

I have been focused like a laser for some time now on justice for the victims of human trafficking. When I think for a minute about the fact that the typical victim of human trafficking is a 12- to 13-year-old girl, who has been sold essentially into sex slavery and who has lost control over her life and perhaps, to her mind, to her future. I cannot think of a more compelling need for the Senate than to try to offer a lifeline to these victims of human trafficking. That is what this legislation that hopefully we will act on today—perhaps no later than tomorrow—is designed to do. It creates a fund that could be as high as \$30 million—not from taxes but from fines and penalties paid by people who commit sexual offenses and basically represents the demand side of the human trafficking equation.

We have found a way now, on a bipartisan basis, to move this legislation forward so we can offer a hand to rescue these victims of human trafficking, so we can give them an opportunity to heal and we can provide them some hope for a better future.

I know all of us, by virtue of the privilege of the office that we serve in, have had stories from constituents about human trafficking. I remember quite clearly Brooke Axtell of Austin, TX, who now works with a number of nonprofits, and has basically turned her tragic story into serving others who have likewise become victims of human trafficking. Brooke's story is really almost beyond belief. She says that at age 7 she was sexually abused. She was literally held captive in a basement and sold to men who would pay money to have sex with her, a 7-year old child.

Brooke has brought to light her pain and has begun to heal as a result of having been rescued and been given a helping hand. But she has now turned her tragic story into hope by honorably helping others find a way out of a life that she herself experienced. She founded a group called Survivor Healing and Empowerment, which is a healing community of survivors of rape, abuse, and sex trafficking.

There is another horrific story that I have heard—I am sure just as all the Members of the Senate have heard coming from their States, because this is not something isolated in one State. This is a national—indeed, it is an international—phenomenon. Another woman I have had the privilege of meeting with and who has shared her story with me is Melissa Woodward from the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Melissa was 12 years old when she was sold into the sex trade by a family member—unbelievable. Eventually, she was pulled out of school to be trafficked full time when she was in the sixth grade. Her life, as she describes it, became a prison. She was literally chained to a bed in a warehouse, she says, and endured regular beatings and obviously, sexual assaults.

There was even once an attempt to set her on fire by one of her abusers.

All the while, she says, she was forced to serve between 5 and 30 men every day. She said she wished she was dead.

As heartbreaking as Melissa's story is, just as sad is the way she was treated after she escaped her captors. In one of the big changes in the way we have approached victims of human trafficking—at one point we claimed they were the criminal because they had engaged in prostitution. But the idea of a child prostitute is an oxymoron. A child cannot consent to a life of prostitution.

What we find, in looking at the victims of human trafficking, is that many of them are manipulated, coerced, and forced to engage in this sex activity for the economic benefit of their johns or their pimps or their traffickers. This is all about money. This is about the face of evil that treats human beings as objects or as things, without the basic dignity and respect which all human beings are entitled to. But as I said, one of the problems with the way we used to treat victims of human trafficking is that we treated them like criminals. That was all too common an outcome for trafficking victims who were labeled as prostitutes and left with very few options but to ultimately return to a nightmare that, sadly, exists in our country.

That is beginning to change. It needs to change even more, which is another reason why we need to pass this bill. This is the kind of legislation that I think in many ways is unique, because it is a nonpartisan piece of legislation. All this legislation is designed to do is to help the victims of human trafficking get rescued and then begin to heal and to get on with their lives. It is designed to provide much-needed resources for victims of human trafficking—plain and simple. It may be nothing more than a safe place to sleep, protected from the people who would continue to abuse them.

It is designed to help people such as Brooke, Melissa, and so many others—the tens of thousands of victims of human trafficking. This legislation would not only provide help for those victims, but it would ensure that children such as Melissa are treated as victims and not criminals.

It would also add law enforcement tools to help authorities rescue victims and to take down human traffickers and the organized criminal networks who support them. That is an important point because human trafficking is not a mom-and-pop business. This is run by organized crime and criminal networks, some of them international or transnational.

I want to thank my colleagues for caring—for caring about people such as Melissa and Brooke and the many examples of human trafficking that we have all been introduced to.

I want to particularly express my gratitude for all of our colleagues for working on this and not giving up until we found a pathway toward success. This body's consideration of this bill

has proven that compromise and bipartisanship need not be relics of the past in today's Washington. They are very much alive and well, particularly when the need is so very great, as it is in this area. So now for the sake of these victims, let's get this important legislation passed and provide crucial help for the children trapped in modern day slavery.

I want to just conclude by saying a few thank-you's. I know it is a little premature. But we would not have gotten this far if it were not for the help of organizations such as Rights4Girls, Shared Hope International, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, the End Child Prostitution and Trafficking organization, the National Association to Protect Children, and members of our staff in the Senate who have worked so hard to get us where we are today.

I want to express my gratitude to Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator MURRAY, and Senator REID, on the other side of the aisle, who have worked so closely with us, and of course to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, and particularly I want to single out the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL. He said we would not move to the nomination for Attorney General of the United States until we get this done. And, indeed, today, I hope and believe that we will get this done, and then we can turn to that nomination.

But there are others, perhaps too many to name: Senator WARNER, Senator HEITKAMP, and others on the Democratic side. There are those on the Republican side. Senator COLLINS comes to mind, and there are others who have worked so hard and so relentlessly and with such determination to get us where we are today. We need to get this over the finish line so we can move on to other business.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I was not going to be talking right now, but I understand some of the people who are going to be reserving time are not yet here.

PILOT'S BILL OF RIGHTS 2

Mr. President, I want to remind my colleagues on the floor that we have a piece of legislation that is coming up that no one is really plugged into right now, but it is going to be coming before us in a very short period of time.

Back in 2011, I introduced a bill and passed a bill called the Pilot's Bill of Rights. It was something that was very meaningful to a relatively small number of people, but these are single-issue people, and it strove to correct a problem in our justice system that existed for as long as I could remember.

Having been an active commercial pilot for the last over 50 years—and there are not too many in the Senate; and in our delegation in Oklahoma, I was the only one until a couple years ago—it is only natural that I receive comments from a lot of people concerning problems they have with the FAA.

There are a lot of great people in the FAA, and a lot of them I have worked with for many, many years. But there are also some—and this is true with any regulatory body, anyone who has authority over individuals. I remember back many years ago when I was the mayor of Tulsa. We had a great police force. But all it takes is two or three of them who are the bad guys. We are seeing some of that around today, and that gives a bad reputation to a lot of people. The same thing is true with some of the people who are working with the FAA.

I can remember helping others, and I always did come to their aid when they felt they were not getting proper justice. But it really did not register with me until it actually happened to me. Back about 3 years ago, flying an airplane into a Texas airfield that is not a controlled airfield, there was an activity going on on the runway without any NOTAMs that had been advised—and nobody actually had any way of knowing this—and with permission I landed on that runway. This is a runway in far South Texas called the Cameron County Airport. It has a 9,000-foot runway. They were working on just a couple thousand feet of it, so it was very easy to come in.

Now, because of certain individuals who had some other reasons to be critical of me, all kinds of things happened as a result of that. In fact, just recently they have even had some cartoons talking about how I landed on a runway and was chasing people off the runway. None of that was true.

But this is what happened. They proposed to have a violation against me, and I was totally helpless, knowing—and many hundreds of others have had this experience; I never had—that I could lose my license on the whims of one individual in the field.

Now, it would not have been as critical for me. That is not how I make my living. But look at some people who do make their living that way. They could lose their license just because of one individual who did not like them. Bob

Hoover is a good example. Bob Hoover, who I guess is in his nineties now, arguably was the most gifted pilot I can ever remember. He was the one, I say to the Presiding Officer, who would put a glass of water up on his dash and do a barrel roll and not spill the water. I have been with him when that happened. Well, one guy in the field did not like him for some reason, and they staged a violation. He could have and did lose his license.

Now, I had to come to this body—and it took a year and a half—to pass a bill to allow Bob Hoover to get back in. That is an extreme example, but nonetheless, that happened. And that is what was happening to me.

So anyway, we passed the Pilot's Bill of Rights. The main thing there and what we are trying to do is to extend to pilots the same protections under the law that other people have. We have heard the phrase many times: You are guilty until proven innocent. Well, in one area in our society that is true—it has historically been true—and that is for violations or alleged violations against pilots.

So anyway, we passed this. We corrected some things that have not really come to fruition. For example, what is called a NOTAM is short for a notice to airmen. A NOTAM is something that has to be published. It is supposed to be published by the FAA if there is anything going on at an airport such as construction on a runway that would create a hazard.

So the pilots have to look up the NOTAMs. The problem with this is, there are no guidelines as to where they can find a notice to airmen. So we corrected this, we thought, in the Pilot's Bill of Rights. However, it was not as good of a correction as we thought it would be.

So now we are coming back with a Pilot's Bill of Rights 2. By the way, I have to tell you, Mr. President, I had 67 cosponsors out of 100 Senators. So this is something that was very popular and passed with overwhelming majorities.

So what we are doing now with the Pilot's Bill of Rights 2 is about four things.

First, the medical certification process is one that is kind of interesting because there is no uniformity. Someone can have a physical problem, a medical problem, and he might be in Chicago, IL, or he might be in Tampa, FL, and they will have a completely different interpretation by the medical examiner as to what should be the remedy of that person's problem. So this puts uniformity back in there.

Then it does something—and this is going to be something that people who do not understand and are not listening to me right now might state that this would be something that could be a hazard or might be some kind of a danger—and that is, we passed in 2004, a rule creating a medical exemption for pilots of light "sport pilot eligible" aircraft. That is for airplanes that weigh under 1,230 pounds and only have

2 seats. There are about 34,000 of them around. It has been over 10 years since FAA issued this exemption, and since then the medical safety experience of these pilots has been identical to those with medical certificates, which begs the question of the value of this expensive and burdensome requirement for pilots who fly for recreation.

A joint study was done by the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the AOPA, and the Experimental Aircraft Association, the EAA, on the 46,976 aviation accidents that occurred from 2008 and 2012. Of those 46,976, only 99 had a medical cause as a factor. That is less than one-quarter of 1 percent of all accidents. And of those 99, none would have been prevented by the current third-class medical screening standards and the medical certification process. So it does not offer any protection. It does not serve any useful purpose.

Now, we are proposing in the Pilot's Bill of Rights 2 to extend that medical exemption that is currently in place for light sport aircraft to include planes weighing up to 6,000 pounds with up to 6 total passengers, including the pilot. That would add airmen and aircraft to an existing FAA-approved medical standard without degrading or creating substandard safety.

What I am saying here is that of all these almost 47,000 aviation accidents, only 99 had a medical cause, and of those 99, not one would have been prevented by the current third-class medical screening standards and the medical certification process. So this is just another burden on the public—not individuals, but specifically on pilots, and it does not accomplish anything.

What we will do now is have consistency in the application of the medical certification process, and it is something that is overdue. It should not be a problem getting that bill passed, and yet it does need explanation.

The second thing it does is extend the due process rights preserved in the original Pilot's Bill of Rights bill to all FAA certificate holders—not just those who are certificate holders who fly airplanes. There are others who are examiners and work in other fields. They should have the same benefits.

What it does is—and this is kind of hard to explain—but if someone is accused of a violation, that individual has a process that has been in law prior to the Pilot's Bill of Rights; and that is, you go through and the FAA makes a judgment. Then you can appeal it to the NTSB. The NTSB historically has been a rubber stamp for the FAA. So it does not really qualify anything.

What we did in the Pilot's Bill of Rights 1 is allow an individual then to go into the court system and get what they call a *de novo*. A *de novo* means they have a whole process that starts from scratch. They do not just take what the FAA says, the NTSB says, but the courts treat it as a new case and look at it. This has not been happening. So we put some teeth in that so

that will be something that will be workable.

So I really feel we are going to be able to do this, and it is really getting the things done that we tried to do in the Pilot's Bill of Rights, but there have been some problems getting the courts to understand it. In fact, in two separate cases, the Federal district courts ruled that my original bill did not require a full rehearing of the facts. This legislation explicitly spells out the option to appeal an FAA enforcement action to the Federal district courts for a guaranteed *de novo* trial. But they have not been doing it. So this puts teeth in it so they are going to actually have to do it.

By the way, there are things that are in there that people are not aware of. For example, in my case, I allegedly did something that was not in compliance with FAA rules and regulations, but they did not say what it was. They did not give the evidence. So you did not have access to your evidence. The new bill ensures that is going to happen.

The third thing is on NOTAMs. A NOTAM is a notice to airmen. It is a pilot's responsibility—this has been true for decades—to know if a NOTAM has been filed by the FAA. That is a notice to airmen. But there is not any way of knowing where to find that. In my case, they claimed there was a NOTAM saying that the runway at Cameron County Airport was closed. That was a lie. There wasn't. There was no NOTAM out there. Finally, we proved that was the case.

So now we are going to have it enforced so we know where these notices to airmen are filed, and it is going to be the responsibility of the FAA to put them in a central location where they would have access to them. This is something that was addressed in the Pilot's Bill of Rights, but somehow it was not specific enough. The teeth we put in this bill is that in the event they do not have it, the NOTAM is published where it can be found in a central location. Then the FAA cannot use that as an enforcement action. That will get the job done.

The fourth thing it does is to extend the liability protection to individuals designated by the FAA as aviation medical examiners, pilot examiners, and this type of thing. What this does also is address what we call and most people would refer to as the Good Samaritan law. I have a lot of pilots—and I have been in the same situation—who want to help. They want to get a patient to a doctor in an emergency situation.

I can remember one time many years ago when a tornado went through and destroyed the island of Dominica, north of Caracas, Venezuela. I got 12 pilots together with 12 of their airplanes, and they volunteered to take all the medical supplies down there. Now, if something had happened in the meantime, they would have had no protection. Yet out of the goodness of

their hearts, at their own expense, they were out there trying to save lives. I was there. I know.

So this actually is one that is going to give liability protection to individuals other than just the pilots—other people who own FAA certificates—and at the same time give protection to those people who are trying to help other people.

So I believe this bill should be coming up in the next couple of weeks. It will be going to the commerce committee. I would encourage Members to—and particularly those 67 Members who were the cosponsors of the original Pilot's Bill of Rights should be on this one too. In fact, most of them are right now. I know Senators MANCHIN and BOOZMAN were the first two to get on. They happen to be the chairmen of the General Aviation Caucus in the Senate. By the way, we have equal support over in the other body, in the House of Representatives.

Last summer, at the EAA AirVenture Oshkosh fly-in convention—that is the largest fly-in convention anywhere in the world—I hosted a public forum to solicit input for the legislation we are having, the Pilot's Bill of Rights 2, and I received over 400 comments from individuals. These are people who were present at the Oshkosh event.

So we have solicited their input, and we have all the organizations behind it. I would say, insofar as the one that might become controversial; that is, the exemption on a third-class medical—doctors have unanimously voted in favor of it—they are called the doctors in aviation—and others.

This is one of these rare opportunities we have on a bipartisan basis to pass something that is going to offer legal protections to one class of people who currently don't have it and have not had it in the past.

I yield the floor.

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. HOEVEN. 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. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise again to speak in support of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. It is good legislation, drafted and introduced by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, and also the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR. They originally put this bill together in the last Congress, and I was pleased to be a cosponsor of that bill. I am also very pleased to be an original cosponsor of the legislation they introduced earlier this year, the legislation we have on the floor now.

This bill has many important, strong points. I am going to go through some—not all but a number of them.

For example, it makes sure victims get restitution and witnesses get re-

wards for cooperating with law enforcement before others and encourages prosecutors to get training on restitution in human trafficking cases. It also gives law enforcement greater authority to seize the assets of convicted human traffickers, and it protects victims and witnesses by requiring human traffickers to be treated as violent criminals for purposes of pretrial release and detention pending judicial proceedings.

It also ensures that Federal crime victims are informed of any plea bargain or deferred prosecution agreement in their case and clarifies that the ordinary standard of appellate review applies in cases concerning Federal crime victims' rights petitions.

It recognizes that child pornography production is a form of human trafficking and ensures that victims have access to direct services at child advocacy centers to help them heal.

It allows State and local human trafficking task forces to get wiretap warrants within their own State courts without Federal approval. That will help them to more effectively investigate crimes of child pornography, child sexual exploitation, and human trafficking.

The bill also improves nationwide communications so law enforcement can better track and capture traffickers and child pornographers. It ensures regular reporting on the number of human trafficking crimes for purposes of the FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

It also requires law enforcement to upload photos of missing individuals into the National Criminal Information Center database and notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of any child reported missing from foster care, and it strengthens current law to reduce demand for human trafficking by encouraging police, prosecutors, judges, and juries to target all persons involved in the buying and selling of human trafficking victims. It is just wrong to prosecute victims and fail to prosecute those who prey on them.

This legislation will help for all of those reasons, but this legislation is also very important because it creates a fund from fines and penalties imposed on those who would engage in human trafficking. The fund is important because it not only compensates victims of human trafficking and other crimes of exploitation for their injuries, but it also provides resources to help law enforcement prevent such crimes in the future.

As we work on this important issue, it is also very important that we understand that human trafficking is not just a big-State, big-city problem. Every State in the country is facing this issue, including my home State of North Dakota, but we currently have a challenge addressing this problem.

After consulting with the North Dakota attorney general's office, we learned that North Dakota has been

discouraged from applying for antihuman trafficking grants, because in its application, the Department of Justice asks for at least 2 years of local data on human trafficking victims. North Dakota, in recent years, has been the fastest growing State in the country. So here we are, the fastest growing State both in terms of population and in terms of income growth. Consequently, more so than many States, only recently we have seen significant increases in human trafficking issues. So we don't have that 2 years' worth of data that DOJ requires, but we very much need assistance with addressing the problem of human trafficking. It is not unique to North Dakota. There are other States—typically fast-growing States, States that may have the same kind of energy development or other areas where they have seen a significant influx of people and are continuing to see a significant influx of people. This is a national issue. It is not specific just to my State but to any State where we have seen rapid growth, influx of money, influx of people from outside the State and where human trafficking is an issue.

To remedy that, I have offered an amendment to the current legislation we have on the floor now, the Cornyn-Klobuchar bill, that clarifies that an eligibility entity with a worthy trafficking initiative, in an effort to combat trafficking in its jurisdiction, will not be disadvantaged in receiving funds under the Cornyn-Klobuchar bill because they, like North Dakota—be it a State or whatever—have only recently begun collecting data on human trafficking. So in cases where they don't have 2 years of data, as long as they can demonstrate a valid need and a valid solution to try to address this important issue and to reduce human trafficking, that is what will be required for the application, and not having 2 years of data will not be an issue in terms of scoring or an issue that DOJ would hold against that application for receipt of the funds for a worthy project.

This is important to make sure that all across the country, in every State, we are addressing human trafficking. We all need to be united, in every State across this great country, working to combat human trafficking. That is why this amendment is very important.

There are few issues that as a governing body we can be more united on than making sure we protect our children, that we prevent human trafficking in any form, and that we do it on a national basis in every State. That is what my amendment is all about.

For this reason, I offer this amendment. I hope it will be included as part of the Cornyn-Klobuchar legislation, which, as I said earlier, I am only too pleased to cosponsor.

The value and importance of this legislation is reflected in the broad coalition of victims' rights and law enforcement organizations that support it. It

has been endorsed by nearly 200 groups, from the Fraternal Order of Police to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

We need to pass this legislation. Crimes such as human trafficking and child pornography target the most vulnerable among us in a most despicable way. I urge all of my colleagues to pass this bill, to put an end to modern-day slavery, and to help victims get the support they need.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to express my appreciation that this afternoon the Senate is finally getting back to legislating on the important issue of human trafficking. It is critical we pass this legislation to combat one of the world's most heinous crimes and one that threatens thousands of innocent people every year.

I am the cochair and cofounder of the human trafficking caucus. Our opportunity is not only to raise awareness of this issue but also to pass important legislation to address the problem.

We learned that human trafficking is now a \$32 billion worldwide industry, leaving it only second in size to the drug trade for criminal activity. Many view this as an international problem. They think, well, this happens somewhere else or on another continent, such as Africa or Asia. The fact is it happens right here. Of course, every country around the world has a responsibility to fight back against traffickers and stop their acts of violence. But while this industry has a global reach, the reality is that human trafficking is a major problem not only in my home State of Ohio, it is a problem in every State represented in the Senate. The Justice Department has told us that the average age of victims getting involved in trafficking is 12 to 14 years old. Think about that. These are children. These are kids. The number of American children at risk of sexual exploitation and human trafficking is estimated to be about 300,000. These children represent the most vulnerable among us, and we should make sure we are doing everything we possibly can to protect them. Every American life has value and every child deserves a chance to live a bright future.

Today, however, we can take comfort in knowing we are fighting back against human traffickers and making it harder for their criminal activity to continue in a couple of different ways, both of which are very important.

First, our legislation makes it easier to find some of these vulnerable chil-

dren. Missing children are particularly vulnerable, and the legislation I am about to talk about enables us to find those children more quickly and helps to get them into a nurturing environment. Second, it will strengthen law enforcement's ability to find and punish those who are committing these crimes.

We accomplished the first goal with the Bringing Missing Children Home Act. It is a bill that I authored with Senator CHUCK SCHUMER of New York. We know there is a strong connection, unfortunately, between sex trafficking victims and children who have been in and out of the child welfare system. We also understand that kids who are missing or who have run away from home are the most vulnerable to trafficking, exploitation, and abuse. The FBI sting in 2014 recovered 168 sex trafficking victims, and nearly all of them had spent time in the child welfare or foster care system. While many of these children had been reported missing, the information obtained by authorities was not sufficient enough to be able to find them, and that is what this legislation gets at.

The Bringing Missing Children Home Act will make it easier to find these children in two different ways. First, it amends the Missing Children's Assistance Act by replacing the term "child prostitution" with "child sex trafficking." This reinforces the fact that children who are exploited are victims, not criminals. Secondly, the bill requires law enforcement agencies to update their records of missing children within 30 days of an initial report with additional information that could include medical or dental records or even a photograph. Having this new information, particularly a photograph, is incredibly important when searching for a missing child. I know this because this has been a big problem in my home State of Ohio.

We started looking at this legislation and considering this bill on the floor on March 6. Since March 6, 60 children have been reported missing in my home State of Ohio. Yet we only have photographs for 14 of them. It is hard to find these children, and not having that information makes it even more difficult. Our legislation will help to get those photographs and will help ensure that all of us can play a role in helping to find these missing children.

The bill also makes it easier for law enforcement officials on the State and local level to coordinate with child welfare services, and it allows missing persons units and State law enforcement agencies to modify and improve missing children's entries to include important information that was uncovered during an investigation. That is not currently the case. It just makes sense to be able to have better records.

While we are making it easier to find trafficking victims, we will also make it easier to find and punish perpetrators of these crimes with legislation I have authored with Senator DIANNE

FEINSTEIN. It is called the Combat Human Trafficking Act and is part of this underlying bill we will also be considering here on the floor. This act focuses on those who commit these crimes. It increases the penalties for those who buy acts from sex trafficking victims. It requires new training by the Justice Department on targeting. It expands reporting on trafficking prosecutions and strengthens victims' rights. A lot of this comes out of what we have learned over the past decade since we have really taken up this issue at the Federal level. It improves Federal law to take into account the information we now know. Through better enforcement of laws against buyers, we will be able to reduce the demand for sexual exploitation and ensure that criminals are prosecuted to the full extent, preventing further trafficking crimes from ever happening.

As the cochair of the Senate Caucus to End Human Trafficking, it has been a priority of mine to get this legislation passed in an effort to help victims of trafficking and to prevent the number of victims from increasing.

I also hope we can add an amendment I authored entitled "Ensuring a Better Response for Victims of Child Sex Trafficking." This amendment contains a piece of legislation I authored last year with Senator WYDEN of Oregon called the Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act. It will help improve the information law enforcement officials have about the scope of the trafficking problem. This was signed into law last year, but there is additional information we would like to provide in terms of getting the response part of that bill passed.

The bills I have spoken about are important steps to one day ending human trafficking and putting this horrible industry out of business altogether. Trafficking deserves no place in America.

I thank Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, and others for their hard work on this legislation I have talked about. I would also like to express how grateful I am that Members of this Chamber were able to put partisanship behind us, politics aside, and reach common ground to move forward on this important issue. Ending human trafficking is clearly a bipartisan goal. It is a nonpartisan goal. It is something on which we should come together. The legislation we have before us today will make a profound impact on so many Americans, including some of the most vulnerable. I am happy to see we are a little closer to having these bills become law. I think they will become law once they pass this Chamber, go through the House, and are signed by the President.

We still have a lot of work to do. This is just a start. After today, the fight to combat human trafficking will be far from over. Somewhere in America, there will still be children looking to be found, wondering if anybody

cares, despite our legislation. Today's legislation will make it easier to find them, but it is still up to all of us. All of us have a role in helping to keep these children from going missing in the first place and then finding and providing them with a nurturing setting and a home where they are embraced and where they can be taken away from the stress of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

There will always be traffickers looking to exploit the vulnerable. We know that. But today, if we pass this legislation, we will be sending a warning to those who commit these heinous crimes. As long as you are a perpetrator or an accomplice to human trafficking—folks will know that law enforcement is going to do what it takes to track them down and to punish them.

I am glad we have been able to find common ground again and move a little closer to making these positive changes a reality. I am hopeful that we will be able to vote on this today and tomorrow, move this to the House, get it through to the President, and indeed begin to make a difference to my constituents in Ohio and around the country.

With that, I yield back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I am here today to identify yet another installment of the "Waste of the Week." We have been doing this now for several weeks, trying to save taxpayers' dollars out of documented waste of their dollars when they send them to Washington. In recent weeks, I have highlighted examples of waste, some big some small.

To date, we have documented over \$47 billion of taxpayer funds that have gone to duplication of effort, simply gone to things the Federal Government never should have been involved in in the first place, examples of fraud, abuse—\$47 billion and climbing on our tax savings gauge here which is approaching now \$50 billion. Our goal is \$100 billion. We are going to keep going as we discover each week yet another waste of taxpayer dollars.

This week's "Waste of the Week" involves the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, also known as FECA. This law was enacted in 1916—well intended, I think, to provide workers' compensation benefits to civilian Federal employees who sustained injuries while employed by the Federal Government and includes funds for vocational rehabilitation and medical benefits.

As I said, it was well intended at the time, providing a lifeline for people in-

jured on the job to keep these people afloat financially until they are ready to go back to work. "Ready to go back to work" has become somewhat of a major question in terms of how this 1916 law is applied, because you have to wonder, is someone 99 years old looking to go back to work.

Well, in 1916, when this act was enacted, it treated them as if they were and are able to go back to work. Let me explain. Both the FECA compensation and medical benefits are payable for the duration of a person's inability to work, which can extend well into their individual golden years.

You say: How does that all happen? But under current law, there is no maximum duration of benefits and no maximum age at which benefits must be terminated. Thus, when beneficiaries become eligible for Federal retirement or disability annuities, they are given the choice as to whether they want to remain in the FECA program or choose the Federal retirement program.

Well, it is not much of a choice. The choice is obvious because given the level of benefits monthly, FECA benefits can be a much better deal than what they would be paid under retirement benefit plans. The FECA benefits are as high as 75 percent of the worker's pre-disability wage. The annual cost-of-living-adjustment is applied each year, the COLA, to the benefits.

Someone came up with a pretty interesting idea here. FECA benefits are not taxed. So, clearly, this ends up being a much better deal for beneficiaries. But is it a better deal for taxpayers? That is the question. Let's take a closer look. This applies to all Federal agencies, but let's take one agency. The Department of Labor reports that approximately 45,000 cases currently receive long-term disability benefits under FECA, and 15,000 or one-third of these cases involve beneficiaries aged 66 or older.

Clearly, it is time—actually it is past time—to reconsider and make reforms to the FECA. At a minimum, we should require workers, when they reach retirement age, to transition into the retirement plan as all their peers have had to do and not continue, throughout their lifetime, the much more generous benefits of FECA.

As I said, the agency with the most FECA claims is the U.S. Postal Service. I want to use this as an example of how this is applied. The Postal Service Office of Inspector General told us that FECA rolls include 9,554 postal workers aged 55 or older eligible for retirement; 3,389 aged 65 and over; 928 aged 80 or older; and, yes, one postal worker at the age of 99.

So in 2013 the U.S. Postal Service paid about \$1.3 billion in workers' compensation claims and \$67 million in administrative fees. In addition, as of June 30, 2014, the estimated workers' compensation liability totaled \$17.8 billion. Now, while many of these benefits go to workers of a traditional working

age, the U.S. Postal Service estimates that these higher than retirement benefits are resulting in an extra \$37.8 million being paid out annually.

That comes to nearly \$400 million over the next 10 years, and that is just from one agency, the U.S. Postal Service. Estimates as to the cost to the taxpayer when all of the Federal agencies are included show that more than \$1 billion will be spent over the next 10 years in extra workers' compensation payments for those who would unlikely be working throughout the Federal workforce.

As my colleague, Senator SUSAN COLLINS from Maine, has been highlighting for years, FECA has become a gold-plated retirement system tainted by unfairness, perverse incentives, and the potential for abuse and fraud.

This program has become increasingly expensive and requires some commonsense reforms—reforms that many States have already implemented in their own workers' compensation programs. Remember, these payments are designed as a bridge to help injured workers until they are able to return to work. That is the most important phrase here—"return to work." This program was never intended to serve as a higher paying alternative to the Federal retirement system. Yet, under the law, it is used for that, and it has cost the taxpayers a significant amount of their tax dollars for unnecessary payments.

Let's not ignore ways we can improve our fiscal health and return our Federal programs, at a minimum, to their original intent. It is time we look at this policy and restore integrity to the FECA, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Today, I am adding another \$1 billion to the taxpayer savings gauge for this week's waste of the week, and I look forward to discussing ways we can eradicate this waste from our Federal budget so that we can give hard-earned dollars back to the taxpayers—money that simply is not used properly and is labeled, of course, a waste of their money.

So we have increased—we are approaching \$50 billion, and we are shooting up to \$100 billion by the end of this year. I am hoping we can go significantly past that.

The next step, of course, is to take what we have identified and make sure that the law is changed, that it is reformed, and that we can proudly say to the taxpayer that we are doing our part in Washington. While the larger issues of debt and deficit need to be addressed and must be addressed, if we cannot come to consensus on that, at least we can come to consensus on eliminating these egregious abuses of taxpayer dollars.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, as Americans celebrate the 35th Earth Day this week, I rise for the 96th time—I seem to be coinciding with the Presiding Officer's schedule so he has been treated to his share of these speeches—to urge this body to wake up to the threat of climate change. It is real, not a hoax. It is caused by carbon pollution, and it is already making changes that we are already seeing in the world around us. We must cut our carbon pollution to prevent even bigger climate changes—changes in our atmosphere, oceans, and human habitat—potentially unprecedented in the history of our human habitation of this planet.

Yet the polluters who are producing this problem would have us do nothing. They make money when we do nothing. So we do nothing. The polluters run a racket. They all float onto us the costs and damage from their fossil fuel product—the costs of heat waves, of sea level rise, of ocean acidification, of dying forests, and more. The polluters happily dump those costs onto everybody else. And to keep this profitable racket running, the polluters spend huge sums on lobbying and politics, particularly right here in the Congress.

As one author has written, "rivers of money flowing from secret sources have turned our elections into silent auctions." And the polluters get what they pay for. The Republican Party in Congress has become the political arm of the fossil fuel industry. The polluters also spend huge amounts on a big, complex PR machine to churn out doubt about the real science and cook up some paid-for science.

Documents recently discovered by Greenpeace show that one scientist, whose work consistently downplayed the role of carbon pollution and climate change, received—get this—more than \$1.2 million from oil and coal interests over the last decade. Those nice people at the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation gave him at least \$230,000. In recent years, his grants came through Donors Trust, the front group that funnels money from oil, coal, and other special interests.

Well, what do we know? We know that financial incentives affect people's behavior. Does anyone doubt that? That is life. That is why politicians have to disclose their political contributors, the gifts and benefits they receive, and even personal financial information. That is why regulatory agencies and scientific journals require scientific submissions to make plain who funded the work. That is why ex-

pert witnesses' funding sources are relevant in court proceedings. And that is why Upton Sinclair once said: "It's difficult to get a man to understand something when his salary depends on his not understanding it."

So we know that money talks. That is not news. What else do we know? Well, we also know about that industry playbook to keep safety regulation at bay by funding phony science and manufacturing doubt about legitimate science. That is not news, either. That has been around for years.

The tobacco industry campaign to mislead the public about the health effects of cigarettes was so fraudulent it was determined in Federal court to be a racketeering enterprise. Think about that—an industry campaign of deception about the risks of their product that persisted for years and was ultimately determined in Federal court to have constituted a racketeering enterprise. Does it sound familiar? And tobacco is not alone. The lead paint industry shut down its trade association, the Lead Industry Association, rather than answer questions under oath in a court proceeding.

Entire books have been written documenting this industry's strategy, for example, "Merchants of Doubt," which has recently been made into a documentary, or "Doubt is Their Product," or "Lead Wars," or "Deceit and Denial." So we know the strategy.

Finally, we know something else. We know that a network of front organizations with innocent-sounding names has emerged to propagate the baloney science. This phenomenon has been well documented by Dr. Robert Brulle at Drexel University, among others. His follow-the-money analysis diagrams the complex flow of cash to these front groups that industry persistently tries to obscure. Well, here is what makes sense to me: If it is important enough for them to want to hide it, it is important enough for us to want to know about it.

So Senators BOXER, MARKEY, and I sent a letter to about 100 companies, trade groups, and other organizations affiliated with the fossil fuel industry. We asked whether they spent money to support climate research. It sounds reasonable, based on those three things that we know. Well, oh, my, what a fit of caterwauling that drew from the rightwing PR machine. Today, I will give a recap of the outrage highlights.

It is a "witch hunt," said the far-right Heartland Institute, "what fascists do." We are "ethically challenged . . . mental midgets," said Heartland's president. He later called this little letter "harassment . . . abuse of authority and misrepresentation of the facts." Heartland, by the way, is that classy group that put up a billboard comparing climate scientists to the Unabomber, just to give an idea of their credibility. Finally, "[S]hame on you," read Heartland's response to our letter, which Heartland called a "campaign to stigmatize and demonize."

The rightwing John Locke Foundation said our letter was “trying to McCarthyite” them. Rightwinger Hans von Spakovsky of the Heritage Foundation said it was “an abuse of power.” Investor’s Business Daily got so excited they mixed up their metaphors to say we were both “inquisitors” and “stalk[ers],” out to “intimidate” and “threatening peaceful citizens.” They scoffed, “as if it were any of [our] business” to know if polluters are funding the science. Keeping that Spanish Inquisition theme going, the Washington Times called us “climate change Torquemadas.”

So it looks as if we hit the full faux-outrage quadrifecta—witch hunts, fascism, McCarthyism, and even the Spanish Inquisition. But then they got really serious, and they unlimbered the ultimate rightwing malediction. We were accused by the Cato Institute of—cover your ears, young pages—having “a widespread faith . . . in government’s ability to solve problems.”

Well, Cato made its position on climate change clear, saying that for us “to believe that man’s emissions of carbon dioxide are warming the planet” was a “bias” and that the legitimate science endorsed by everyone from NASA to the Department of Defense to every legitimate scientific society—every major legitimate scientific society in the country—all of that was “propaganda,” and that we, of course, were climate alarmists. Cato also sent us a letter in response to our inquiry, telling us we cannot “use the awesome power of the federal government to cow” Cato and others. Cow?

According to the Wall Street Journal editorial page, which sadly has become a front for the fossil fuel industry, we were “trying to silence” the other side. Although, I have to confess, it is not clear how the other side would be silenced by simply having to reveal whose payroll they are on, which is all we asked.

Let’s be clear, our letter didn’t suggest that industry scientists should be silenced—just that the public should know if those scientists are being paid by the very industries with a big economic stake in the issue.

Let’s test how much the rightwing front groups care about the suppression of scientific information. Let’s look at their outrage over the reports of public employees in Florida being told—by the government no less—not to talk about climate change.

Interviews by the Florida Center for Investigative Reporting with current and former employees, contractors, and volunteers at the Florida Department of Environmental Protection revealed that the administration of Republican Gov. Rick Scott issued an unwritten rule banning official use of the phrases “climate change” or “global warming.” Those reports have been corroborated by employees of other State agencies. We have heard stories of retribution against State employees who dare discuss climate change, of climate

change-related projects being put on the back burner, and even of the term itself being edited out of official documents, including those produced by a university scientist. It sounds like suppression of science. Where was the outrage from the right? Where were the comparisons to fascism and McCarthyism and the Spanish Inquisition for this actual government-sponsored suppression of scientific information? Guess what. There was none.

It is not just Florida. Recently, the Republican members of Wisconsin’s Board of Commissioners of Public Lands voted to prohibit the professional staff “from engaging in global warming or climate change work.” The Wisconsin timber industry, as Senator BALDWIN and I have both pointed out, sees the threat climate change poses to Wisconsin forests, including, among other things, the frozen winter roads that loggers use to move their equipment around that warmer weather melts and turns to impassable muck. But the Republicans in charge of those lands have simply ordered State officials to ignore climate change, suppressing the science—plain and simple.

Where was the outrage from the rightwing groups that had fits about our little request for some transparency about what scientist is on whose payroll? Where was the outrage? There was none, which shows that the real issue has nothing to do with scientific freedom. The real issue here of freedom is the freedom of big, dishonest special interests to hide whose hand is in the puppet.

Here is where it really gets ironic. The enormous multibillion dollar polluting industries whose front groups accuse us of bullying—of being fascists and intimidators and Torquemadas—over our little letter are the very ones pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into elections, much of it secretly, for the plainly avowed purpose of threatening and punishing elected officials who might dare to cross them and acknowledge the dangers of carbon-driven climate change—of all people to be complaining.

Americans for Prosperity, to give one example, a Koch brothers venture, has said that Republicans who support any action on climate change will be put at a “severe disadvantage” in the 2016 elections. That is a serious threat, given the Koch brothers’ pledge to spend \$900 million in this election cycle. Yet that same Americans for Prosperity Foundation blasted our little letter as “an attempt to silence those whose views do not meet with your approval.”

Please. Really? Against a \$900 million campaign threat and a stable of paid-for scientists, against that massive screen of fossil fuel front organizations spouting industry propaganda, our little effort at getting a little transparency about who is funding the phony-baloney climate denial science—that is a raindrop against a torrent. We do indeed need to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before my prepared comments, I do want to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his passion and his leadership in coming to the floor over and over again, ringing the alarm bells about what is happening not only to our country but our world. We are paying the price in lives and in dollars. We are seeing our farmers pay the price because we have not effectively addressed what is happening to our world in terms of climate change.

I want to thank the Senator for his continued passion in reminding us over and over again why we need to act right now.

SELFRIDGE AIR NATIONAL GUARD DEPLOYMENT

Mr. President, today 350 airmen from Michigan, along with 12 A-10 Warthog aircraft, are deploying to the Middle East to take part in Operation Inherent Resolve, our Nation’s mission to eliminate the terrorist group known as ISIL. This deployment has special significance for Michigan. Michigan is home to thousands of families and community leaders with loved ones living in the Middle East who have seen firsthand the devastating effect of ISIL as it brutally murders innocent people, drives them from their homes, and destabilizes the region. For so many families in Michigan, the fight against ISIL is deeply personal. Today, that fight is personal to many more families as these airmen from Selfridge Air National Guard Base deploy to the region.

The A-10 Warthogs are the very best close air support aircraft in the U.S. military. Known as a tankbuster, the A-10 is ideal against ISIL, which uses tanks stolen from the Iraqi Army. We in Michigan are proud of our fleet. We are proud of our people, their courage, their passion, and their hard work. We are proud for all they have done to protect our Nation.

In 2011, the 127th Wing at Selfridge deployed 300 airmen and one dozen A-10s to Kandahar Airfield, a NATO base in southern Afghanistan. Over 120 days, the unit logged over 8,000 flight hours in 2,000 flight missions in an extremely hostile environment.

Today, I ask my colleagues in the Senate to keep these 350 airmen in your thoughts and prayers. We wish them Godspeed as they embark on this very important mission, and we remember especially their families and friends who will stay behind and support them with their prayers as well.

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. DAINES assumed the Chair.)

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 178 on Wednesday, April 22, Senator CORNYN or his designee be recognized to withdraw the pending Cornyn amendment and offer amendments Nos. 1124 and 301. I further ask that there then be 1 hour of debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the Leahy amendment No. 301, followed by a vote on amendment No. 1124, both with a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption. I further ask that if the Cornyn-Murray-Klobuchar amendment is agreed to, the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, and the Senate then vote on the following amendments in the order listed, with 2 minutes of debate equally divided before each vote: Cornyn No. 1127; Leahy No. 290; Brown No. 311; Burr No. 1121; and Kirk No. 273, as modified.

I further ask that amendments in the preceding list each be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption, and that following disposition of these amendments, there then be 5 minutes equally divided in the usual form, followed by votes on the following amendments, which have been cleared by the managers and should be adopted by voice vote: Klobuchar No. 296; Hoeven No. 299, as modified; Sullivan No. 279; Wicker No. 1126; Flake No. 294; Cassidy No. 308; Portman No. 1128; Brown No. 310; Brown No. 312; Heller No. 1122; and Shaheen No. 303.

I further ask that there be no second-degrees in order to any of the amendments listed and that following disposition of the Shaheen amendment, the committee-reported substitute, as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the majority leader consider at this time modifying his request to drop the Kirk amendment No. 273?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader so modify his request? The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from Oregon is asking to amend the consent request. I would reserve the right to object to that request and make the simple point that the Kirk amendment targets online child exploitation and sex trafficking, which is rampant. Given the fact that the Internet is now one of the principal tools used, on Web sites such as backpage.com, thousands of American children and human trafficking victims are sold into slavery. It is simply unconscionable for us to stand by and allow this to continue.

What Senator KIRK is asking for, which I support and believe we should do, is a simple up-or-down vote on the

Kirk amendment. So I reserve the right to object and ask our colleague to allow this up-or-down vote on the Kirk amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the answer is no, but I think the Senator from Oregon wishes to respond.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, continuing my reservation, I don't take a backseat to anyone when it comes to fighting for the victims of sex trafficking. As the distinguished Senator from Texas knows, I was an original cosponsor of this legislation, and much of it is based on bills I have written and advocated on behalf of for years, including with the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Much of this sex trafficking legislation, colleagues, is based on meetings and discussions I have had for years with young women who have been trafficked, law enforcement officials, and community leaders. I remember like it was yesterday how I was with the Portland police on 82nd Avenue in East Portland, and we encountered young women in their early teens who walked around with knives in their purses just hoping to survive the evening. The underlying legislation before us, in my view, is going to be a very valuable tool in helping women like those whom I saw in Southeast Portland.

Unfortunately, an amendment that Senator KIRK seeks to offer has been attached to this request that undermines the legal foundation of every social media platform and attacks a basic cornerstone of Internet law. The Kirk amendment will undermine the fight to help victims by distracting the focus of prosecutors from the pimps and the Johns who prey on these young women.

The vague language in the Kirk amendment would mean any Web site that hosts user-generated contact—that means any social media platform, any news sites with comments and classified sections and any e-commerce sites—could face felony charges based on a vague concept of knowing and a vague concept of advertising.

Instead of focusing resources on going after pimps and traffickers, the Kirk amendment would enable prosecutors to go after Web sites millions of Americans use for nonfearful purposes, chilling innovation. Under current law, prosecutors already have the ability to go after any entity that knowingly profits from sex trafficking. Every minute our prosecutors are occupied going after legitimate businesses, in my view, is time not spent locking up the real criminals.

This amendment hurts America's innovative businesses and entrepreneurs and stifles free speech instead of getting tough on the sex traffickers whom Senator CORNYN and I have sought to target all these years.

So I will close by simply saying I am for throwing the book at every sex trafficker and those who enable them.

Our country absolutely must do everything we can to prevent the next child from falling victim to these predators. In my view, the Kirk amendment distracts from that goal. I hope it will not ultimately be added to this important piece of legislation. I hope Senators will vote no on the Kirk amendment.

With that, Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the request of the majority leader?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LORETTA E. LYNCH TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 21, Loretta Lynch, to be Attorney General.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative 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 nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Lamar Alexander, Bob Corker, Jeff Flake, Susan M. Collins, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, Lisa Murkowski, Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

REMEMBERING NORMAN H. BANGERTER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a loving father,