core or deciding whether schools and teachers are succeeding or failing, or mandating a one-size-fits-all approach to employee background checks on 6 million school personnel in 100,000 schools. I believe the American people are tired of this Washington-knows-best attitude toward local schools.

Senator KIRK and I have the Stop Sexual Abuse By School Personnel Act of 2015—which offers an approach toward this laudable goal in the correct way. Let me explain why I say it is the correct way.

First, it requires every state to have background checks for its 6 million employees who have access to children, but it doesn't dictate to them how to do the checks. Repeatedly we have found that when Congress tells the U.S. Department of Education to do something, it then proceeds to write a lot of

regulations about exactly how to do it. I will give you an example.

In No Child Left Behind, there are requirements about improving low-performing schools. The law says there are six ways you must fix them. I put in the law last year a seventh way to fix schools: allowing the Governor of the State to come up with his or her own way to do this. Then, the U.S. Department of Education Secretary can approve or disapprove that approach. The Department, in its well-intentioned activities, defined what a Governor of Tennessee or Utah or Iowa could say about his or her own idea about fixing low-performing schools. That happens all the time. It happens all the time. Over the last several years we have created, in effect, a national school board in Washington, DC, by substituting the judgment of Washington for local schools. Achieving the laudable goal of stopping sexual abuse by school personnel in the way suggested by the Senators from Pennsylvania and West Virginia would only make that national school board bigger. In the words of one teacher I spoke with, their proposal would only make the U.S. Department of Education more of a human resources department for 6 million local school personnel.

Last year, the Government Accountability Office found that 46 States require background checks for all public school employees. My amendment require all states to do them. It would also ensure background checks for contractors who have unsupervised contact or interaction with children.

It would also let schools and school districts use Federal funding to expand access to more registries since the cost of conducting the checks sometimes keep them from doing so.

My amendment takes this broader approach because the Government Accountability Office report in 2014 that background checks alone are not enough to prevent child abuse by school personnel. Background checks are only as good as the databases used to conduct them. I understand sometimes those databases can have inaccurate or incomplete information. One report estimated that 1.8 million workers a year are subject to FBI background checks that include faulty or incomplete information such as the final result of the case.

GAO's report also highlights that those charged with child abuse are only a fraction of those who abuse children. For example, a risk management company told GAO that few child abusers are caught the first time they abuse, and many abuse children multiple times before they are caught. Therefore, background checks alone are not enough to help protect children from abuse.

Experts say, according to the GAO report, that training to prevent child abuse is a key tool to help school employees recognize early warning signs of abuse and they recommend that schools integrate training into their

child abuse prevention efforts. Yet, because of cost constraints, GAO found that only 18 States required training. The amendment Senator KIRK and I are offering would help more States with schools that offer training by allowing States and school districts to use Federal funding to do it.

Third, the Alexander-Kirk amendment would establish the Department of Education as a resource for States. The Department of Education is not supposed to be the school board for Utah or Tennessee or Iowa; it is supposed to be, if anything, an enabling resource. So another important way to prevent child abuse is to ensure schools are aware of information and resources that are already available to them by the Federal Government.

According to GAO, again: "The Federal Government, through its existing resources and expertise, is well positioned to assist States and localities and to help strengthen their prevention and response efforts."

Yet, last year, more than 30 States surveyed by GAO were not aware of Federal resources available to schools to help address sexual abuse because no single agency was leading this effort, and coordination among the Federal agencies is limited. In one baffling example, a lead official who coordinates interagency meetings to talk about child maltreatment said none of the meetings had focused on sexual abuse by school personnel.

States are looking for help. Twenty-nine States said additional guidance and technical assistance could be useful, such as guidance on developing professional standards and codes of conduct, examples of training models, and materials, and opportunities for grants. That is why the Alexander-Kirk amendment adopts GAO's recommendation to instruct the Secretary of Education to lead an effort, in coordination with other agencies, to develop and disseminate best practices that States, districts, and schools can take to prevent and respond to sexual abuse by school personnel.

Fourth, the amendment would recommend that the Secretary of Education pull together a dependable set of data on abuse by school personnel for the Secretary's report card. GAO reported that several Federal agencies collect data related to violence against children and students, but none systematically identify the extent of sexual abuse by school personnel. Therefore, my amendment also adopts the GAO recommendation that the Secretary of Education work to identify ways to better track and analyze the prevalence of child abuse by school personnel and report on it in the Secretary's report card.

This is an approach to solving the problem that respects the idea that in my hometown, and in each Senator's hometown in 100,000 schools, there are school boards, parents, and communities that cherish their children and they don't believe that Washington

cherishes them more. This proposal would give those parents, communities, teachers, and principals the tools they need to prevent child abuse. It would enable them to do a better job of stopping sexual abuse of children by school personnel.

In a meeting I attended earlier today, it was said that the Senate has already passed the Toomey-Manchin amendment because we passed the child care and development block grant. Let me talk about that a minute. The child care and development block grant went through the committee I now chair. There are three things wrong with the argument that the Toomey-Manchin amendment has already passed. First, the child care development block grant is funded 100 percent by the Federal Government. It affects 1.5 million children. It affects a little more than 1 million children. The Federal Government funds about 10 percent of elementary and secondary education. So if we fund 100 percent of a program, the argument is strong that we can also write the rules for it. If we fund 10 of a program, the people who fund 90 percent might say, "What gave you the right to tell us what to do?"

Second, the argument was made that the child care and development block grant contains basically the same set of background checks as the Toomey-Manchin. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Toomey-Manchin amendment is significantly different from the background check provisions in the child care and development block grant. It is different in terms of its scope, privacy provisions, mitigating factors in an appeals process, potential lawsuits against a school district, and materiality. Let me focus on these differences for a minute.

First, in terms of scope, the child care and development block grant applies to about 1.5 million children who receive vouchers to for childcare. The Toomey-Manchin bill applies to all elementary and secondary schools in States that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That is 100,000 public elementary and secondary schools, 14,000 local school districts, and 50 State education agencies.

Second, in terms of privacy, the child care and development block grant ensures that the only information employers receive is whether the prospective employee passed or failed the background check. The Toomey-Manchin amendment has no similar protections and allows employers to share the results of background checks with other prospective employers. That is a privacy concern.

Third, it differs in terms of what we call mitigating factors: The child care and development block grant permits States to create a review process through which disqualified employees can become eligible for employment due to mitigating factors such as the length of time since they committed a crime. The Toomey-Manchin bill

doesn't permit States to conduct such reviews. My bill allows states to do a review.

Fourth, private right of action provisions: The child care and development block grant expressly does not create a private right of action if the childcare provider is in compliance with all State regulations. The Toomey-Manchin bill does not contain similar language, potentially exposing schools to litigation. The Alexander amendment does include that.

Finally, materiality. The child care and development block grant precludes hiring an employee if they make a material false statement on a background check. The Toomey-Manchin bill has no such materiality requirement.

I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, these differences between the background check requirements in the child care and development block grant bill and the Toomey-Manchin amendment.

Finally, I am glad we are discussing the topic of protecting students from sexual abuse. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia for putting the spotlight on this issue. I have worked with them to suggest changes to their bill.

We have fundamental differences in our approaches. I think, when it comes to local schools, the limit of Washington's responsibility is to enable communities and schools to do a better job of educating our children.

Most of the discussion we are having in the Senate education committee today is reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The discussion is about who determines whether schools and teachers are succeeding or failing, local communities or Washington? The theory is that local control of these decisions allows for more innovation. This respects the fact that parents, communities, teachers, and principals cherish their own children. It certainly would be wrong for us to say Washington cherishes their children more than they do.

I spend a lot of my time arguing with people—they are often Democrats—who want to say: I have got a good idea. Now, let's impose it on all schools. For example, Common Core—we have 42 States operating under waivers from the U.S. Department of Education. In order to get that waiver, which they need to keep their schools from being deemed as failing, states have to, in effect, adopt Common Core. This requirement has created a general uprising in Tennessee; I imagine it has in North Carolina; I suspect it has in Iowa, not so much because of what the standards are but because the very idea that Washington would be telling local school districts it knows better than their state capital and local school boards what their academic standards ought to be. The same thing with teacher evaluation.

When I was the Governor of Tennessee in the 1980s, we became the first

State to pay teachers more for teaching well. I had a year-and-a-half brawl with the National Education Association. When we defeated them, and 10,000 teachers were gradually able to move up the career ladder.

When I came to Washington, people thought I would require every State do that. I said, absolutely not. That is not the way our constitutional federalism works. States have a right to be right, and have a right to be wrong on teacher evaluation and Common Core. Those are tremendously important issues, but it is hard enough to fairly evaluate a teacher without Washington trying to tell you how to do it.

Take the business of whether a school is succeeding or failing, whether a school has made adequate yearly progress, or whether a teacher is highly qualified. We have had a 12-year experiment with trying to make all these decisions at the U.S. Department of Education. One teacher said it had become a human resources department for 100,000 local schools. It hasn't worked. It does help to know how the children are doing on their tests. It does help to aggregate the results so we know whether children are falling behind. It does help for States to have the results from the national assessment of educational progress so we can compare North Carolina to Tennessee. But it does not help to have well-meaning people in Washington say: I know exactly how to make your children safe, how to tell them what to learn, how to evaluate teachers, how to tell them whether schools are succeeding or failing, and how to fix them.

One other example. What about guns? Sexual abuse of children is a terrible tragedy. That is why we have at least two amendments on it, and maybe we will have a third. So are guns in schools. We have had some terrible tragedies there.

What did the U.S. Congress do about that 20 years ago? They passed something called the Gun-Free School Zones Act. They whipped it right through Congress as if that was going to fix the problem of guns in every school in America. There were two things wrong with it. The Supreme Court of the United States struck the bill down as unconstitutional, as a Federal overreach into local affairs. But the main thing wrong with it was that is not how you make schools safe. You don't make schools safe by passing a law in Washington and pretending you have made 50 million children safe in 100,000 schools. This would suggest that if there is a problem with school safety in my hometown in Maryville, TN, it is up to the U.S. Senate to fix that problem, to make the schools safe. It is not. That is not how you do it. In my hometown, they make that school safe because the community is involved. They win the football games, they have good academic scores, and they have safe schools. Someone asked the principal when they won the football game why they did so well? The principal said, it

is because we are a community school. When something happens here, the community shows up.

If we want to fix the problem of abuse of children in schools, there is a right way to do it and there is a wrong way to do it. The right way is to recognize the problem, require States to have background checks, and enable them to do a better job at using Federal funds to access data registries and provide training for employees. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education can be designated as the lead agency to provide best practices to local schools and to include data on the prevalence of child abuse by school personnel on Secretary's report card. The wrong way to do it is to take over the personnel decisions for 6 million employees in 100,000 schools and pretend that schools will be safer. There is a fundamental difference of opinion by Senators who agree on a laudable goal.

I believe it is more appropriate under our constitutional system of federalism for Congress to limit itself to enabling schools to do a better job of their essential responsibilities rather than creating, in effect, a national school board that tries to run our schools and hire and fire those personnel.

I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks a summary of the Alexander-Kirk amendment.

I yield the floor.

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

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BACKGROUND CHECK REQUIREMENTS IN CCDBG AND TOOMEY BILL

The Child Care and Development and Block Grant (CCDBG), as amended in 2014, and Senator Toomey's amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act both create a new requirement that states, as a condition of receiving federal funds under relevant programs, conduct comprehensive criminal background checks for all prospective and current child care or school employees. Key differences between the two approaches include:

Scope:

CCDBG applies to all child care providers that receive federal funding

Toomey's bill applies to all elementary and secondary schools in states that receive federal funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This includes:

100,000 public elementary and secondary schools

14,000 local school districts

50 state educational agencies

Privacy:

CCDBG ensures that the only information employers receive is whether the prospective employee passed or failed the background check.

Toomey's bill has no similar protections and allows employers to share the results of background checks with other prospective employers.

Mitigating factors:

CCDBG permits states to create a review process through which disqualified employees can become eligible for employment due to mitigating factors, such as the length of time since they committed a crime.

Toomey's bill does not permit states to conduct such reviews.

Private right of action:

CCDBG does not create a private right of action if the child care provider is in compliance with all state requirements.

Toomey's bill does not contain similar language, potentially opening schools to litigation.

Materiality:

CCDBG precludes hiring an employee if they make a material false statement on a background check; Toomey's bill has no such materiality requirement.

THE STOP SEXUAL ABUSE BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL ACT OF 2015

WHAT THE ALEXANDER AMENDMENT DOES

Requires states to have a criminal background check for all school employees.

Allows States or local school districts to use federal funding authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education act to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures on background checks for school employees, including:

Providing states with the flexibility and resources to conduct searches of State and Federal criminal registries, as determined by the State;

Empowering states to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures concerning the timely disclosure, notice, and appeal of background check results;

Supporting the development, implementation, or improvement of mechanisms for assisting in the identification of and response to incidents of child abuse, including by providing training and development for school personnel; and

Any other activities determined by the State to protect student safety.

Adopts the 2014 GAO report recommendation to establish the U.S. Department of Education as the lead agency to inform schools of best practices.

Authorizes the U.S. Education Secretary to make reporting of student sexual abuse by school personnel a part of an annual "Secretary's Report Card."

Protects schools and school districts from being sued if in compliance with State regulations and requirements.

REASONS TO SUPPORT THIS AMENDMENT

It requires states to have a criminal background check for all school employees, help states and local school districts do them, but does not dictate how they do it.

It will support what most states are already doing—According to GAO, 46 States already require background checks of some kind for all public school employees and 42 States have established professional standards or codes of conduct for school personnel.

Rather than mandating a one-size-fits-all approach for 14,000 local school districts and 100,000 public schools, it will provide states with flexibility to establish, implement, or improve background check policies and procedures that best meet State and local needs.

It will support State and local efforts to increase reporting of child abuse, limit the transfer of school personnel implicated in abuse, as well as provide training on how to recognize, respond to, and prevent child abuse in schools.

It will protect schools and local school districts from civil litigation resulting from background check decisions that are otherwise in compliance with State regulations and requirements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS).

The Senator from Iowa.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the nomination that will be before the entire Senate next week, the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be the Attorney General of the United States of America, and to urge all of my Senate colleagues to quickly confirm United States Attorney Lynch to this position.

Loretta Lynch has dedicated much of her life—many years of her life—to public service, serving twice as the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York. In this role she earned a reputation as a tough but fair prosecutor.

I would like to take a few minutes to outline some of Loretta Lynch's record. As United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she has kept communities safer by bringing serious, violent criminals to justice, prosecuting high-level gang members and drug traffickers. U.S. Attorney Lynch has also tirelessly fought public corruption. While she was at the U.S. Attorney's Office, she was the lead prosecutor in municipal corruption cases on Long Island and supervised the prosecution of the New York State Senate majority leader recently.

During her time in private practice, Loretta Lynch did pro bono work as special counsel to the prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, further evidencing her commitment to public service and to the enforcement of the law. Hers is a truly impressive record, and one that without question prepared United States Attorney Lynch to serve as Attorney General Lynch upon confirmation by the Senate.

I had the opportunity to meet with Loretta Lynch this past January. She and I discussed how the Department of Justice can do more to give law enforcement the tools it needs, also to eliminate witness intimidation—a major issue in cities such as Philadelphia and others around the country. Also, we talked about reforming the juvenile justice system, and finally reducing tensions between police, law enforcement and the communities they serve.

I was very impressed by United States Attorney Lynch. I believe she is well suited to address these and many other issues she will confront as the Attorney General of the United States. These issues, of course, are not only critical to Pennsylvania but also our whole country.

I am also confident that Loretta Lynch, when she is confirmed—and I believe she will be—will continue the important work of Attorney General Holder to fairly enforce Federal voting and civil rights laws, to support equal-

ity for LGBT Americans, to work to reduce the over-incarceration of non-violent offenders, and also to address disparities in our criminal justice system.

Despite Loretta Lynch's record as a prosecutor, serving twice as the United States attorney in the State of New York, and despite her record and countless expressions of support from law enforcement, from civil rights advocates, and past Attorneys General, Loretta Lynch's nomination has been pending for 122 days before the Senate. This is the longest it has taken the U.S. Senate to vote on the nominee for Attorney General in 30 years.

This is especially surprising given that the Senate has already confirmed Loretta Lynch twice. In both 2000 and 2010, the Senate confirmed Loretta Lynch to be the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, as I mentioned earlier. In each case her confirmation before the Senate was unanimous.

Loretta Lynch's nomination we know is historic for many reasons, but the principal reason is she would be the first African-American woman to serve as the Nation's Attorney General. However, apart from the historic nature of her nomination, and I hope confirmation, Loretta Lynch is supremely qualified for this position for all the reasons I stated earlier. They could be summarized in a few words: integrity, intellect, and experience. I could add more words to that, but they are the qualities we want in any prosecutor and, of course, they are the qualities we want in an Attorney General. I believe we have those qualities with Attorney General Holder, and we want to have the confirmation completed for the new Attorney General nominee, Loretta Lynch.

I strongly support Loretta Lynch's nomination, and I am pleased the majority leader has committed to considering her nomination on the Senate floor. I call on all of my colleagues to confirm Loretta Lynch without delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we live in a country of unparalleled opportunity. The blessings of liberty are the birthright of every American, and the Framers ordained our Constitution to protect these rights. To deny any person these basic freedoms would seem almost unthinkable today. So the fact that even as I speak there are thousands of individuals living as slaves in our very own country is even more unthinkable. But it is undeniably true.

In this country, right now, there are thousands of human beings living as slaves, men, women, and children, stolen from their homes, stripped of their God-given rights, and robbed of their human dignity. These individuals live