House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God of the universe, thank You for giving us another day.

It is Your nature to hold us in Your living presence always. It is our nature to think of You or of others only momentarily or in passing.

Be with each of us that we may be our very best and prove ourselves worthy of Your love and Your grace.

Bless the Members of the people’s House in their work and deliberations today that they might merit the trust of the American people and manifest the strength of our republican democracy to the nations of the world.

Without You, O Lord, we can do nothing. With You and in You, we can establish a community of peace, goodness, and justice now and forever.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL
The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. QUIGLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MODERNIZING 529 SAVINGS PLANS
(Ms. JENKINS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 529, a bill that Congressman KIND of Wisconsin and I introduced to make sensible enhancements to 529 college savings plans.

The 529 plans enjoy growing popularity, primarily with middle class families who are looking for ways to responsibly prepare for the growing cost of college. The 12 million 529 accountholders across the country are able to choose a plan whose funds will then grow and be withdrawn tax free to pay for college expenses such as tuition or room and board.

H.R. 529 will make several technical changes to 529 plans that will allow students to purchase a computer using their 529 funds, remove the unnecessary distribution aggregation requirements from the accounts, and allow 529 funds to be redeposited if the student withdraws from college. These modernizations will allow 529 plans to help families get the most out of their savings.

I ask my colleagues to join me in this effort.

REMEMBERING ERNIE “MR. CUB” BANKS
(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, the Chicago Cubs, baseball, and all sports has lost a legend. Ernie Banks, “Mr. Cub,” passed away last Friday.

From humble beginnings, Ernie won two MVPs as a power-hitting shortstop and became an All-Star and a Hall of Famer. But perhaps more importantly, he overcame the racism he faced to become an amazing ambassador for the Cubs, his beloved Wrigley Field, and the game itself.

You could not have met a more decent, kinder, and happier soul on any field of endeavor. It was for these roles that he was honored with the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Ernie, thanks for reminding us that baseball is a game that should be watched and played for fun. Indeed, let’s play two. You will be missed.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING
(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, January is Human Trafficking Awareness Month, and I am pleased that the House is taking up a number of bipartisan measures this week to help eradicate this disturbing crime and assist its victims.

To most Americans, human trafficking is something that happens in faraway lands. Unfortunately, the reality hits much closer to home. Right now, over 300,000 young Americans are in danger of falling victim to this fast-growing criminal enterprise. As both a member of the Human Trafficking Task Force and a representative for anti-trafficking advocates and organizations in my district in Pennsylvania, I am well aware of the devastating impact of this modern-day slavery here in our Nation and in our communities back home.

But 2015 can be the year we take significant steps to end this scourge. The work on the ground in Bucks and
Montgomery Counties by organizations such as Worthwhile Wear, The Well, Network of Victim Assistance, as well as faith-based groups, law enforcement, and concerned citizens is making an impact and increasing awareness and strengthening our response locally.

The House is giving consideration this week on Capitol Hill allows this Congress to work together to ensure that we can support those impacted by this crime and combat and ultimately defeat human trafficking in our Nation and, hopefully, around the world.

REMEMBERING RONNIE BERLACK
AND BRYCE ASTLE

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the lives of Ronnie Berlack and Bryce Astle, two members of the United States Ski Team who were taken from us far too soon by a tragic avalanche while training in Austria in early January.

These two young men dedicated themselves to representing our country with skill and dignity as members of the national ski team. They were both very talented. But, sadly, we will never know how high their stars may have risen.

Ronnie and Bryce touched many others with their love of life, their drive to compete, and their commitment to their teammates. Ronnie was a native of Franconia, New Hampshire, the same town that produced skiing great Bode Miller. He started skiing at Cannon Mountain before attending Burke Mountain Academy in Vermont and coming into his own as a talented ski racer. Bryce spent most of his childhood in Utah, where he spent weekends skiing with his family at Alta and Snowbasin, a bond that met while competing against each other in FIS races, before training together last summer and becoming great friends.

In the wake of this horrible tragedy, everyone who knew these two young men has spoken to their integrity, their adventurous spirits, and their big, big hearts. They spent their lives working hard at the thing they loved the most. My heart goes out to their family, their many, many friends, and the entire ski racing community.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, it is shocking: human trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime and the third largest criminal enterprise in the world. In my home State of Ohio, the most common age a child becomes victimized by trafficking is 13 years old. At 13, a child should be looking forward to their first days of high school, not living in fear. In 2014 alone, in Ohio, 98 arrests were made in human trafficking investigations, involving 181 potential victims.

Today, the House is fighting back. The anti-trafficking bills this week will take aim at modern trafficking networks and the criminals who seek to abuse the lives of their victims. These bills encourage States to adopt safe harbor laws, enhance services for homeless youth, and further protect children in our Nation’s foster system. We must help survivors reclaim their lives through heightened public awareness and increased collaboration among governments.

Our Founders declared inherent and inalienable the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Human trafficking violates these core rights. A strong commitment to every human life will help the millions who suffer in the dark shadows of this heinous crime.

CONGRATULATIONS, COACH MIKE KRZYZEWSKI!

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleague, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, to congratulate Coach Mike Krzyzewski of Duke University on becoming the first coach in the history of Division I NCAA basketball to win 1,000 games. Blue Devils everywhere are proud of this remarkable feat, the crowning achievement of a career that has seen Coach K win four national titles and two Olympic gold medals.

As fellow Duke fans will note with relish, many of these 1,000 wins came against other storied ACC programs such as Carolina, NC State, and Wake Forest. That makes Coach K’s historic achievement all the more impressive.

I taught at Duke and then represented the campus for a number of years. I know firsthand of Mike Krzyzewski’s character and integrity. He is not only a world-class coach; he is also a committed educator who has trained and inspired his players to succeed in whatever they undertake in life.

The Emily Krzyzewski Center in Durham, behind which Mike was the driving force, was named in his honor and is a testament to his dedication to at-risk youth as they aspire to a college education.

So on behalf of the Duke community, whose core values Coach K exemplifies, and on behalf of the House of Representatives, congratulations! We look forward to watching you build on your winning tradition for many years to come.

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, earlier this month the United States Department of Agriculture announced $370 million for 115 conservation projects in 50 States. These dollars are a result of the Regional Conservation Partnership Program which was recently created in the 2014 farm bill by the consolidation of numerous regional conservation programs previously authorized under the 2008 law.

This RCPP funding will also leverage an additional $400 million through non-Federal matching funds. Roughly 40 percent of these total dollars are going towards national or multistate projects, and about 35 percent towards “critical conservation areas,” which include the Great Lakes region, the Chesapeake Bay watershed, as well as other high priority agricultural regions.

As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, the committee will be closely watching how USDA administers this critical program through oversight of the conservation title in the coming year.

I strongly support commonsense, voluntary agriculture conservation. I look forward to working with USDA and the various stakeholders on how to make these programs as effective and results driven as possible.

CONGRATULATIONS, COACH MIKE KRZYZEWSKI

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise with Congressman PRICE to recognize the head coach of Duke University men’s basketball team on becoming the winningest Division I men’s basketball coach in our Nation’s history.

Coach Mike Krzyzewski’s 1,000th career victory came Sunday afternoon in New York City at Madison Square Garden against the Red Storm of St. John’s University, a thrilling second half game.

Over his 35 years as their head coach, he has led the Blue Devils to four NCAA Division I championships, 13 ACC tournament championships, and 12 ACC regular season championships. People like Grant Hill, Johnny Dawkins, Shane Battier, and even my son-in-law, Dahnay Jones, all honed their skills under the watchful eye of Coach K and went on to successful careers in the NBA.

Coach K is a four-time Olympic gold medal winner—in 1984 and 1992 as Team USA’s assistant coach, and in 2008 and 2012 as its head coach. In his most recent book, entitled, “The Gold Standard: Building a World-Class Team,” Coach K has said leading Team USA to gold was one of the “most gratifying experiences” of his life.
Mike Krzyzewski’s accomplishments are impressive by any measure. Perhaps most impressive, though, is his work off the basketball court. In addition to supporting countless charities over the years, he and his wife, Mickie, founded the Emily Krzyzewski Center, named in honor of his mother. The center mentors school-aged children to prepare them with the skills needed for college and beyond.

When asked what he would like to be remembered for, Coach K said: “Just the fact that I’m an honest man, a truthful person, and somebody who cares about people, not just himself.”

Coach K serves as an inspiration to so many around the Nation and the world. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Coach Mike Krzyzewski on his historic 1,000 victories.

**BORDER SECURITY BILL IS DANGEROUS**

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, it is now week 4 in the new Republican Congress. There is still no jobs bill anywhere in sight. Instead of taking up an infrastructure bill or a minimum wage bill to give working families bigger paychecks, we are seeing a dangerous immigration bill that will actually hurt our Nation’s security.

Next week, Republican leadership is abandoning a bipartisan border security bill from the last Congress and instead, an irresponsible and unworkable $10 billion bill that simply appeases the extreme voices within their caucus.

Border security experts say this bill would be ineffective. They call it unserious and dangerous for our Nation’s security. Secretary Jeh Johnson says that if enacted, it would actually leave the border less secure.

This does not combat threats or secure our border. It simply requires the Federal Government to spend billions of dollars of taxpayer money on unnecessary projects.

If we really wanted to do something here in this House about border security, we would pass the Secure Our Border Act that was unanimously passed by the Homeland Security Committee in the last Congress, bipartisan and unanimous, and it would get things done.

**OPERATION TAXPAYER INITIATIVE**

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, Granite Staters are fed up with Washington’s wasteful ways. The government’s irresponsible spending has led to billions of your dollars being wasted to fund projects that already exist.

Instead of ensuring that the most truly in need receive a hand up, your taxpayer dollars are instead being handed out to increase Washington’s bureaucracy.

That is why I have launched Operation TAXPAYER, an ongoing initiative designed to eliminate the wasteful plaguing of our government, running up our debt, and crowding out funding for worthwhile programs.

As part of this initiative, I have introduced H. Res. 45, a bipartisan bill to fundamentally alter the way legislation is brought to the House floor. Under H. Res. 45, every piece of legislation awaiting consideration by Congress would receive a duplication score by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, with the goal of providing Members the necessary knowledge to identify whether or not a new bill creates a new program or project that already exists within our government.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan step that will allow our government to finally take sizable bites out of our debt and deficit while ensuring the protection of safety nets for all Americans.

**SECURE OUR BORDER ACT WILL COMPOUND SECURITY CONCERNS**

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, cancellation of this week’s vote of the Secure Our Border Act is a relief for northern border communities, including my western New York district.

This legislation would require a biometric exit system at every border crossing which would duplicate inspections and significantly slow the flow of people and goods across the northern border.

The Beyond the Border agreement already allows for exit data to be shared between Canadian and U.S. officials; thus, the implementation of this system at the northern border would be redundant at least.

Already congested border crossings, such as the Peace Bridge in western New York, would see longer delays which would ultimately create disastrous economic effects and compound security concerns. A Peace Bridge authority official said that implementation of this program would effectively shut down the northern border.

Investments in personnel and infrastructure should be made along our borders, but we must take into consideration the unique needs of northern and southern border communities and protect the economic relationship that is essential to the United States and Canadian economies.

**THE WORLD NEEDS RELIGIOUS FREEDOM**

(Mrs. McMorris Rodgers asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join in remembering one of the darkest stains on the history of the world.

Today, on International Holocaust Remembrance Day, we pay homage to the Jews that were lost and remember the freedom that triumphed the day the death camps were liberated. On this day 70 years ago, thousands of prisoners were liberated at Auschwitz, the Nazi death camp where over a million Jews lost their lives.

In all, more than 6 million Jews were killed by the Nazis, wiping out a part of European culture that existed for more than a thousand years. Today, Europe confronts a new wave of anti-Semitism as we witnessed in the murders recently at the kosher market in Paris.

What the world needs is religious freedom and the promotion of faith as a force for good. We also need strong military alliances that suppress racial hatred and genocide whenever it raises its ugly head.

After the death camps were liberated, Jews still confronted an anti-Semitic Europe, and they made their way to Israel. When they fought for the war of independence in 1948, half the soldiers were survivors from the death camps.

Today, when we remember the victims, let us also remember that it was the liberation of the Jews that helped found a new state: the state of tolerance, democracy, and freedom that Israel so proudly embodies.

**REMEMBERING JERRY "J.R." MCBRIDE**

(Mr. Foster asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)
minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, as the 114th Congress continues to set its course for the coming term, I rise today to honor Jerry “J.R.” McBride, a member of the DuPage County Board, who died of cancer in October at the young age of 47.

I rise not to dwell on his passing but to suggest that we all may take a moment to learn a few lessons from his life. J.R., as he was affectionately called, lived his life by focusing on the needs of others.

He was a family man. He cared deeply about his wife, Becky, and his five children. He was a community man, helping more area nonprofit organizations than I have time to mention here.

Perhaps most important for those of us in Congress, J.R. was a public servant who put the needs of his community and his constituents ahead of politics and partisanship.

J.R. was an equal opportunity listener and a friend to Republicans and Democrats alike. He knew the importance of cooperation and of compromise, of humor and humanity. He saw in his fellow public servants the commitment to do what is right for the people that we have been elected to represent.

Mr. McBride recognized that we are all in this together, and he was committed to working together for the greater good. That lesson, along with his accomplishments for DuPage County and his memory, will live on.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS A HEINOUS CRIME

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this week, we will take up legislation that helps combat one of the fastest growing, most despicable criminal enterprises in the world: human trafficking.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, we had a reported 82 incidents of human trafficking cases last year and a reported 426 calls of human trafficking violations. I am pleased that late last year, Pennsylvania added itself as a State that enacted stricter human trafficking laws.

Mr. McBride recognized that we are all in this together, and he was committed to working together for the greater good. That lesson, along with his accomplishments for DuPage County and his memory, will live on.

THE TRAGIC REALITY OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. YOUNG of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the tragic yet growing reality of human trafficking. This evil exists even in the United States of America. Here at home, 300,000 young Americans are in danger of becoming victims of sex trafficking.

Most troubling is how quickly these young people vanish in the shadows. Within 48 hours of being on the street, one in three kids will be lured into sexual exploitation, according to the National Network for Runaway Youth.

That is why we must build awareness. Education is power. Please seek out the organizations that can educate you so that you can make a difference.

In Iowa, we have the Iowa Network Against Human Trafficking. Iowa Teens Against Human Trafficking, Breaking Traffik, and many, many other fantastic community and religious organizations working to raise awareness and combat human trafficking in the State.

Look them up. Get involved. We will work together to end trafficking because our women and children are not safe. This isn’t something that just happens across the oceans; this is happening at home.

MERCHANT MARINERS ARE OWED A DEBT OF GRATITUDE

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, in World War II, more than 200,000 brave Americans answered the call of duty by joining the merchant marine, braving troubled seas to deliver crucial supplies to the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific. They faced enemy attack. Thousands perished at sea, and hundreds more were captured.

Unfortunately, the veterans of the merchant marine who risked their lives in service of our Nation were never eligible for the provisions of the GI bill that helped millions of veterans go to college, secure a home, and transition seamlessly into civilian life.

To right this wrong, I am introducing the Honoring Our World War II Merchant Mariners Act of 2015. This bill would provide the one-time payment of $25,000 to fewer than 5,000 surviving World War II mariners.

With many of these forgotten heroes well into their nineties, time is running out to repay this debt of gratitude. I encourage my colleagues to act quickly in cosponsoring this important legislation.

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I was pleased that the Speaker expressed support for infrastructure improvements on “60 Minutes” last Sunday.

America is in desperate need of repair. Officials in San Diego just reported that it would take $3.9 billion to maintain their infrastructure, and there is no doubt that my colleagues are facing similar circumstances in their home districts.

The longer we wait, the longer we drag our feet on this issue, the bigger the pietag grows. The economic benefits of an improved infrastructure are clear. S&P is estimating that $1.3 billion in infrastructure investment creates 29,000 construction jobs, and that is not including indirect job creation.

But we all know this is more than an economic issue. We are risking the safety of the American people who are traveling every day on crumbling roads and bridges.

Madam Speaker, what are we waiting for? There is much to gain by acting and yet so much to lose by doing nothing.
BOKO HARAM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring, recognizing, and respecting those who traveled through the devastation and horror of the Holocaust. To those who lost their lives, I prayerfully mourn them. For those who survived, I champion them and thank them and make a commitment as we have done as brothers and sisters, Republicans and Democrats, and as Americans: Never again.

I rise as well to speak of the heinousness of the acts of Boko Haram and the killing and murderous acts against innocent children in Nigeria. We must stand together and act against this crisis. We must recognize that this bloodshed will not stop.

I am grateful that Secretary Kerry is in Nigeria and collaborating on what the next steps are. I want to thank the United States military, which has provided insight and cooperation.

But, Madam Speaker, there needs to be more. We need to have a waiver of some provisions dealing with utilization and collaboration in the Nigerian military. We must ask them to do what is right. We cannot sit by while the bloodletting Boko Haram continues to kill women and children across Nigeria. Enough—it must stop now.

DECLARING WAR ON IMMIGRANTS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, last week, House Republicans voted to eliminate DAPA, a program that would protect nearly 40 percent of undocumented immigrants, promote family unity, and boost our economy. They also voted to end DACA, which has helped TEAM Nevada enroll 10,000 in Nevada, come out of the shadows and pursue the American Dream.

This Republican attack is not only being waged at the Federal level. Yesterday, Nevada’s Republican attorney general joined more than two dozen other States in a lawsuit challenging President Obama’s executive action on immigration, although every President since Eisenhower has used similar executive authority to protect immigrants in our country.

So what then is the real reason for this declaring war on immigrants? Could it be that they want to keep a desperate underclass to fill those low-wage, no-benefit jobs? Or do some fear that these folks might become citizens and vote them out of office? Regardless of the reason, these modern day know-nothings should be ashamed of themselves.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF GLOBAL SAI MOVEMENT

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Global Sai Movement, which celebrates the teachings and ideals of Shirdi Sai Baba, the most respected of the 19th century Indian perfect masters and renowned for his teachings of respect, compassion, and acceptance. He transcended religious barriers, earning accolades from Hindus, Christians, and Muslims.

Dr. Chandra Bhanu Satpathy deserves great credit for his earnest and humble leadership of the Global Sai Movement. Since 1989, Dr. Satpathy has proven himself to be an exemplary leader, working to improve the welfare of others in the spirit of Sai Baba’s teachings.

He has established nearly 350 cultural and community centers around the world and has sponsored international cultural and spiritual festivals.

At a time when many parts of the world are in turmoil, much of it due to sectarian divisions, Dr. Satpathy and the Global Sai Movement offer a bridge of goodwill and vision for a peaceful future.

REMEMBERING LEON COUNTY SHERIFF LARRY CAMPBELL

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Madam Speaker, today I rise to remember and honor Leon County Sheriff Larry Campbell, who after 50 years of public service lost a long-fought battle with cancer on December 24.

Sheriff Campbell first joined the Sheriff’s Office during his senior year at Florida State University after serving in the Marine Corps. He was elected sheriff in 1986, a position of trust he would hold until his passing.

Sheriff Campbell was respected by law enforcement across our State for his leadership. He was also well known for being an avid supporter of charitable causes, including the United Way and American Heart Association.

Sheriff Campbell is survived by his wife, Michelle; his son, Jack; and two daughters, Jeannette and Stephanie. Our community will remember Sheriff Campbell as a dedicated public servant. We owe him and his family a great debt of gratitude.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Rose-Lehtinen). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Speaker will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX. Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION, INTERVENTION, AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 350) to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 350

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015.”

SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) REVIEW.—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogs the activities of the Federal Government and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on deterrence, prevention, and control of child victims of trafficking and offenses, preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking, the commercial sexual exploitation of children, and other similar topics that the Task Force determines appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report, which shall include—

(1) information on the efforts of Federal and State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) information on each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking.
human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

SEC. 4. PROVISIONS PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ‘‘including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking’’.  

SEC. 5. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ‘‘victim of trafficking’’ has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 350, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in favor of H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015 introduced by Representative KRISTI NOEM of South Dakota.

As we have heard on the floor repeatedly this week, human trafficking generally and child sex trafficking specifically is a horrible crime that sadly exists in our country. Estimates suggest that over 290,000 youth are at risk of human trafficking in the United States, with children as young as 12 years old becoming victims of commercial sexual abuse. While Federal, State, and local law enforcement have made great strides to combat and eradicate human trafficking, there remains work to be done on this front.

As in all things, to effectively combat human trafficking, we must first fully understand the problem. H.R. 350 requires the existing Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to survey and catalogue the methods being employed by our Federal and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to report on best practices that can improve the response. The bill also directs the Government Accountability Office to report on Federal and State efforts to fight trafficking, including the grant programs aimed at assisting victims and fighting this crime.

Finally, in order to help young victims move on from their trauma, H.R. 350 clarifies that existing Federal trafficking grants may be used for programs that provide housing for victims of sex trafficking. Currently, 29 States do not have shelter beds dedicated to the victims of sex trafficking. This provision would help address that travesty.

Similar legislation was passed in the House last Congress but was not enacted into law.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on the other side of the Capitol to pass this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. Bob Goodlatte,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015. As a result of those consultations, I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further consideration of that bill that may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding that, by forgoing consideration of H.R. 350, the Foreign Affairs Committee does not waive jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this, or any other, legislation. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 350.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

H. ROYCE, Chairman. Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 350, the ‘‘Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015.’’ As you noted, the Committee on Foreign Affairs was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of H.R. 350 so that it could proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Foreign Affairs is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 350.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime and the third largest enterprise in the world. The scourge of our society is estimated to be a $9 billion industry in the United States and as much as a $30 billion industry worldwide.

Because of the criminals and all of those who wish to do wrong realize that it is a bigger and better business than drugs because, tragically and unfortunately and with great sadness, they use their product over and over again. They use these innocent persons, many women, many children, many boys, over and over again.

Because this criminal activity rarely occurs in public view, it is difficult to say exactly how many children are being victimized. What we do know, however, is that it is extensive. All you have to do is walk along any of the streets of major cities and find homeless teenagers, or even younger than that, and you will find out that in some way they have been taken and touched and brutalized by sex trafficking.

Madam Speaker, an estimated 290,000 American children are at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that one of every seven endangered runaways who reported to the center are likely victims of minor sex trafficking.

I am told that the average age of minors entering the sex trade is between 12 and 14 years old. Vulnerable youth are primary targets. They are more easily lured into prostitution and other forms of child exploitation, while runaways and children in foster care are especially vulnerable. Child victims of trafficking can and do come from a type of home or socioeconomic background that makes them particularly, if you will, in the line of fire.

The bottom line, however, Madam Speaker, is that all of these children are deserving of rescue, recovery, protection, and shelter. One of the advocacies that I had in my own hometown was to provide for children in foster care that had aged out, because those are likely victims, unbeknownst to themselves, and they are worthy of saving.

The bill before us, H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015, is an important step toward pursuing traffickers and those who solicit the services of trafficked individuals. It mandates a review of Federal and State prevention activities by the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, and this review is to be done in consultation with non-governmental organizations. That is a great partnership.

The purpose of this review is to identify best practices in the prevention of
trafficking. This study, along with the mandated GAO, will provide much-needed intelligence to be shared among those Federal, State, and local agencies dedicated to combating sex trafficking.

And, I might add, Madam Speaker, that what is also needed is a commitment, an investment of resources, to not just have the studies but to make sure that we match the importance of this legislation with resources.

First, one of the biggest limitations on the ability of law enforcement agencies to successfully combat human trafficking in and around Houston is a lack of data sharing. Another witness said we—local enforcement—need the Feds to build a Houston trafficking regional database accessible only to vice and human trafficking personnel to store, share, and search data on all aspects of Houston-area human trafficking investigations.

Madam Speaker, the need for the information that will be collected by the GAO study and the Interagency Task Force to monitor and combat trafficking is not only needed, it is long overdue.

This bill also addresses a major concern that anti-trafficking advocates have shared with me—the lack of housing or shelter for survivors. Trafficked kids need a way out, someplace to escape to. Without such a refuge, these children will return to their traffickers. Trafficked kids need a way out, some place to escape to. Without such a refuge, these children will return to their traffickers.

Today, we are considering several bills that address domestic minor sex trafficking, and it is right that we do all we can to protect our children. Many anti-trafficking advocates have shared with me—the lack of housing or shelter for survivors. Trafficked kids need a way out, someplace to escape to. Without such a refuge, these children will return to their traffickers.

I must share with you, however, the testimony of another witness at last year’s field hearing. That witness said, . . . (many of the females that my officers are encountering on the streets, in the massage parlors and strip clubs, and on the internet sites are typically 18 to 21. We know from experience that while these young women may be adults now, they have, in all likelihood, been under the control of a pimp/trafficker for many years. Many of the females my officers are encountering on the streets, in the massage parlors, at the strip clubs, and on the Internet sites are typically 18 to 21. We know from experience that while these young women may be adults now, they have, in all likelihood, been under the control of a pimp/trafficker for many years. There is no doubt that what is also needed is a commitment, an investment of resources, to not just have the studies but to make sure that we match the importance of this legislation with resources.

I will share with you the testimony of another witness at last year’s field hearing. The witness said:

Many of the females my officers are encountering on the streets, in the massage parlors, at the strip clubs, and on the Internet sites are typically 18 to 21. We know from experience that, while these young women may be adults now, they have, in all likelihood, been under the control of a pimp/trafficker for many years.

Madam Speaker, I met those women. Yes, they have been under the horrible domination of these traffickers for many years, and some were sold by their parents. We need to take definitive steps to ensure that this group of victims does not fall through the cracks because we are focusing on the minors. We do this by ensuring that the laws we pass and the supportive assistance we establish are also available to these older young women. In closing, Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act. I compliment the sponsors and cosponsors, and I encourage them to remember that there are still those other victims of human trafficking who are equally deserving of our consideration and protection. While we will accomplish much in combating trafficking by our actions today, let us commit ourselves to doing more.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 350, the “Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention and Recovery Act of 2015.”

According to the Bureau of Investigation, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime, and the third largest criminal enterprise in the world. This scourge of our society is estimated to be a $9.8 billion industry in the United States and as much as a $30 billion industry worldwide. Because this criminal activity rarely occurs in public view, it is difficult to say exactly how many children are being victimized. What we do know, however, is that the problem is extensive.

Madam Speaker, an estimated 290,000 American children are at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that one of every seven endangered runaways entering the center are likely victims of minor sex trafficking. I am told that the average age of minors entering the sex trade is between 12 and 14 years. Vulnerable youth are primary targets. They are more easily lured into prostitution and other forms of child exploitation, and children and children in foster care are especially vulnerable. Child victims of sex trafficking can and do come from any type of home or socioeconomic background.

The bottom line, however, Madam Speaker, is that all of these children are deserving of rescue, recovery, protection and shelter. The bill before us, H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking, Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015, is an important step toward pursuing traffickers who solicit the services of trafficked individuals. It mandates a review of federal and state prevention activities by the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, and this review is to be done in consultation with nongovernmental organizations. The purpose of this review is to identify best practices in the prevention of trafficking. This study, along with the mandated GAO will provide much-needed intelligence to be shared among those federal, state and local agencies dedicated to combating sex trafficking.

Witnesses at a Homeland Security Committee field hearing held in Houston in March of last year testified, First, one of the biggest limitations on the ability of law enforcement agencies to successfully combat Human Trafficking in and around Houston is our lack of data sharing. Another witness stated, We (local law enforcement) need the Feds to build a Houston Trafficking Regional Database, accessible only to Vice/Human Trafficking personnel to store, share, and search data on all aspects of Houston-area Human Trafficking investigations.

Madam Speaker, the need for the information that will be collected by the GAO study and the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking is not only needed. It is long overdue! This bill also addresses a major concern that anti-trafficking advocates have shared with me—the lack of housing or shelter for survivors. Trafficked kids need a way out, some place to escape to. Without such a refuge, these children will return to their traffickers.

Today, we are considering several bills that address domestic minor sex trafficking, and it is right that we do all we can to protect our children. Many anti-trafficking advocates have shared with me—the lack of housing or shelter for survivors. Trafficked kids need a way out, someplace to escape to. Without such a refuge, these children will return to their traffickers.

I yield such time as she may need.
far away, but it changed me forever. Oftentimes, when I have thought about human trafficking or sex trafficking over those years, I have thought about its being far, far away from home. Then I began to learn about what a problem we have here in the United States. It is not just happening in other countries. It happens here. It happens in States like New York, Florida, and California, but it also happens in South Dakota! They are back again today, because we have flirted with this problem for many years. I have two daughters, and I know that the average age that a young girl is trafficked is between the ages of 12 and 14. I have a son who is 12, and the average age of boys who are trafficked is between the ages of 11 and 13. I cannot imagine my children having to go through what some of these victims have had to go through.

I also spent my life involved in many different youth organizations. I have been a children’s minister for many years. I still teach Sunday school. I have also been involved with 4-H. I have spent my life with kids, trying to help their lives become better so that they can build the kinds of traits and character they need to help them become shining stars in this world. I recognize that many children don’t have those opportunities; yet I see the devastating effects of this industry here in our country. They say one of the first steps to recovery is the belief that you have a problem. We have got a huge problem in this country, and that is why you will find these bills on the House floor today. We want to make sure that we do not only recognize that there is a problem, but that we give our law enforcement officers as many tools as possible to get rid of this industry and to help as many victims as possible.

Hundreds of thousands of children are trafficked every single year in the United States. Most of these victims are women and girls. Many come from tough backgrounds that have led them to the situations they are in today; but did you know that most of them, if they are involved in the sex trafficking industry, are forced to have sex 25 to 48 times a day? That is unfathomable to me. We as a nation have a responsibility to do everything that we can to prevent trafficking. When prevention efforts fail, we have a responsibility to help those victims recover. I have many of my colleagues today have also made this a priority, and I am grateful for their leadership on this issue.

Last year, we passed many of these bills through this House, but they got hung up in the Senate even though they were extremely bipartisan over here in the House. That is why they are back again today, because we need to get these bills signed into law to save our children.

Now, as we begin the 114th Congress, our resolve is bright forward again to fight against human trafficking. I am grateful for everyone here today who has sponsored the bills, who has worked on behalf of these bills, and I am grateful for their leadership to make sure that we pass these bills and get them signed into law.

The bill that I have sponsored here today is going to make sure that when we are dealing with situations that they are spent in a manner that is going to actually help kids and help people get out of this industry. It is going to make sure that we are cooperating with nonprofits and with other organizations that have been involved in the industry before and that were being effective while we put those efforts forward. Then it is going to make sure that we have the dollars available to have shelters for those victims who are trying to come out of this situation. We have fewer than 200 beds available for victims in this country who want to recover, who want to heal, and who want to get on with their lives in pursuing the American Dream, like so many other people in this country have. That is why this bill is important. That is why all of these bills are important. It is why we need to pass them.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as I have no further requests for time, I will just close by saying our children need our response. They are suffering. It is important that we work together to minimally provide them with the shelter that they need and with the resources for them to eliminate the scourge of human trafficking and sex trafficking. With that, I ask for the support of the underlying legislation, H.R. 350.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I think this is an example that this House can do important things on a bipartisan basis. I commend the gentlewoman from South Dakota for introducing the legislation, and I commend the gentleman from Texas for supporting the legislation, and I urge an “aye” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 1590 to stop exploitation through trafficking, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015.”

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR INCENTIVES.

Part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 170(c), by striking “where feasible” and all that follows, and inserting the following: “where feasible, to an application—

(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers, that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

(2) from an applicant in a State that has enacted a law that—

(A) treats a minor who has engaged in, or has attempted to engage in, a commercial sex act as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons,

(B) encourages the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution or sex trafficking offense, based on the conduct described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) ensures that the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) is accompanied by the provision of—

(i) shelter that they need; and

(ii) the services described in clause (ii) of section 1591(f) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7120).

(2) in section 1709, by inserting at the end the following:

(5) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

(v) the number of individuals required by the State to be placed in a shelter or other appropriate service provider, including child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, legal services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.

(3) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end and inserting “and the following:—

(1) the number of individuals required by the State to be placed in a shelter or other appropriate service provider, including child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, legal services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.

(4) in section 1709, by striking “and 1594” and inserting “1594, 2251, 2251, 2421, 2422, and 2423”;

(5) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end and inserting “and the following:—

(1) the number of individuals required by the State to be placed in a shelter or other appropriate service provider, including child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, legal services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.

(6) ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

(7) ‘severe form of trafficking in persons’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

SEC. 3. REPORT ON RESTITUTION PAID IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “1590,” following “1590,”

(2) by striking “and 1594” and inserting “1594, 2251, 2251, 2421, 2422, and 2423”;

(3) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end and inserting “and the following:

(1) the number of individuals required by the court order to pay restitution in connection with a violation of each offense under title 18, United States Code, the amount of restitution required to be paid under each such order, and the amount of restitution actually paid pursuant to each such order; and

(ii) the gender, age, gender, country of origin, country of citizenship, and description of the role of the offense of individuals convicted under each offense; and

SEC. 4. NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.

Section 107(b)(2) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

(“B) NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.—Beginning in fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts made available for grants under this paragraph, the Secretary of Health and Human Services
shall make grants for a national communication system to assist victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons in communicating with service providers. The Secretary shall give priority to grant applicants that have experience in providing telephone services to victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.

SEC. 5. JOB CORPS ELIGIBILITY.

Section 144a(a)(3) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3190a(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) In the case of a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 102 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)), notwithstanding paragraph (2), an individual described in this subparagraph shall not be required to demonstrate eligibility under such paragraph."

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.

Section 536(o)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

"(3) There shall be, in addition to, and not to be used in lieu of, these provisions, a national human trafficking hotline that shall be available to the public 24 hours a day, and shall provide—

(A) immediate assistance to victims;

(B) information about traffickers and their methods of operation;

(C) information about services available in the area where the victim is located; and

(D) assistance to the law enforcement agencies, upon the request of such an agency, in locating and recovering missing children."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBERN) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in H.R. 159, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This weekend is one of America’s greatest sports traditions—the Super Bowl. As most Americans huddle around the television, either rooting for their teams or against the rival as the case may be, sadly, many American children are huddled on the streets or in hotel rooms—the victims of sex trafficking.

A sinister side to major sporting events and to other large events is that a portion of the attendants come looking to abuse young children as much as they come for the headline events. While no one knows exactly how much the incidence of child sex trafficking increases during these events, it is known that pimps doe bring children and other victims of abuse from around the country to offer them for sale at the Super Bowl and at other similar events. During last year’s Super Bowl, the FBI and other law enforcement agencies arrested more than 45 traffickers and rescued 16 child victims of sex trafficking, including victims as young as 13 years old and some who had been reported missing by their families.

Compounding this tragedy is the fact that most States have no exception to their prostitution laws for minor victims of trafficking. These children must often fear arrest and prosecution when law enforcement manages to locate and rescue some sex trafficking victims. This must stop. In recognizing the need for protection and support for the growing number of child victims of commercial sex trafficking, an increasing number of States have taken steps to establish so-called “safe harbor” provisions that either decriminalize minor prostitution or divert minor victims to the services and support needed for recovery.

H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, introduced by Mr. PAULSEN of Minnesota and Ms. MOORE of my own State of Wisconsin, seeks to continue this trend by encouraging the States, through preferential treatment in the Federal COPS grants, to enact safe harbor legislation that ensures these victims are treated as victims and not as criminals and that they are directed to support services and not to detention facilities.

The bill also codifies a “national human trafficking hotline” that ensures young workers are eligible for enrollment in the Job Corps program. It requires the Attorney General to report on sex offender convictions, and it clarifies the authority of the U.S. Marshals Service to help locate and recover missing children, many of whom are vulnerable to becoming sex trafficking victims.

This bill passed the Judiciary Committee by voice vote. Similar legislation passed on the House floor unanimously last Congress, but it was not enacted into law.

There is no such thing as a child prostitute—just victims of commercial sexual abuse at the hands of adults, so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 159.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Mr. SENSENBERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the case study of a 15-year-old who was trafficked from Mexico to the United States around the time of the Super Bowl. This is the face of child sex trafficking.

On January 31, 2015, Border Patrol agents in Laredo, Texas, rescued a 15-year-old U.S. citizen who had been trafficked from Mexico. According to an agent, the child was sold for sex by her mother to an acquaintance.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The manager, Mr. SENSENBERN, is right. These are certainly both cases and legislation that, one, we are appalled at with the case studies that we have seen and with the legislation that we seek in a bipartisan manner to solve that exploitation.

I rise in support of H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015. The Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act is another weapon in the war against sex trafficking in our country.

Madam Speaker, we are truly at war. And we stand here today, some child is being sex-trafficked—some runaway who is away from her family, not able to be found, not finding a place of refuge—falling into the deadly hands, if you will, of someone who will take advantage of her almost for the rest of her life. In Houston, I met women who had engaged in or who had been subjected to that in the early part of their lives, and they will tell you how it follows them for a long, long time, so they subject themselves to drugs and alcohol to eliminate the pain.

This bill contains important victim-based initiatives to help combat sex trafficking. One of those initiatives,
the national safe harbor law, is essential to making sure that victims of sex trafficking are not criminalized but, instead, are diverted to Child Protective Services. Only 12 States have safe harbor laws for minor victims of sex trafficking. That is far too few. Obviously, we need all 50 States to have this safe harbor.

My colleagues, there is no such thing as a child prostitute. There are only child victims of rape. Children cannot give consent. There is no such thing as a child prostitute. Likewise, it is illegal for adults to have sex with children, as what they are—horrific and horrible and vile criminals. The person who is the john is a rapist, a child rapist. We must punish those who prey on the vulnerable, and that includes not only the pimps and the traffickers, but also the rapists.

□ 1300

On the other hand, in an effort to help their recovery, we must not continue to victimize the victims. This bill empowers victims by providing for a national hotline to request help. The importance of this national hotline must not be underestimated.

In my opening statement, I spoke of a field hearing that I convened last March in Houston as a member of the Homeland Security Committee. During that hearing, Mr. McClelland, the chief of the Houston Police Department, testified that an 18-year-old victim of human trafficking contacted the national hotline asking for help to escape her violent pimp.

The young victim had been forced to have sex with a john who ended up stabbing her and leaving without paying any money—a stabbing. She was fearful and wanted to get the money. It was a horrible situation.

While her injuries were not life threatening, she did require medical attention for her injuries. However, the pimp refused to let her have medical treatment, and she owed him to make up the money that the previous john who stabbed her did not pay.

Vice’s human trafficking unit received the information from hotline personnel and were able to contact, locate, and rescue the young female. They also arrested the pimp and charged him with felony of compelling prostitution. Madam Speaker, I wish there was a harsher charge, but it was good work by the local law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, this story ends well. The young victim was reunited with family members that same day. This case serves as a great example of how law enforcement and nongovernmental organizations can successfully work together to not only rescue victims of human trafficking, but also arrest the perpetrators of this crime and get them off the streets and from other victims who are still out there.

H.R. 159 also helps victims obtain restitution, and this is what I like: it puts them back on the right track by giving them eligibility for the Job Corps program, where we have seen lives turn around. It wants to say to them: You are valuable, you are worthy, and you have a future.

This bill will help ensure that all victims of sex trafficking are treated as victims in every State and every jurisdiction. For these reasons, I join with my colleague, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and urge my colleagues to support this legislation as well.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 159, the “Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015.” The Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act is another weapon in the war against sex trafficking. The bill contains important victim-based initiatives to help combat sex trafficking. One of those initiatives, the National Safe Harbor Law, is essential to making sure that victims of sex trafficking are not criminalized, but instead are diverted to child protective services. Only 12 states have safe harbor laws for minor victims of sex trafficking.

My colleagues, there is no such thing as a “child prostitute”; there are only child victims of rape. Likewise, it is illegal for adults to have sex with children, who, by their very age, are under the age of consent. Sex with a minor is rape! The seriousness of the offense is not diminished by having the “john” pay for the sex. It is still rape, and it’s time we stopped referring to the customer, the person having sex with a child, with such a polite title as a “john.” He is a rapist, a child rapist! We must punish those who prey on the vulnerable, and that includes not only the pimps and traffickers but also the rapists.

On the other hand, we must not continue to victimize the victims. This bill empowers victims with a national hotline to request help. The importance of this national hotline must not be underestimated.

In my earlier statement, I spoke of a field hearing that the Committee on Homeland Security held in Houston in March of last year. During that hearing Mr. Charles McClelland, Jr. Chief of Police, of the Houston Police Department, testified,

> ... an 18 year old female victim of Human Trafficking contacted the National Human Trafficking Resource Center Hotline asking for help to escape her violent pimp. The young victim had been forced to have sex with a “John” who ended up stabbing her and leaving without paying her any money. While her injuries were not life threatening, she did require medical attention for her injuries, however, the pimp refused to take her to get medical treatment until she earned him more money to make up for the money that the previous “John” did not pay.

Vice Human Trafficking Unit personnel received the information from Hotline personnel, and were able to contact, locate, and rescue the young female. They arrested the pimp and charge him with felony compelling prostitution.

Madam Speaker, this story ends well. This young victim was reunited with family members that same day. This case serves as a great example of how law enforcement and nongovernmental organizations can successfully work together to not only rescue victims of Human Trafficking, but also arrest the perpetrators of this crime and get them off the street and away from other victims who are still out there.

H.R. 159 also helps victims obtain restitution and grants them eligibility for Job Corps programs. This bill will help ensure that all victims of sex trafficking are treated as victims in every State and every jurisdiction.

For these reasons I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), the principal author of the bill.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is easy and convenient to think that sex trafficking only happens in countries outside the United States. The truth is that more than 100,000 are at risk of being trafficked for commercial sex here in the United States each and every year, here in America.

We have a word for a situation when one group of people is dehumanized and has their basic human rights snuffed out for someone else’s economic gain. That word is slavery. The problem we have today is not a thing of the past. It is not from some remote corner of the world that you can’t find on a map.

Slavery in the form of human trafficking is happening right now. It is happening in our cities, suburbs, and rural communities. It is happening in every and every one of our congressional districts.

I am sad to say that Minneapolis, Minnesota, my home State, has actually been listed as one of the 13th largest centers for sexual exploitation of children in the entire country. I realize how critical it is to educate our community about what I have learned from talking to victims like Dayanna, who became a 13-year-old trafficking victim. Dayanna didn’t get a lot of love and attention from her mother or family.

While she took it upon herself to take care of her brothers and sisters, she longed for someone to give her love and attention. She ended up being seduced by a man who promised to be her “boyfriend.”

Guess what? At age 13, within days after running away with him, she found herself being trafficked in Chicago and Philadelphia, without a home and separated from her family. Only a daring jump from a second-story window actually allowed her to escape.

Many might think that if Dayanna had come from a different family situation, she wouldn’t have been trafficked; sadly, that is not the case.
I will never forget meeting with the mother of a young woman named Brit-
tany. Britanny was a very young girl who was violently raped, murdered,
and then found dead in an impound lot last February. Unlike Dayanna, Brit-
tany had a loving family. She worked with children at a local recreation center and taught dance lessons.

Despite these circumstances, Britanny was also a victim of sex traf-
ficking but was too embarrassed to speak out until it was too late. As Brit-
tany’s mother said: “It doesn’t matter if victims have a home because if sex trafficking can happen to my daughter, it can happen to any young girl.”

That is exactly what we are talking about: young girls who are only 12, 13, or 14 years old. They are not old enough to have graduated from high school. They are not old enough to have voted in an election. They are not old enough to pass their driver’s li-
cense test. In most States, these girls would be considered crimina-
l that should be incarcerated and charged with prostitution instead of being treated as victims.

We found that criminalization only traumas girls and actually isolates them from the community and the services that they need and de-
serve. That is why, Madam Speaker, we need this legislation, H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which is based on States with safe harbor laws.

Safe harbor laws ensure that these girls are treated as victims. Safe har-
bor laws will give legal protection for minor victims and provide them with specialized social services.

We know that by bringing these vic-
tims out of the shadows, we can make sure they get the services they need, including medical and psychological treatment, housing, legal services, educa-
tional assistance, job training, and more.

Law enforcement can then focus on actually bringing the perpetrators of these awful crimes to justice. This bi-
partisan legislation incentivizes States to adopt these safe harbor laws, so we can expand on the successes we have seen in States like Minnesota.

In 2011, Minnesota became the fifth State to approve safe harbor legisla-
tion. After their safe harbor laws went into effect, guess what? Law enforce-
ment in Minnesota began arresting more johns than ever before, and human trafficking convictions more than doubled. Best practices evaluated by law enforcement and victims groups show that removing the fear of pros-
ecution from victims actually works.

Today, only a little over a dozen States have full safe harbor laws. We have got to do more to protect these victims and be sure the pimps and johns are brought to justice.

This legislation also helps victims by codifying a national human trafficking hotline and making victims eligible for Job Corps services. By giving them an avenue to access for job skill training, they can begin to rebuild their lives.

Madam Speaker, the bill also helps law enforcement by allowing the U.S. Marshals Service to support other State, local, or Federal law enforce-

ment agencies that are investigating missing child cases.

Finally, the bill increases oversight by requiring additional reporting to Congress on restitution orders in traf-
ficking cases. These provisions are all essential pieces of important pieces in the effort to combat sex trafficking.

I want to thank my colleague GWEN MOORE from Wisconsin for her advoca-
cy, passion, and partnership on this legislation and moving it forward on a bipartisan basis. I also want to thank the leaders of the Judiciary Committee team who have recognized that this is a top priority and moved it quickly early in this session of Congress.

I look forward to working with my colleague, Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota, who has worked so diligently to combat sex trafficking in places like Nigeria, and I tra-
ditionally brought her on that initiative.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in sup-
port of H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which has been so diligently pushed through with the superb partnership of Congressman ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota. It has been a thrill to partner with him throughout this process.

This is a bipartisan collaboration be-
cause, unfortunately, this is a bipar-
tisan problem. Solving the problem of sex trafficking of children will re-
quire work on all of our parts because it is a financial boom. People become multimillionaires in this illicit trade.

Also, the gentlewoman from Texas has worked so diligently to combat sex trafficking in places like Nigeria, and I joined with her on that initiative.

It is very disheartening to know that right here, within our own borders, the FBI estimates that at least 100,000 chil-
dren in the United States of America are currently trafficked. Law enforce-
ment estimates that another 200,000 are right on the cusp. They are at risk of sexual exploitation.

These victims are not “women of the night” or sex workers. These children are doing it of their own free will. The average age of these victims is 13. It is an embarrassing statistic. It is embar-
rassing to report that my own home-
town of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has be-

come known as a sex trafficking hub for both children and adults.

In 2013, alone, just on a random day, the FBI did a sweep and rescued 10 ju-
vilene girls from sex traffickers in Mil-
waukee. Trafficking is all too common in communities across the Nation—
from urban settings, rural settings, subur-
ban settings, and from coast to coast.

Predators victimize vulnerable young people such as those in the foster care system. They prey upon those living in poverty, but what we do know is they also seek out higher-income children, going after those children who may have problems in their own homes. Some are LGBT identified.

There is no safe harbor for children unless we create it through laws such as this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, I yield the gentle-
woman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. I am proud of this legis-
lation, I am pleased to cosponsor it, and I urge all of my colleagues to sup-
port H.R. 159.

Mr. SENSENBERN. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we have all come today with an important project, and that is to help save our children.

I wouldn’t want to leave this very important bill that talks about saving our children from sex trafficking with-
out letting our colleagues know that we want every possible act of human trafficking to be reported at 1-866-347-
4243. We want those who are victims to know that they can seek help, too, at 1-888-737-7888.

The statement we are making is that we are doing everything we can to ex-
tinguish and eliminate this heinous tragedy in our country. I ask my col-
leagues to support this legislation and to recognize that we must stop explo-
itation through trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 159, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is another ex-
ample of bipartisan cooperation in the House of Representatives. I do wish to commend the principal author of the bill, Mr. PAULSEN from Minnesota, and my colleague, the ranking member of the Crime Sub-
committee, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

We have all worked together. Hope-
fully, we can send this bill over to the other body, and they will promptly pass it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBERN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 159, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-
thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
STOP ADVERTISING VICTIMS OF EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 285) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts.

Mr. STRICKLAND. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 285

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2015” or the “SAVE Act of 2015.”

SEC. 2. ADVERTISING THAT OFFERS CERTAIN COMMERCIAL SEX ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a)(1), by inserting after “obtains,” the following:—

“advertises,”

(b) MENS REA REQUIREMENT.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a), by inserting after “knowing, or” the following:—

“the defendant knew that the advertisement was advertised and knew or recklessly disregarded the fact that the ad involved a minor or someone involved through force, fraud or coercion.

This legislation raises the bar even higher for defendants who, while not directly placing the ads, do knowingly benefit from the placement of advertising.

Specifically, this bill requires the government to show that these defendants knew that they were advertising child sex trafficking and that they advertiser involved a minor or a coerced adult.

Reckless disregard is not sufficient.

H.R. 285 only clarifies that people who advertise sex trafficking could face criminal prosecution.

Under current law, there is the additional possibility of civil liability for defendants who violate the Federal sex trafficking statute. However, under section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, online publishers of third-party advertisements are generally immune from civil liability for such advertisements.

H.R. 285 does nothing to disrupt or modify the immunity already provided by section 230.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extra-legislative material on H.R. 285, currently prohibits advertising prostitution on an international level. I witness and reported on the devastating consequences of human trafficking, where innocent women and children were dragged into the dark abyss of sexual slavery.

But never, never in my wildest dreams did I ever think human trafficking was so rampant here in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, right now there are young women being forced into prostitution in virtually every district across the Nation. Indeed, I was shocked to learn that my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, has been identified as one of the top 20 areas for sex trafficking in the United States.
Madam Speaker, this is a problem that is hiding in plain sight. Every year, thousands of young American lives are impacted by this despicable crime.

However, there is hope. I take hope from the work that is done by law enforcement professionals who are on the front lines every day protecting our Nation’s children from those who would seek to exploit them. I take hope from those who work in victims’ services and their tireless efforts to help survivors recover, heal, and forge new lives out of the horrors of sexual enslavement.

Most importantly, I take hope from all those involved in this hideous crime. This bracelet, Madam Speaker, was made by survivors at a safe house called Crisis Aid International in my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri.

Their strength gives us strength, their resolve gives us inspiration, and their steadfast commitment to ending sex trafficking gives us the courage to fight.

I am grateful for the many colleagues that have supported legislation and held events in their home districts to raise awareness and education of this crime. Our work has yet to begin.

However, Madam Speaker, there is much, much work to do still. Legislators, we have an obligation to come together and to do something because we can, because we should, and because we must.

Over the last 10 years, prostitution has slowly but persistently migrated to an online marketplace. Classified services like backpage.com and others are the vehicles for advertising the victims of sexual slavery in this world.

Pimps and traffickers blatantly advertise their victims’ sexual services, with provocative photographs and unsubtle messages, complete with per-hour pricing. The traffickers pay Web sites like Backpage and others to display their messages, and these Web sites, accordingly, reap enormous profits at the expense of victims of sex trafficking.

Many of these ads feature children and trafficking victims, and they are resulting in thousands of children every year being openly sold for sex on the Internet.

Madam Speaker, government intervention is necessary to end facilitation of sex trafficking by Web sites like backpage.com and others who commercially benefit from this criminal activity.

Companies that base their business models off the profits made by selling sex with children should not be allowed to operate.

The SAVE Act seeks to criminalize this behavior, thereby dramatically reducing the victimization of vulnerable children and women forced into sexual slavery in the United States.

Madam Speaker, this legislation passed the House last year in an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 392–19.

I recognize that it is critically important that innocent actors are protected from the liability, while giving prosecutors the means to combat human trafficking.

To be clear, Madam Speaker, this legislation prohibits only those advertisements that the government can prove actually cause harm to a child or sex with an adult who is involved due to force, fraud, or coercion.

There is well-established precedent for Congress to criminalize the advertising of legal goods and services, as the chairman has outlined previously. Surely, advertisements offering sex with children should also be subject to the same restrictions.

Criminalizing the advertisement of trafficking victims will stem the flow of money, resulting in a reduction of both demand and supply.

The victims of sex trafficking are not nameless, faceless children. They are our daughters, our granddaughters, our nieces, and our neighbors. They are the vulnerable youth of our society, the ones who should be protected the most.

Madam Speaker, not exploited for money and greed.

I urge my colleagues to support the SAVE Act because it will provide the tools necessary for law enforcement to combat this despicable and exploitation of women and children in the United States.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scott), who also so ably on this committee, and we congratulate him for his ranking position on the Education Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 285, the SAVE Act. While I support the underlying goal of ensuring that those who facilitate sex trafficking through advertising are prosecuted to the full extent of the law, I am opposed to the bill’s mandatory minimum sentencing provisions.

Mandatory minimum sentences have been studied extensively and have been found to distort rational sentencing systems, discriminate against minorities, waste money, and often require a judge to impose sentences that violate common sense. To add insult to injury, studies have shown that mandatory minimum sentences fail to reduce crime.

Under this bill, the advertising of sex trafficking will result in a mandatory penalty of 10 or 15 years, depending on the circumstances of the crime. There is no doubt that many of these individuals prosecuted under this bill should receive long prison sentences, but, in some cases a mandatory sentence of 10 or 15 years may not be justified.

This is particularly troublesome when you consider the possible scope of defendants who could be prosecuted under this bill. Notably, the prohibition on advertising does not only apply to the sex trafficker who places the ad, or the employee who accepted the ad, but also includes those who benefit financially from the ad.

That is all of the employees, including the receptionist or the computer guy, everybody on the payroll who might have seen the ads or read in the paper that the company publishes some illegal ads but decided to look the other way: they should be held responsible under the provisions of the bill.

And many of them would certainly warrant a sentence of 15 years or even more, but not all of them.

Madam Speaker, mandatory minimum sentences didn’t get into the criminal code at all once but one at a time, each one part of an otherwise good bill. If we expect to get rid of mandatory minimums, we have to first stop passing new ones like this.

Madam Speaker, if people ask why a judge in Florida had to sentence Marissa Alexander to 20 years for firing a warning shot at her abusive boyfriend, we can tell them why Alexander’s girlfriend got 25 years when she had no meaningful role in his drug dealing, or why the United States has 5 percent of the world’s population but 25 percent of the world’s prisoners, they would not understand why and why we had to vote for a bill that further expands mandatory minimum sentences.

Fifteen years in prison, mandatory for everybody on the payroll that gets caught up in this bill—that is what is in this bill. There is no discretion afforded to the judge. The sentence would have to be imposed, whether it makes any sense or not.

Madam Speaker, if we expect to repeal mandatory minimum sentences, the first order of business is to stop passing new ones. This bill contains a new mandatory minimum that someday will require a judge to impose a sentence that violates common sense. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. SENSENIBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Goodlatte), the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee for his hard work on this issue, and I appreciate the time.

While it goes without saying that the growth of the Internet and smartphones have proven to be of great value in many aspects of our lives, these tools can also be used by criminals to facilitate the commercial sexual exploitation of children and other victims by providing an easy way for pimps or traffickers to market child sex trafficking victims to those who seek to do them harm. With just a click of a button, individuals can now use Web sites to advertise, schedule, and purchase sexual encounters with minors, just like they would use these services to hire a ride home.

The SAVE Act, introduced by Mrs. WAGNER from Missouri, makes a technical clarification to an existing Federal sex trafficking statute to make
clear that the law extends to traffickers who knowingly sell sex with minors and victims of force, fraud, or coercion through advertising, as well as to people or entities that knowingly benefit from the sale or distribution of such sex trafficking.

While much of the growth of this terrible crime is on the Internet, this bill is technology neutral and applies to all advertising of children for sex, regardless of the medium. It is important to note that these advertisements, as with other advertisements promoting illegal activity, are not protected speech under the First Amendment.

H.R. 285 was the subject of robust committee process both last Congress and this, and the bill was reported out of the Judiciary Committee last week by voice vote. The legislation that is on the floor today strikes the right balance by protecting victims from commercial sexual exploitation, while also ensuring constitutional rights are respected and innocent third parties are not wrongly prosecuted.

This legislation simply clarifies and modernizes Federal criminal law to keep pace with the evolving trend of exploiting the Internet for criminal gains. The bill passed the House floor last Congress with wide bipartisan support but was not enacted into law.

I commend my colleague from Missouri, Congresswoman WAGNER, for sponsoring this important legislation again.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I urge the United States Senate to take this bill up. Let’s get it signed into law by the President of the United States. It would help save our children from the horrors that people understand but do not want to see. It is good legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We started this afternoon by saying that we join together in stopping the scourge of human trafficking and sex trafficking, and I still stand by that premise. I support the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act. I do believe that adding advertising and having the provision in the law that includes mens rea is an important protection, that there must be an intent to sell and to advertise victims of exploitation.

This, of course, is part of a number of proposals that we are considering today—and we hope we are successful—to combat sex trafficking; but, as we have discussed with respect to these other bills, much more must be done to prevent sex trafficking as well as to aggressively investigate and prosecute these crimes. H.R. 285 amends the current Federal sex trafficking statute so that advertising would now be one of the prohibitive means of facilitating this type of exploitative criminal conduct.

We know, of course, that technology, however, sometimes is tricky. The bill correctly recognizes the fact that sex traffickers increasingly obtain customers for their illegal acts through the means of mass communication, either through various forms of print media or via the Internet. Maybe they throw in the cell phone or have it as well, but they use advertising to get their victims. They are out to get that child. They are out to get that young woman or young man, boy or girl, and we must stop them in their tracks. In fact, sex traffickers use generalized marketplaces as well as sites and pages devoted to advertising the availability of commercial sex.

While the Internet has enriched our lives greatly, these sex traffickers are only interested in using it in the most vile manner; and they use the Internet to perpetrate heinous criminal schemes, such as the selling of minors for sex. Without question, sex traffickers who advertise their scheme should be penalized for their criminal acts.

While I realize that some have raised questions about how the advertising prohibitions under this bill would apply to online companies, I am concerned that we have a free use of that, if I may call it, “virtual neutrality.” Because of this, we adopted an amendment during the Judiciary Committee’s markup last Congress and now again, in a bipartisan effort, to address such concerns. That amendment is included in the text of H.R. 285. We know, for example, however, that with the way the Internet is, some innocent person might wind up finding things on their site that they may not have had anything to do with. We hope the standard of mens rea will help those individuals have a defense.

So as it relates to this legislation, I raise concerns, as my colleagues have done, about the utilization, conduct, of mandatory minimums, primarily because of the vastness of the Internet, and our friends made the point that this advertising could wind up or some act could wind up on there without their knowledge.

We know the one-size-fits-all approach, which is part of the mandatory minimum approach, to criminal actions in the form of mandatory minimums has greatly contributed to our Nation’s crisis of overincarceration, and our Judiciary Committee, rightly so, particularly at the hearings.

In the markup of this bill, the Judiciary Committee did not adopt an amendment that would have removed application of the statute’s mandatory minimum penalties and instead allow a judge to apply an appropriate sentence under the circumstances of the case up to the statute’s existing penalty, which I support enthusiastically, life in prison.

Given the complicated nature of Internet commerce, networks with respect to how advertisements are delivered, the role of the judge might help to carve through, to ferret out, the facts and determine the level of

I ask my colleagues again to consider the mandatory minimum. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 285, the “Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act,” is among a number of important proposals we are considering today to combat sex trafficking.

As we have discussed with respect to these other bills, much more must be done to prevent sex trafficking as well as to aggressively investigate and prosecute these crimes.

H.R. 285 amends the current federal sex trafficking statute so that advertising would now be one of the prohibited means of facilitating this type of exploitative criminal conduct.

The bill correctly recognizes the fact that sex traffickers increasingly obtain customers for their illegal acts through the means of mass communication, either through various forms of print media or via the Internet.

In fact, sex traffickers use generalized marketplaces Web pages to advertise, as well as sites and pages devoted to advertising the availability of commercial sex.

While the Internet has enriched our lives greatly, these sex traffickers use the Internet to advertise their scheme. We hope the standard of mens rea will help those individuals have a defense.

Without question, sex traffickers who advertise their schemes should be penalized for their criminal acts, while I recognize that some have raised questions about how the advertising prohibitions under this bill would apply to online companies.

Because of this, we adopted an amendment during the Judiciary Committee’s markup last Congress to help address such concerns. That amendment is included in the text of H.R. 285. Nevertheless, I cannot support this bill in its current form because it would subject yet another category of conduct to mandatory minimum sentences.

Mandatory minimums lead to sentences that sometimes are not appropriate based on the facts and, in particular, the penalties. A one-size-fits-all approach to criminal actions in the form of mandatory minimums has greatly contributed to our Nation’s crisis of overincarceration.

In the markup of this bill, the Judiciary Committee declined to adopt an amendment that would have removed application of the statute’s mandatory minimum penalties and instead allow a judge to apply an appropriate sentence under the circumstances of the case up to the statute’s existing maximum penalty of life in prison.

Given the complicated nature of Internet commerce, networks with respect to how advertisements are delivered, the role of the judge might help to carve through, to ferret out, the facts and determine the level of
And, authorizing life imprisonment would allow sufficient latitude for the imposition of extremely lengthy sentences—when appropriate.

Because of this defect involving mandatory minimum sentences, I must oppose the bill that we consider today.

By voting “no,” the House will allow the Judiciary Committee time to fix this serious flaw.

With this important consideration in mind, I must ask my colleagues to oppose the bill today so that we may consider a better bill dealing with this aspect of sex trafficking in the near future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I am an avid supporter of the Internet; I have been one since the late 1970s. However, there is a dark side to the Internet. There are back pages out there that have a business model to make money off of exploiting child sex slaves, advertising child sex slaves.

This bill gives law enforcement the tools they need to investigate and prosecute those who exploit the Internet to traffic children. This bill advances a compelling government and humanitarian interest to protect our children from those who seek to buy and sell them like products. This bill makes it illegal to knowingly profit from the distribution of sex trafficking. This bill advances a compelling government and humanitarian interest to protect our children from those who seek to buy and sell them like products. This bill makes it illegal to knowingly profit from the distribution of sex trafficking.

The SAVE Act does not seek to restrict the free, legitimate exchange of information and ideas. I heard some of my colleagues on the other side—the gentleman from Georgia and others—express concern about innocent employees of Web sites or sites like Google that may accidentally index one of these sites or somebody who has an online forum on their Web site and somebody makes an off-topic post. That is why we added the word “knowingly.” I want the legislative history of this bill to show that “knowingly” is important. They have got to know that they are advertising for victims of human trafficking.

It was carefully crafted so that legitimate Internet companies and legitimate employees of Web sites that have a business model to make money off of exploiting child sex slaves, advertising child sex slaves.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY). Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Congresswoman WAGNER, and all the other Members for the work that you and I have put in on this important legislation put forward last night and today to combat human trafficking.

Human trafficking is a 21st century form of slavery, and it is devastating to those who are victimized by these traffickers. I spoke very recently with Jerry Peyton, the founder of an organization called Sold No More, dedicated to ending trafficking in Tucson, Arizona. Jerry experienced the devastation of trafficking firsthand in his own family. His daughter Lisa, who was a high school honors student, ran away from home after the death of her boyfriend, where she quickly was preyed upon by traffickers and forced into smuggling and prostitution. Jerry found his daughter with five men who ran a drug ring and was able to rescue her, yet the police never apprehended the men who victimized Lisa. The only police record of this innocent reads: “A juvenile returned to the custody of her parents.”

Jerry’s family’s experiences highlight the growing need for resources to train law enforcement to identify and respond to instances of trafficking. He told me that in Pima County there is not one law enforcement officer in any agency dedicated full-time to the trafficking issue.

Before 2010, there had not been a single case of sex trafficking in Pima County, despite arrests for prostitution that targeted victims like criminals. When they place their ads in back pages for clearly young victims, within 24 hours, there are 100 calls that come in looking to exploit these victims. This is wrong. We can start raising awareness of trafficking by changing the perception of these traffickers. I think it’s estimated that only about 10 percent of those trafficked in our country have come across the border. The overwhelming majority are runaways and vulnerable children who are preyed upon.

These are our neighbors being trafficked in our communities, not some distant far-off place. Under the surface of our communities, sex trafficking is a prevalent and devastating reality. Widely-attended events like the Super Bowl coming up in Glendale, Arizona, or the annual gem show in Tucson act as a magnet for traffickers and, unfortunately, their victims.

It is critical that we pass this bill to prosecute all offenders who victimize and participate and advertise, including online, in the trafficking of children. We also must support efforts to raise awareness and educate those who work in law enforcement, health care, child protective services, and elsewhere to prevent all trafficking, give law enforcement the tools they need to be proactive, and care for the victims after they have been rescued.

I support this legislation and the other bills put forward to combat human trafficking, and I urge support from my colleagues.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA). Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and discuss this issue briefly.

It just came to me last week when my 13-year-old daughter turned 14 and I looked at her and have seen her with her friends, just the scourgery, the horrendous things that are done to these young ladies, whether it is here or internationally.

I was brought back to a visit I had last year to an organization called WAR, Women At Risk International, in my district, the Second District of Michigan, where they are trying to use civilian first responders to identify these signs of trafficking to make sure that those aren’t those police reports saying “minor returned to parent” and that they are able to utilize the things that they see or suspect as a way of pulling those girls out of those situations.

It is heartfelt that I want to make sure that this body pursues this issue, and I commend all of our colleagues who have dealt with this as we are trying to create these circles of protection and hope around these women and children that are in this horrible situation.

Madam Speaker, I commend everybody for this legislation, and I urge a “yes” vote.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, in closing I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, we have had three bills so far, and we are getting ready to offer two others that all speak to this very devastating impact on our children—human trafficking and sex trafficking. I think it is estimated that only about 10 percent of those trafficked in our country have come across the border. The overwhelming majority are runaways and vulnerable children who are preyed upon.
Our children are on the Internet, they are tech savvy, and they easily can become victims of an attractive site or attractive sounds and music, so I think this legislation, again, points a very serious issue.

The bill is an amendment of an existing legislation that includes a mens rea. There must be intent; but we do know, in the course of legislation, we have the opportunity to make sure that what we do does meet the test of getting those who are truly the perpetrators.

I would hope as this bill moves to the Senate, as we recognize the importance of this legislation, we, again, be reminded that one size does not often fit all and that judges can rightly have discretion to a sentence of life.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation so that we can have a comprehensive approach to legislative bills that have been on the floor today to attack head on, if you will, those who prey on children, young men and women, people who find themselves lost with no place to go and become the serious victims of child pornography, sex trafficking, and human trafficking.

As Members, we know that, many times, the entire life of that individual is changed forever.

I yield back the balance of my time and ask for support of the underlying bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we have spent about an hour and a half today talking about how bad this problem is. The two previous bills were passed unanimously by voice vote.

There seem to be two arguments against the current bill. One is that the net might be too broad. That has been responded emphatically by putting a “knowingly” standard in so that somebody who is innocent will not be caught up if an advertisement for sex trafficking appears without their knowledge.

The second is the philosophical debate on mandatory minimum sentences. I think there are some crimes where there ought to be a mandatory minimum sentence. I know many of my colleagues sincerely disagree with that, but believe me, advertising kids—for sex should be something that puts you in jail for some time.

I am glad this bill allows for life sentences in case of egregious offenses, but I think that even in those that might be less than egregious, spending some time in jail will show this country and maybe others who may be tempted to get involved in this horrific business that if you are caught, you are going to spend some time.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 285.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015
Mr. POE of Texas, Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 181) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, as amended. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 181
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015.”

SEC. 2. VICTIM-CENTERED SEX TRAFFICKING DE- TERRENCE GRANT PROGRAM.
Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 10904b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j); and

(2) by striking subsections (a) through (f), and inserting the following:

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to develop, improve, or expand comprehensive domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims’ services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

(B) address the unique needs of victims of child human trafficking;

(C) facilitate the rescue of victims of child human trafficking;

(D) investigate and prosecute acts of child human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking;

(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-child human trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue children;

(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer’s time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

(i) wire taps;

(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

(iii) travel; and

(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

(C) dedicated anti-child human trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assistance in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenses, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking; and

(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims’ services through coordination with—

(i) child advocacy centers;

(ii) social service agencies;

(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

(iv) housing agencies;

(v) legal services agencies; and

(vi) non-governmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering services to victims of child human trafficking;

(E) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for child human trafficking victims that include—

(A) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

(B) the development of specialized and individualized treatment programs for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

(ii) life skills training;

(iii) housing placement;

(iv) vocational training;

(v) education;

(vi) family support services; and

(vii) job placement; and

(C) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and non-governmental organizations to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement; and

(F) the establishment of victim services programs for victims of child human trafficking, which offer services including—

(A) residential care, including temporary or long-term placement, as appropriate;

(B) 24-hour emergency social services response systems; and

(C) counseling and case management services.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

(d) MENTIONS OF INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

(A) disclose—
“(1) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(2) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period prior to the date of the submission of an application under this section; “

“(b) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b); or

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

“(c) RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) In general.—A grant under this section shall expire 1 year after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) Renewal.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 3 times and for a period of not greater than 1 year.

“(d) Administration.—The Attorney General shall enter into a contract or other agreement with an eligible entity that has experience in issues related to child human trafficking, and that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 51(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of such grant funds. In carrying out this section, the Attorney General shall determine the appropriate number of covered grantees to be audited each year.

“SEC. 8. HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.

“(a) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—In fiscal year 2015, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of covered grantees to ensure that the person described in section 6(h) was accurately awarded grant funds.

“(b) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A covered grantee that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible for an allocation of grant funds from the covered grant program or operation that is described in section 6(h).

“SEC. 9. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

“(a) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—In fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of covered grantees to ensure that the person described in section 6(h) was accurately awarded grant funds.

“(b) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A covered grantee that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible for an allocation of grant funds from the covered grant program or operation that is described in section 6(h).

“SEC. 10. NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from income taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(b) PROHIBITION.—A nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 51(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not be eligible to receive, directly or indirectly, any funds from a covered grant program.

“(c) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is a covered grantee shall disclose
in its application for such a grant, as a condition of receipt of such a grant, the compensation of its officers, directors, and trustees. Such disclosure shall include a description of the procedures relied upon to determine such compensation.

(e) Conference Expenditures.—
(1) Amounts made available under a covered grant program may be used to host or support a conference that uses more than $20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy (as designated by the Deputy Attorney General) provides prior written approval that the funds may be expended to host or support such conference, except that a conference that uses more than $20,000 in such funds, less than $500 in such funds for each attendee of the conference, shall not be subject to the limitation under this paragraph.

(2) Writen Approval.—Written approval under paragraph (1) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

(3) Report.—The Deputy Attorney General shall include a final report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this subsection.

(f) Prohibition on Lobbying Activity.—

(1) In General.—Amounts made available under a covered grant program may not be used by any covered grantee to—

(A) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(B) lobby any representative of the Federal Government or a State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(2) Penalty.—If the Attorney General determines that a covered grantee has violated paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall—

(A) require the covered grantee to repay the grant in full; and

(B) prohibit the covered grantee from receiving a grant under the covered grant program from which it received a grant award during the 5-year period beginning on the date of such violation.

(g) Definitions.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term "covered grant program" means the following:


(2) The term "covered grantee" means a recipient of a grant from a covered grant program.

(3) The term "unresolved audit finding" means an audit report finding in a final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that a covered grantee has used grant funds awarded to that grantee under a covered grant program for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the final audit report is issued.

SEC. 10. CRIME VICTIM'S RIGHTS

(a) In General.—Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

"(9) The right to be informed, in a timely manner of any plea agreement or deferred prosecution agreement.

"(10) The right to be informed of the rights under this section and the services described in section 503 (c) of the Victims Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607 (c)) is pending on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(b) in subsection (d)(3), in the fifth sentence, by inserting "unless the litigants, with the approval of the court, have stipulated to a different time period for consideration before the period; and

(c) in subsection (e)—

(1) by striking "this chapter, the term" and inserting the following: "this chapter:"

"(1) COURT OF APPEALS.—The term 'court of appeals' means:

(A) the United States court of appeals for the judicial district in which a defendant is being prosecuted; or

(B) for a prosecution in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

(2) CRIME VICTIM.—The term

(A) minors and certain other victims.—In the case:

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) DISTRICT COURT; COURT.—The terms 'district court' and 'court' mean the District Court of the District of Columbia.

(3) APPEAL.—Appeal made under paragraph (1) shall include a written statement of the reasons for the court's decision.

(4) CONCLUSION.—With respect to a grantee that is a public entity, the Federal Government or a State, local, or tribal government, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall award the grant to a public entity or a private entity that has a clear policy prohibiting such activities.

(f) Writen Approval.—Written approval under paragraph (1) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

(g) Conference Expenditures.—

(1) Limitation.—No amounts made available under a covered grant program may be used by any covered grantee to—

(A) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(B) lobby any representative of the Federal Government or a State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(2) Penalty.—If the Attorney General determines that a covered grantee has violated paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall—

(A) require the covered grantee to repay the grant in full; and

(B) prohibit the covered grantee from receiving a grant under the covered grant program from which it received a grant award during the 5-year period beginning on the date of such violation.

(h) Definitions.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term "covered grant program" means the following:


(2) The term "covered grantee" means a recipient of a grant from a covered grant program.

(3) The term "unresolved audit finding" means an audit report finding in a final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that a covered grantee has used grant funds awarded to that grantee under a covered grant program for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the final audit report is issued.

SEC. 12. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROHIBITIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (F), as subparagraph (G);

(2) by redesigning subparagraph (G), as subparagraph (H); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) No requirement of official certification for currently lawful permanent residents.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled;".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.
act on them, these bills are being brought up again.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, I am glad to be the original sponsor, but I am also thankful that my friend, CAROLYN MALONEY from New York, who has been a leader on trafficking issues long before I was ever in Congress, is the original co-sponsor on the Democrat side.

Madam Speaker, you don’t get much more bipartisan than a New York liberal Democrat and a conservative Republican from Texas. We are just separated by a common language. Other than that, we get along quite well, especially on this issue.

When Brooke was 7, Madam Speaker, her mother was ill in the hospital. Her care was then entrusted to a nanny; but protecting her was not what the nanny had in mind. Instead of taking care of Brooke and making sure that she was healthy and safe, the nanny sold her into sex slavery. She was a trafficking victim when she was 7.

As is common with child trafficking victims, Brooke was also a victim of child pornography. She was subjected to the most sadistic forms of abuse. She was 7. All she wanted to do was be safe.

Stories like Brooke’s and other survivors’ make it clear that human trafficking is quite serious. It is occurring with the most vulnerable group of Americans: young children. I have four kids, three of them are granddaughters; seven of them are grandkids; seven of them are granddaughters. We all believe, I think, the greatest resource of America is our youth, and their lives and their souls are being stolen every day for money, for filthy lucre.

This crime happens in America, and it happens across the seas, and it is all about money. I understand that the greatest criminal enterprise for money is drug trafficking, but close behind is the sex trafficking of children.

Why is sex slavery such a money-maker? Well, unlike drugs that are sold one time, children are sold numerous times. As our friend, KRISTI NOEM, of South Dakota mentioned earlier, children are being sold up to 50 times a day, Madam Speaker.

Plus, the consequences for the criminals is not as great as the consequences for drug smugglers, and the risk of apprehension is not as great. This bill tries to fix all three of these entities that are involved in sex trafficking. There is the trafficker, the slave master; there is the consumer, the child abuser; and then there is the child—they are victims of crime, and the American social conscience needs to change to understand these children are not criminals, they are not prostitutes. They are children that are victims of slavery. We need to change that conscience, and we need to change it legally.

Now, in all fairness to police, many times, they see a child on the street; they arrest the child for child prostitution and file a juvenile crime case against that individual. Many times, they don’t have a place to take the child.

We have approximately 3,000 animal shelters in the United States. I got one of my three Dalmatians from an animal shelter, but there are less than 300 beds for child sex trafficking victims. Why is that? There is no answer, except we need to deal with it.

Police don’t have a place to take the rescued child, except they put them in the criminal system, which is not a good thing. It doesn’t help the child at all recover, even though everybody knows that the child is a victim. We need places to take children. We need to treat those children like victims of crime.

That is what this bill does. It helps rescue and restores victims of crime. On the other end, the slave master, well, it punishes them. As Chairman SENSENBRENNER said, life sentences are appropriate, and that is quite appropriate, at least a minimum sentence of life, and that is what this bill does as well.

The bill also goes after the demand, the consumer. Those men—primarily—they are child abusers, and for too long, society has kind of looked at that situation as, “Oh, well, boys will be boys.”

Madam Speaker, those days are over. The days of “boys being boys” is over in America, and this law will go after the common knowledge who they are. You talk about photographs on the Internet, their photographs ought to be on the Internet after they are convicted, but the law goes and punishes them as well.

It gives law enforcement, child welfare, health care officials, and others who will come in contact with victims training. It also clarifies some State and Federal wiretap laws. It allows law enforcement officials the flexibility to obtain warrants in all Federal human trafficking investigations so that they are better able to follow evidence and target criminal networks, because there are networks throughout the country that are taking children and selling them every night.

Madam Speaker, we will only be able to reduce the demand by putting the demand behind bars, where they belong. Girls are not property; they are little girls. And the same is true of boys who are being trafficked in the United States as well.

The legislation here also strengthens and clarifies the Trafficking Victims Protection Act by making it clear for judges, juries, prosecutors, and law enforcement that criminals who purchase sex acts from trafficked victims should be a priority and be prosecuted. That is why we build prisons, for people like that we build. We rescue traffickers.

So I am encouraged by the tremendous support in the House on these 12 bills, bipartisan bills, coming up. And I do want to commend the ladies of the House who have been the ones—on both sides of the aisle—advocating and making sure that this legislation comes to the House floor.

Passage of Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will be a major step toward ridding our country of modern-day slavery. Brooke and her mother have worked through Brooke’s issues after she was trafficked at 7. They are working together. She has been rescued and restored, and she is an advocate for better legislation and protection of children like she was when she was trafficked. But the message is, Madam Speaker, our children are not for sale, period.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am glad that the member, Congressman POE, set the tone again for the vigorously of the bipartisanship around what all of us want, which is to, in essence, cut out the cancers of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

Let me first of all congratulate Mr. POE, Judge POE, a Texan whose language I can fully understand, as well as his partner, Congresswoman MALONEY. Over the years, she has championed the rights of women and the empowerment of our children: what a great partnership, Judge POE and Congresswoman MALONEY. I am delighted to join with them in my commitment to fighting human trafficking and sex trafficking in supporting H.R. 18, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2014, marked up in the Judiciary Committee. Many amendments were accepted, and so this bill has a holistic approach.

I am also glad that we did not run away from this issue in Houston, as we convened a hearing that I called for with my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to openly and forthrightly listen to law enforcement, people who had been victimized, adults who are still suffering from what had happened to them as a child. This hearing was held in March. It was a field hearing, titled, “Combating Human Trafficking in Our Major Cities.” It was a fitting venue because, regrettably, Houston has been noted as a human trafficking hub in the United States. But it was the important contributions of my colleagues, many on the floor today, who added to the record to begin to craft or accept, and so this bill has a holistic approach.

At that hearing, we heard testimony from Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials regarding an operation the day before in which they discovered and rescued 115 from a packed, run-down stash house in south Harris County. It was not completely vetted as to whether or not all of the individuals in the stash house or some of the
individuals or a few were victims of human trafficking or sex trafficking. I would venture to say that their future would not be a future worthy of promoting. Ninety-nine of those victims were men, 16 were women, one of whom was pregnant, and 19 others were juveniles. You wonder what would happen to the juveniles.

I went to that stash house. It was a terrible scene. All of them had been kidnapped and smuggled into the United States, as previously said, human trafficking, sex trafficking, a great business for those who are of that kind of vile mind because they can use them and use them and use juveniles over and over again, some of whom, however, have been driven to such low ends of the Earth, meaning the victims, that their life is ruined. Some have probably been driven to suicide.

Trafficking of any human being, especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in civilized society. The term “slavery” has often been used. And it is true that slavery exists around the world. We need to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthless traffic in children.

These children have suffered the worst imaginable trauma, and as a result, they require and are deserving of comprehensive and tailored services to assist in their recovery. We need to ensure that funding is in place to provide for such comprehensive services. This bill is an essential step toward combating the crisis of domestic minor sex trafficking and helping survivors begin their lives anew. Throughout this afternoon, we have said that they have to have an opportunity to change their lives.

While the rescue of trafficking victims is necessary, so is the prosecution of traffickers. Those who patronize and solicit are already criminally liable under the language contained in the original section of 1591. Under this legislation, a child rapist will no longer be able to find refuge in any jurisdiction. This bill will also promote the coordination of investigations among Federal, State, and local law enforcement and enhance reporting data for missing children—everything that the witnesses at the March 2014 hearing told us for call for this.

Let me say that I am also grateful that this bill emphasizes the local, State, and Federal cooperation. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, which is what the hearing was held under, under the auspices of the Homeland Security Committee, we recognize that is part of the threat to national security. The utilizing of our children, the victimizing of our children, the co-opting of our children, the soliciting of our children, and this bill gets right at the target.

Human trafficking is the second fastest growing criminal industry in the world, generating over $32 billion annually. This bill is the most comprehensive piece of legislation to deal with this problem over the years, and it is a great foundation to continue to build, to weed out every nuance, every person hiding behind the rock who is dealing in sex trafficking and human trafficking.

For years, we have labeled child victims of sex trafficking as prostitutes and juvenile delinquents rather than the victims that they are. We have been running away from them for being a runaway, but we don’t know the horrible stories and what they have experienced. They are victims of criminal conduct, and we need to treat them that way—not prostitutes. Therefore, the specifications of the terms “patronizing” and “solicit” in this bill simply clarify and emphasize the fact that these actions are actually covered.

One of the early organizations, the Center for Missing and Exploited Children, which I have associated with throughout my entire time in the House, early on raised the clarion call that we must do something about these exploited and missing children. I know that they are celebrating as we have been on the floor talking about human trafficking and sex trafficking.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Judiciary Committee saw fit to adopt section 11 in H.R. 181, the Jackson Lee amendment, which expresses a sense of Congress that human trafficking is an affront to the civilized society and that perpetrators of such vile acts should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and we can build on this for finding those who may be thinking that they are squeezing our children.

Mr. Speaker, as a global leader in combating global trafficking throughout the world, the United States must hold all nations to the same standards by which we hold ourselves. The demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human rights violation of human trafficking. Elimination of that violation requires elimination of that demand. I am glad that we are here confronting it head-on, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 181, the “Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015.”

Madam Speaker, last year, on March 20, 2014, the Homeland Security Committee, of which I am a member, held a field hearing titled, “Combatting Human Trafficking in Our Major Cities,” in my home city of Houston. It was a fitting venue because, regrettably, Houston is a human trafficking hub of the United States.

At that hearing my colleagues, Chairman McCaul, Judge Poe, Congressman Al Green, Congressman Farenthold, and I heard testimony from Federal, state and local law enforcement officials regarding an operation the day before during which they discovered and rescued 115 people from a packed, rancid stash house in south Harris County. 99 of those victims were men, 16 were women, and 10 were juveniles. All of them had been kidnapped and smuggled into the United States.

Trafficking of any human being, especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in civilized society. We need to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in children.

These children have suffered the worst imaginable trauma, and as a result, they require and are deserving of comprehensive and tailored services to assist in their recovery. We need to ensure that funding is in place to provide for such comprehensive services. This bill is an essential step toward combatting the crisis of domestic minor sex trafficking.

I would venture to say that their future is necessary, so is the prosecution of traffickers. While we habitually refer to those who solicit commercial sex acts from minors as “customers” and “johns,” I don’t refer to those who solicit commercial sex acts from minors as “customers” and “johns.” The hard, cold fact is that these people are nothing more than “child rapists.” We need to stop being polite and call them what they are—“child rapists”!

Federal courts have interpreted the existing statute, Title 18 United States Code, section 1591, to cover the acts of patronizing and soliciting. Therefore, the specifications of the terms “patronizing” and “solicit” in this bill simply clarify and emphasize the fact that these actions are actually covered.

Those who patronize and solicit are already criminally liable under the language contained in the original section of 1591. Under this legislation, child rapists will no longer be able to find refuge in any jurisdiction. This bill will also promote the coordination of investigations among Federal, State, and local law enforcement and enhance reporting data for missing children—everything that the witnesses at the March 2014 Houston field hearing called for.

Human Trafficking is the second fastest growing criminal industry in the world, generating over $32 billion annually. This bill is the most comprehensive piece of legislation to deal with that problem in years.

For years we have labeled child victims of sex trafficking as prostitutes and juvenile delinquents rather than as the victims they are. We have been running away from them, treating them as juvenile delinquents and not as victims. We need to treat them that way. This bill recognizes that and treats victims as victims, provides for more services and shelters for them, and provides for resources to law enforcement, child welfare, health care officials, and others who will come into contact with them.

One of the early organizations, the Center for Missing and Exploited Children, which I have associated with throughout my entire time in the House, early on raised the clarion call that we must do something about these exploited and missing children. I know that they are celebrating as we have been on the floor talking about human trafficking and sex trafficking.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Judiciary Committee saw fit to adopt section 11 in H.R. 181, the Jackson Lee amendment, which expresses a sense of Congress that human trafficking is an affront to the civilized society and that perpetrators of such vile acts should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and we can build on this for finding those who may be thinking that they are squeezing our children.

Mr. Speaker, as a global leader in combating global trafficking throughout the world, the United States must hold all nations to the same standards by which we hold ourselves. The demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human rights violation of human trafficking. Elimination of that violation requires elimination of that demand. I am glad that we are here confronting it head-on, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 181, the “Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015.”
and provides resources to law enforcement, child welfare, healthcare officials and others who will come into contact with these victims.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that the Judiciary Committee saw fit to adopt as Section 11 of H.R. 181 the Jackson Lee Amendment, which was the bipartisan effort of Congress that human trafficking has no place in a civilized society and that perpetrators of such vile acts should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Madam Speaker, as the global leader in combating trafficking throughout the world, the United States must hold all nations to the same standards to which we hold ourselves. The demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human right violation of human trafficking. Elimination of that violation requires the elimination of that demand.

I received yet more tragic illustration of the global horrors of human trafficking as recently as last evening during a meeting with the Prime Minister of Jamaica. Last year Jamaica improved its position in the U.S. State Department's Annual Trafficking in Persons Report, and last evening during a meeting with the Prime Minister of Jamaica. Last year Jamaica improved its position in the U.S. State Department's Annual Trafficking in Persons Report, and that collaborative work yielded some real improvements to the bill.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I must also thank Congressman POE and his staff as well as Committee staff on both sides of the aisle for working together to address a point raised by an amendment that Rep. POE offered and withdrew during the bill's markup. The changes that were made to the bill as a result of that collaborative work yielded some real improvements to the bill.

For these reasons I support H.R. 181 and encourage my colleagues to do likewise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who has made it a priority to stop, to combat the scourge of human trafficking by bringing numerous bills before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank this gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his long dedication to addressing this very serious problem and for yielding me this time.

Few nightmares equal the terrible reality that the children of American children awake to each day. Held against their will, before the day is out, they will be forced to share perhaps a dozen strangers’ beds and be subjected to arbitrary violence for any real or imagined infraction.

Child sex trafficking is one of the fastest growing criminal enterprises in our country, and we must update our laws. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, is a targeted effort to deploy our law enforcement and social resources against the worst offenders: those who sexually exploit children and other vulnerable victims.

Rather than simply increasing penalties, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act directly aids the survivors of this crime. The bill creates a comprehensive, victim-centered grant program to train law enforcement, rescue exploited children, prosecute traffickers, and restore the lives of victims. The bill also streamlines existing law enforcement tools by providing that child advocacy centers can and should use their resources to help victims of trafficking and other types of child exploitation.

H.R. 181 clarifies that State prosecutors may obtain wiretaps, pursuant to a showing of cause, for trafficking and other child sex crimes. Additionally, the bill adds several of the Federal antislavery statutes as Federal wiretap predicates—something that should have been done a long time ago. These important tools simply give police the same investigatory tools that they would have if these criminal gangs sold drugs or stolen property instead of sex with children and other victims.

The bill makes the law clear that the men who purchase these children’s innocence will be held to the same standard as those who make it available for sale, and hold sex traffickers accountable by increasing the standard for claiming an affirmative defense by requiring defendants to show by clear and convincing evidence that they believed the victim to be 18 years of age or older.

We in Congress have no higher duty than to protect the innocent children of this Nation. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, introduced by my friend and colleague Judge Poe, is a critical step toward banishing human trafficking to where it belongs—the realm of nightmares.

Please join me in supporting this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who, as I indicated, has worked unceasingly on empowering the most vulnerable, particularly in her work on empowering women, vulnerable women around the world, providing them with rights, and, of course, the work she has done in collaboration with Congressman POE and our committee in her work on this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague for her leadership and for yielding to me.

I want to commend the Republican and Democratic leadership for bringing to the floor a large number of bipartisan bills to address the problem of human trafficking. I particularly want to thank Judge Poe for his enlightened leadership. He has brought an informed, intelligent, effective focus on this crime and he has brought new momentum that is helping this country address this issue.

I thank the bipartisan Women’s Caucus that has made this goal, this common goal of attacking the exploitation of children as a joint priority for our caucus and for this Congress.

It is an important way to mark Human Trafficking Awareness Week, and this modern-day form of slavery happens all across the world. We don’t like to admit it, but it is happening right here in America. It is happening in our small cities, our big cities, every State, every race, creed, and color.

There are no reliable estimates, but by some accounts, there are as many as 2 million minors trafficked within the U.S. alone. When they have missing children reports, many of the parents believe their children have been stolen in sex trafficking. These child victims who are sex-trafficked are United States citizens or are here legally in the United States.

Human trafficking, as my colleague pointed out, is the fastest growing and the third largest criminal activity in the world, but unlike drugs and guns that are sold only once, human lives can be sold repeatedly over and over and over again until their lives are shattered and destroyed. It destroys lives and comes with a huge social and economic cost.

We can all agree that no child should be for sale in America—not now, not ever. Our children should not be for sale, but they are for sale under the guise of human traffickers and pimps.

I am very pleased to work shoulder to shoulder with Congressman POE on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. As a former judge and a former prosecutor, he knows firsthand how damaging this crime is to the lives of our young people—and it involves young boys, too—and how difficult it is to get a conviction. His knowledge in this area is tremendously appreciated, and his knowledge is in this bill. I thank him for having been the key author and for his passion and hard work on it.

This bill directly and specifically supports law enforcement training and prosecution of sex trafficking crimes, and it creates a domestic trafficking victims fund within the Department of Justice to support critically needed services for victims.

We know there are not enough beds; there is no treatment. Many trafficked women tell me they get saved, but then they are put in a park with no place to go. They are told to come up and try to get them back into it.

It goes after those who are trying to exploit children and vulnerable women,
those who would profit off the misery of others by going after their wallets. It targets the demand side: the child abusers, the child molesters.

Our victims fund will be financed through fines levied on those convicted of child pornography, human trafficking, prostitution, solicitation, domestic servitude, forced labor, and sex work. As a nation, we have both a moral and a constitutional obligation to protect the most vulnerable in our society from this horrific exploitation.

I therefore urge all my colleagues to take heed of the underlying legislation, rise to the standard, be part of the total elimination of cutting into the lives of children, of little boys, of little girls, of countries, and of the dreams and aspirations and hope that they could ever have.

I believe the Jamaican Government should be congratulated, and I ask other governments to take heed of the underlying legislation, rise to the standard, be part of the total elimination of cutting into the lives of children, of little boys, of little girls, of countries, and of the dreams and aspirations and hope that they could ever have.

Maybe we don’t necessarily connect it, but we know the story of the three women who were held for a period of 15 years in our own state and were still born out as children. When they were ultimately found, they were women. One cannot help note that the violence that they described was a vile sex trafficking, human trafficking episode. We don’t know how many around the Nation that are today, as we stand on the floor of the House, suffering.

I thank Representative Poe. I thank my colleague Representative Maloney and committee staff on both sides of the aisle to help address this issue, and as well, I am glad that this particular legislation will set a standard that this dastardly series of acts will not be suffered by any human being not only in this Nation, but around the world.

With that, I ask support for H.R. 181 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Poe of Texas. May I inquire of the Chair as to how much time is left on this side?

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Hultgren of Michigan). The previous speaker indicated that this slavery.
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HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 460) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term “human trafficking” means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL TO IDENTIFY HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) In General.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program to—

(1) train and periodically retrain relevant Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other Department personnel that the Secretary considers appropriate, how to effectively detect, disrupt human trafficking, and, where appropriate, interdict a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking, during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities; and

(2) ensure that the personnel referred to in paragraph (1) regularly receive current information on matters related to the detection of human trafficking, including information that becomes available outside of the Department’s initial or periodic retraining schedule, to the extent that such information is sensitive to the suspected victim and is not likely to alert a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking;

(b) TRAINING DESCRIBED.—The training referred to in subsection (a) may be conducted through in-class or virtual learning capabilities, and shall include—

(1) methods for identifying suspected victims of human trafficking and, where appropriate, perpetrators of human trafficking;

(2) for appropriate personnel, methods to approach a suspected victim of human trafficking, with regard to the manner that is sensitive to the suspected victim and is not likely to alert a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking;

(3) training that is most appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving such training perform their official duties;

(4) other topics determined by the Secretary to be appropriate; and

(5) a post-training evaluation for personnel receiving the training;

(c) TRAINING CURRICULUM REVIEW.—The Secretary shall annually reassess the training program established under subsection (a) to ensure it is consistent with current techniques, patterns, and trends associated with human trafficking.

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that all personnel referred to in section 3(a) have successfully completed the training required under that section.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees the overall effectiveness of the program required by this Act, the number of cases reported by Department personnel in which human trafficking was suspected and, of those cases, the number of cases that were confirmed cases of such trafficking.

SEC. 5. ASSISTANCE TO NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.

The Secretary may provide training curricula to any local, or tribal government or private organization to assist such entity in establishing its program of training to identify human trafficking, upon request from such entity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 460, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 460, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015, the first bill I have introduced as a Member of Congress.

A few weeks ago, we took an oath promising to protect the people of this great country. I am convinced that part of this high calling is protecting those who are victims of human trafficking.

North Carolina is often ranked as a top State for labor and sex trafficking. This insidious industry is in our own backyard and, unfortunately, it is growing. Just last week, in my own district, local officials announced the formation of the Alamance County Anti-Human Trafficking Advocacy Council to respond to the growing human trafficking problem throughout Alamance County. However, they cannot do it alone, and we must come together to stop this unconscionable industry.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I feel strongly that the men and the women of the Department of Homeland Security have a crucial role in preventing human trafficking. Up to an estimated 300,000 people are trafficked each year into the United States, and many of these victims will pass by either Border Patrol or TSA. We must make certain that these agents are properly trained in the current trends and practices to end human trafficking.

This bipartisan legislation requires the Department of Homeland Security to train Transportation Security Administration, Customs and Border Protection, and other relevant DHS personnel to counter human trafficking in a manner specific to their professional roles and responsibilities.

The bill also ensures that such training will be assessed by the Secretary of Homeland Security on an annual basis so that it is based on the most current human trafficking trends and intelligence. The Secretary is required to report to Congress on the number of suspected cases reported by the DHS officials.

Lastly, this legislation recognizes the critical role that State and local authorities play in preventing human trafficking by authorizing the Department of Homeland Security to make training curricula available to State, local, tribal, and private sector partners.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, human trafficking is one of the most insidious forms of transnational crime in the world, second only to drug trafficking. It is incumbent upon Congress to take action.
and ensure that DHS personnel are better equipped to prevent this serious threat and this modern-day form of slavery.

The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015 builds on the good work already under way at DHS by mandating positions to enable effective trafficking countermeasures at points of entry, transit hubs, and other high-risk locations across the country.

I would like to thank Congressman McCaul for developing and championing this legislation in the 113th Congress and for working with me to reintroduce the measure in this Congress.

Additionally, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. McCaul, for his work on this important issue and for his support of this bill, as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. Katko, for championing legislation on human trafficking.

Finally, I would like to thank each of the bill’s co-sponsors, including North Carolina’s own Alma Adams, Robert Pittenger, Richard Hudson, Patrick McHenry, and the aforementioned Mark Meadows for their great support of this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated this afternoon was an important afternoon. I thank the gentleman for his legislation and his leadership, and I add my appreciation of the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. Thompson, and, as well, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, who previously did four bills, Mr. Conyers. It seems that we are having bipartisan support on a very important crisis in our Nation and around the world.

In 2014, President Obama said:

At home, we are leading by example. My administration is cracking down on traffickers, charging a record number of perpetrators. We are deploying new technology in the fight against human trafficking, developing the Federal Government’s first-ever strategic action plan to strengthen victim services and strengthening protections against human trafficking in Federal contracts. During the past year, the White House and other Federal agencies, in cooperation with local and state authorities, have cracked down on combating human trafficking, bringing together leaders from every sector of society. Together, we came up with new ideas to fight trafficking at the local and grassroots levels.

The present legislation before us, as I rise to strongly support it, H.R. 460, is the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015. This is a great partnership between Homeland Security, the committee which I am a senior member on, and Judiciary, to fight against human trafficking.

In particular, this bill has a very important purpose because our Homeland Security personnel are in our airports and ports, they are along our borders, they are the eyes and ears, they are the first responders. It is crucial that this bill is effectively working with personnel to train, to deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities and for other work.

This is a very good idea. Human trafficking is not only a crime but also a horrible violation of human rights. Human trafficking is often a hidden crime. Victims of human trafficking may be forced or coerced, they may fear retribution or they might not have control over their documents.

According to the most recent estimate from the Department of State, approximately 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked across global borders each year.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas, is one of the centers of human trafficking. There are over 200 active brothels in Houston and more strip clubs and illicit spas than Las Vegas. These businesses serve as fronts for sex trafficking.

Let me be very clear. This is not a condemnation of my city. This is a recognition that every single elected person; local, county, and State government; and our law enforcement are working every day and we are being successful. I will share with you, with an example, the Blue Campaign.

The main factors that contribute to high levels of trafficking throughout the Nation and in Texas are proximity, demographics, and a large migrant labor population. Houston’s proximity to the Mexican border, I-10, a highway running across country through Houston, and the port make it a popular point of entry. But that is not solely the site of human trafficking. As my colleague has mentioned, it is everywhere. It is a national problem. Therefore, our Homeland Security personnel, thank goodness, will now have the opportunity to have special training so that in the capacity of their work, their eyes and ears will be extra trained to detect those trying to move past the law.

Houston’s human geographic size and large ethnic and culturally diverse population create optimal conditions for trafficking because of the ability to blend in with the community.

To combat human trafficking, the Department of Homeland Security launched the “Blue Campaign” in 2010.

Through the “Blue Campaign,” DHS works in collaboration with law enforcement, government, non-government, and private organizations to protect the basic right of freedom and to bring those who exploit human lives to justice.

In part, DHS does so by increasing awareness and training for its front line employees such as Transportation Security Officers, Customs and Border Protection Officers, and others.

Last year, this training was credited when two men were arrested at Miami International Airport. TSA personnel, who received training to detect trafficking, observed the interaction between the men and a young woman and noticed the signs.

The bill before us today seeks to codify in law the training of DHS personnel on how to
deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking and, where appropriate, interdict a suspected trafficker during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities.

For CBP, this means Officers at our ports of entry will be trained on how to identify potential victims of trafficking.

For TSA, it means that screening personnel, who screen approximately 1.8 million passengers a day, will be knowledgeable about signs of trafficking.

Importantly, the bill requires that the training received be appropriate for a particular location or function, so that the personnel receiving the training perform their official duties.

This will help tailor the training received so that it is relevant to the specific personnel receiving the training.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, we have the opportunity to call attention to the human rights crisis that is human trafficking.

January is “National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.”

To ensure that continued attention be paid to this often hidden crime, I urge passage of H.R. 460.

Though the bill before us today will not eliminate human trafficking, it may help prevent it by ensuring that DHS’s frontline workforce is properly trained to fight it.

**President’s Interagency Task Force Progress in Combating Trafficking in Persons: The U.S. Government’s Response to Modern Slavery**

Human trafficking is an opportunistic crime that targets all types of people—adults and children, women, men, and transgender individuals, citizens and noncitizens alike. No socioeconomic group is immune. Nativity is a factor. Runaways, the homeless, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth are particularly vulnerable. One of the most common assumptions about “average” trafficking victims is that they are vulnerable simply because they come from the poorest, most isolated communities, whether overseas or in the United States. Indeed, many do. Yet some victims, from a variety of backgrounds, have reported that they suffering began with their aspirations for a better life and a lack of options to fulfill them.

That’s where the traffickers come in. Exploiting these realities, traffickers appear to offer a solution—a good job, a brighter future, a sense of security, love even. They prey on their victims’ hope and exploit their trust and confidence, coercing them into using themselves as collateral for that chance.

In the United States, the President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (the PTTF), under its operational arm, the Senior Policy Operating Group (SPOG), bring together federal departments and their key constituencies to address all aspects of human trafficking: enforcement of criminal and labor law, development of victim identification measures and protections, support for innovations in data gathering and research, education and public awareness, enhanced partnerships and research opportunities, law enforcement and foreign assistance and diplomatic engagement. The agencies of the PTTF, the Departments of State (DOS), Defense (DOD), Justice (DOJ), the Interior (USDI), Labor (DOL), Health and Human Services (HHS), Transportation (DOT), Education (ED), and Homeland Security (DHS), as well as the Domestic Policy Council (DPC), the National Security Council (NSC), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). As part of the PTTF, these agencies convene routinely to coordinate both federal policies to combat trafficking in persons and implementation of the TVPA.

Agencies of the PTTF have brought together leaders from government, the private sector, advocates and survivors, faith leaders, law enforcement and academia, and have made significant progress following President Obama’s March 2012 call to strengthen federal efforts to combat human trafficking, including promoting, among others: a number of new and strengthened initiatives, and the first-ever White House Forum to Combat Human Trafficking in April 2013, where the first recipients of the Presidential Award for Extraordinary Efforts to Combat Trafficking in Persons—survivor advocate Florrie Burke and hospitality and travel company Carlson—were honored.

The pages that follow reflect the work these agencies have accomplished over the past year, as well as their commitment to continue to drive this effort forward. From strengthening the SPOG and its four Committees to implementing the nation’s first-ever Services for Trafficking Victims in the United States, to implementing an Executive Order that strengthens protections against human trafficking in government contracting, PTTF agencies are enabling law enforcement and service providers to deploy resources more effectively and raising public awareness both at home and abroad.

The Federal Government has expanded partnerships with civil society and the private sector in order to bring more resources to bear in fighting this horrific injustice. Although the fight against this crime and protecting its survivors lies with governments, governments alone cannot solve this problem. Everyone has a role—from local law enforcement and first responders to the heads of major corporations and everyday citizens. Effective anti-trafficking strategies require partnerships that include federal agencies, law enforcement, survivors and their advocates, and stakeholders from the government, faith, society, business, law enforcement, and the public sector.

Many of my colleagues that I have heard speak today said they learned about this when they came to Congress. I learned about this devastating modern-day slavery when I was a U.S. Senator from the Southern District of Indiana between 2001 and 2007. We started one of the first task forces in the country, and there are task forces across the county that have been focused on human trafficking now for quite some time, but we do more now an estimated 17,500 people are trafficked throughout the U.S. each year. Sadly, this problem disproportionately affects...
young girls between the ages of 12 and 14 who are lured by these crime networks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I learned during that time with that task force and with my time in the U.S. Attorney’s office, we have to educate those that are standing at our ports of entry, those who are standing at our airports and our mass transit areas, and teach them about the warning signs, what they need to be looking for, so we can stop trafficking at the source, prosecute those who are responsible, and save the victims.

That is why I support this bill, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to implement comprehensive training programs on deterring, detecting, and disrupting this human trafficking. Our law enforcement personnel are standing on the front lines. They have to be equipped with the best-practice methods for identifying the victims and the perpetrators so they can bring these perpetrators to justice.

Criminals change their methods all the time, and I am pleased that this bill also requires an annual reassessment of training programs. They have to continue to train. It is time for Congress to act decisively to eradicate human trafficking. We need to do more.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me emphasize what I just said earlier. Two people were caught at Miami International Airport. They were caught by officers of TSA who have completed training to detect trafficking and observed the interaction between the two men and a young woman. It was the exact description that I gave—holding a little girl’s hand, holding a teenager’s hand, looking innocent—but our DHS personnel could be the savers of the day.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, we have the opportunity to call attention to the human rights crisis that is human trafficking. I am glad that this bill has been generated out of the Homeland Security Committee, which emphasizes the security of this Nation but, as well, the important act of making sure America stands against human trafficking and the growing problem of slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. To ensure that continued attention be paid to this often hidden crime, I urge the passage of H.R. 460. The bill before us today will not eliminate human trafficking, but it may help prevent it. Moreover, I believe this bill is an excellent step towards fighting it.

In conclusion, let me say that we are all committed. Again, I refer to all of us. To report suspected human trafficking, dial 1-866-347-2423. If you are a victim, to get help, call the National Human Trafficking Resource Center at 1-888-373-7888.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership, and I thank our committee chairman and ranking member for their leadership.

I ask for support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, for your eloquence on such an important issue.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of victims who are trapped in the United States and around the world who are suffering in silence. In many cases, the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security, who are on the front lines of the fight, are trying to end this heinous crime and help these victims.

This legislation codifies some of the good work already being done to train DHS personnel to detect and prevent human trafficking while also ensuring that such training is specific to the professional roles of the personnel who will utilize it. Moreover, this bill will enable the DHS to its non-Federal partners to better counter the devastating effects of human trafficking.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this critically important, bipartisan bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 460. The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important, bipartisan legislation, which will ensure that DHS personnel continue to receive the training they need to detect and disrupt human trafficking.

Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security. I convened a field hearing in Houston during the last Congress to examine the issue of human trafficking. At the hearing, the Committee heard compelling and disturbing testimony on how human trafficking is destroying the lives of vulnerable populations across the globe, including here in the United States.

Simply put, human trafficking is a desperate crime, and it must be stopped. I believe this bill is an excellent step towards that goal.

The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015 would ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security Administration, and other Department of Homeland Security personnel are trained to effectively detect, and to the extent appropriate, intercept and disrupt traffickers during the course of their normal roles and responsibilities. Not only would this legislation require effective training, it would also ensure that these employees are regularly provided with the most current trends and information on human trafficking, and are adequately equipped to counter this growing problem.

While the men and women at DHS carry out their everyday work, many of them are well-positioned to spot traffickers who may try to exploit our nation’s transportation systems to move their victims, both from overseas and within our borders.

H.R. 460 also ensures that Congress has insight into the level of success of the training being provided, and that the Department’s State and local partners have full access to current curriculums to establish their own trafficking awareness programs.

I applaud Mr. WALKER for introducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on this common-sense measure.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, just last summer, Delta launched The Blue Lightning Initiative with the help of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The Blue Lightning Initiative is a computer based training program that provides airlines with the added tools to help ID and report suspicious activities of human trafficking.

According to Delta, it is among some of the first airlines to adopt this expansive type of human trafficking detection training. Delta and others taking on similar initiatives should be applauded for taking the initiative to end Human Trafficking, one of the greatest challenges we face.

As horrific as Human Trafficking is, it is even more troubling that the United States Government is not taking the steps necessary to properly train DHS employees, such as TSA officers, who have the potential to identify cases of trafficking and help save lives.

This type of training is what Rep. MARK WALKER’s bill H.R. 460, the Human Trafficking Detection Act, aims to achieve. Awareness is
Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HASTINGS) to consider in the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 48
Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 351) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Judge HASTINGS, my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Today, Mr. Speaker, I bring to the floor on behalf of the Rules Committee and the Republican Conference a rule and the underlying legislation which helps address a problem that has been created by the Obama administration.

The administration has decided to slow the export of liquefied natural gas to countries with which we do not have a free trade agreement. This means that American companies have plenty of liquefied natural gas to sell to our allies across the globe but are prevented from doing so by the administration.

The administration’s inaction also comes at a terrible price. For those in need of a good-paying job—whether through a long career or through a service that will help support their families, their communities, and, most of all, that will help make America stronger.
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The administration’s inaction also comes at a terrible price for those in need of a good-paying job—whether through a long career or through a service that will help support their families, their communities, and, most of all, that will help make America stronger.
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Do you know where the highest prices for all liquefied natural gas are now and, apparently, in the near future? Asia. This gas is going to Asia, not to Ukraine and not to Eastern Europe. I heard some discussion yesterday evening about Hungary, and I dispute whether or not any of it will go there as well.

Furthermore, what was true then remains true now: even when the United States finally becomes capable of exporting liquefied natural gas, Ukraine does not have, as I have pointed out, the capability to receive it. I hope you will understand my uncertainty as to why this bill is on the floor.

H.R. 351 will not make gas prices cheaper here either. LNG is already cheap. In fact, this bill is more likely to increase natural gas prices, since we are going to be sending more gas overseas, and it will be hard-working Americans paying the cost.

It is not like there are a whole lot of projects waiting to be approved either. With natural gas prices and crude oil prices well below the levels where natural gas is competitive, companies are putting LNG export and development projects on hold, leaving only more uncertainty as to why we are considering this bill today.

This bill is also incredibly misguided. We cannot solve our energy problems with fossil fuels. It requires a certain kind of arrogance to deny an overwhelming scientific consensus regarding climate change. Importing or exporting more fossil fuels, more drilling, more fracking, more pipelines, it doesn’t matter; fossil fuels are a dead end, full stop.

A serious renewable energy plan is the only way to ensure energy independence. Clean energy is the only way we can be sure that we don’t leave a devastated planet for our children.

This Congress is starting just like the last one. Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This issue about liquefied natural gas and natural gas perhaps comes naturally to Texans. I am from Dallas. I have been around the natural gas in-

Let me tell you what: the Republicans have taken a keen interest in

This bill originated in the last Congress when we were told that it would help Ukraine shake its energy dependence from Russia. I would like for some of my colleagues on the other side to tell me how Ukraine will be able to benefit from their legislation in light of what I believe is the fact to be, and that is that they are not prepared to receive liquefied natural gas from us. In my view, since most of this takes place in the spot neverland of oil and gas sales, I don’t believe, when completed, that this will be a game changer.

Unfortunately, our policies have not kept pace with the industry’s development. Producers seeking to export LNG face a constantly changing approval process which costs millions of dollars and takes years to navigate.

Not only does this undermine regulatory certainty, but with dozens of projects seeking approval, Washington is making it difficult and expensive to make the investment decisions needed to take advantage of this abundant resource. This delays job creation here at home and reduces our ability to positively influence global politics abroad.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the original sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 48, the rule for H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act.

During the 113th Congress, identical legislation to H.R. 351 passed the House of Representatives as H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. Long before its passage, the bill moved through the entire legislative process at the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. This process included a hearing as well as an eventual markup at the Subcommittee on Energy and Power. A subsequent full committee markup followed, and the bill was placed on the Union Calendar.

The House Committee on Rules then established H. Res. 636, the rule for consideration of H.R. 6. After that rule was adopted, the legislation was debated, amended, and ultimately passed the House of Representatives with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote. The President did not issue a veto threat.

The energy renaissance that has swept across America over the last years has transformed the United States from an increasingly energy dependent Nation—beholden to the whims of OPEC—to our current position as the largest producer of oil and natural gas in the world.

This transformation has provided us with the unprecedented opportunity not just to bolster our economy, but to also fully leverage our energy abundance on the international stage by selling a portion of our natural gas abroad.

Through this abundance of natural gas, America has an opportunity to significantly affect geopolitics if we enact smart policies. It could—and should—be a game changer.

Allowing the export of liquefied natural gas, for instance, will create significant jobs and wealth for the United States, enhance our energy security, and provide a reliable source of fuel to our allies, some of whom de-

pend on the mood of Vladimir Putin to meet their energy needs.

Mr. Speaker, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act, aims to address this growing problem by cutting through the bureaucratic red tape and implementing a deadline on the Department of Energy to issue a final decision on LNG applications.

Given the amount of time that has already passed since many of the LNG export applications have been filed and their dockets closed, there is no more information to consider and no reason for DOE not to adhere to its own deadline.

There is very real risk to inactivity. If Washington waits too long to move forward with export licenses, other countries with their own natural gas resources—Canada, Qatar, and Australia, to name three—will step in to meet the demand. Our competitive advantage, along with the opportunity to create more domestic energy jobs and serve as a check on Russia, will be lost.

Serious studies suggest that LNG exports will create hundreds of thousands of American jobs, many of them in manufacturing, including the refining, petrochemicals, and chemical sectors. ICF International estimates that these jobs will occur across the entire value chain, translating into roughly $1 billion in new wages for American workers over a 6-year period.

Export terminals will also generate massive amounts of dollars for the U.S. government revenue for Federal, State, and local governments, while increasing our GDP and lowering the trade deficit.

It is worth noting that this won’t come at the expense of domestic consumers. The U.S. Energy Information Administration stressed that it expects increased overseas demand for LNG will be met by the development of new resources.

In fact, the DOE has concluded that each of the different export scenarios considered “are welfare improving for U.S. consumers” and would result in “an increase in U.S. households’ real income.”

The recent turbulence in Eastern Europe—and throughout the Middle East—has shown all too clearly that energy can be used as a geopolitical tool. Adding a new and reliable source of natural gas onto the world market will diversify our allies’ energy sources and significantly reduce their reliance to a single monopolistic supplier.

I am proud to author this legislation. It is a job creator. It helps America in
leverage the geopolitical stage across the globe. We have seen enough delay. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise first of all to say that some of the speakers from the other side would answer the question as to whether or not this liquefied natural gas is going to reach Eastern Europe. I dispute that.

Just as of an aside, I know no one will say anything regarding same, but the fact of the matter is that, for years, the discussion was the price of regular gasoline. Now that it is nearing $2 and we are the world’s biggest producer of natural gas and moving pretty well, I might add—and I am glad to see—along the clean energy line, I just am curious whether President Obama gets any credit at all for any of these changes because those who argued that gasoline would be at $6 and $7—I even saw one around the gallon—I am just curious, since that didn’t occur, what the thought is.

I recognize we are here on another subject, but I would hope that we would get an answer regarding the LNG and that line especially.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We really do want to address both of your questions. I think they are both legitimate questions.

First of all, according to Hungary’s Ambassador at Large for Energy Security, lifting restrictions on import “would send an extremely important message of strategic reassurance to the region which currently feels more threatened than any time since the cold war.”

I will yield in a second to the author of the bill because he understands that piece of the puzzle.

We talk about thuggery from Russia. The Ukrainians had to renegotiate the amount of money that they were paying just to get their natural gas and stay warm because the Russians raised that price on them. We think that is gouging and taking advantage of people.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) to discuss this point that you asked about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, right now, today, about 50 percent of Russia’s revenue comes from taxes on oil and gas. About 80 percent of that resource goes through the Ukraine. The Ukrainian people are under tremendous pressure, as are other European allies, by the Russians.

Regardless of where U.S. natural gas is shipped, increasing supply and competition in the global marketplace will help provide international consumers with greater choice.

In fact, a representative of the U.S. State Department made a similar statement on the benefits of U.S. natural gas exports at a January 8, 2015, Atlantic Council forum. This is from the State Department:

Now, where the gas will go doesn’t matter. The fact that we have approved exports of natural gas has already had an impact on Europe.

Just the fact that America is getting into the game has put the Russians on notice that our friends and allies and people that they are currently putting under pressure—the Ukrainians and others—are going to have a choice, and it is going to make a different conversation happen at the table.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that helped clarify it.

Mr. SESSIONS, Reclaiming my time, it does help us. I thank the gentleman.

Let us keep going on the second part of the question, which was: Can President Obama just get any bit of credit, just any bit, just a small measure? Well, I would respond to the gentleman: yes, but when he earns it.

The President has made it known from the very beginning that he opposed energy policy that the free market tried to produce. Take this example: even as was at the groundbreaking for the Keystone pipeline, he has been incapable of making a decision for 6 years on something that multiple people, including at least two former Presidents and lots of other people, said it makes a lot of sense to do.

Also, the facts of the case are the Congressional Research Service reported that domestic natural gas production has risen by 19 percent since 2009 but decreased by 28 percent on Federal lands.

So, the idea that the President has tried to help this while reducing it by almost a third from Federal lands, the evidence is just not there to give him credit.

I know that there are people who want to get credit for things even though they didn’t do things, even though they didn’t complete the task that was in front of them, making decisions, making wise decisions, showing the American people what you stand for.

I would do this for the gentleman and help him out, but the administration clearly has been on simply the other side of that issue and that ball.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Corpus Christi, Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), who was with me on the border this last weekend as we looked at border security. He comes from an energy-rich section of our Nation and represents some of the most valuable natural gas that we are trying to make this country energy-sufficient and to help make sure that what is at the pump is at a great price and is a great product for consumers.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is important we get this rule done and move on to consideration of H.R. 351.

I am from Corpus Christi, Texas. One of the first things that happened when I came to Congress is, I was visited by some folks from a company that was looking to put a LNG liquefaction plant in the district that I represent. In fact, we have got two pending in the district that I represent.

Cheniere Energy, a billion-plus dollar plant to liquefy natural gas and export it, has been waiting since I was elected to Congress, longer than I have been in Congress, over 4 years now, to get this plant approved and online to start selling energy.

We want to address the questions that the gentleman from the other side has raised with respect to this.

First and foremost, the technology is there. There is no point for Ukraine or any other country to build the facilities to receive this natural gas until there is a sure and steady supply of this natural gas. And it is a lot easier to get these facilities built in other countries where they don’t have to go through the exhausts times, I would go so far to say, insane permitting process that we have to go through here in the United States.

In fact, there is a company looking at putting another LNG facility in Puerto Rico that is going to build the facility to liquefy the natural gas on a barge, pull it up, hook up to the pipeline, and liquefy it. This same barge technology can be used for re-gasification.

You could literally pull a barge into a seaport in the Ukraine, hook up the ship, hook it up to a pipeline, and they could be receiving LNG in a very short order. So it is there for any country.

And listen, there is this talk about how it could possibly run up energy prices and natural gas prices here in the United States. The liquefaction process consumes some of the natural gas. The numbers I hear vary from around 20 percent or so, and so it will always be cheaper to deliver the gas by pipeline here in the United States, so we will always have a competitive advantage with the natural gas that we produce.

But we have got to have a market for that natural gas. Right now, pretty much the only natural gas we are seeing produced outside of the Eagle Ford shale in Texas is produced with oil. You drill a well, you get both oil and gas.

We have seen a huge dropoff in drilling for natural gas because the demand is so low and the supply is so high, to the point where we are drilling wells and we have discovered gas, and we shut that well down and don’t produce it.

We have got to strike while the iron is hot. We can help improve our balance of trade with the world. We can put people back to work, and it can all be done at no government expense. We have just got to get the regulators in Washington, D.C., out of our hair and let our country do this so we can improve the economy for everybody in America.
We can have a much more secure economy. We can have people back to work. We can have a plentiful supply of energy for the foreseeable future.

You have got Marcellus shale, you have got the Eagle Ford shale, you have got the Barnett shale; you have got Pennsylvania; you have got Texas; you have got North Dakota. There is plentiful natural gas. We need a market for it.

By approving this rule and the underlying legislation, that will happen. Americans will go back to work and America, as a whole, will prosper.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman very much, not only for taking time to discuss these important issues but really for his representation of an industry that can do so many great things, not only for the American people but, really, to help out our friends around the world.

It becomes a part of a very positive foreign affairs policy that the United States is following overseas: to get energy, we can be delivering that energy. Instead of having to have a blue water navy, a navy that is stretched to keep shipping lanes open, we can be handing these off to other countries to take them.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, there was a vigorous opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, a discussion that not only did BILL JOHNSON take part in but also Mr. GARAMENDI, the gentleman, the Democrat, Mr. FARENTHOLD, the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. WEBER), my dear colleague.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Folks, the world is an inherently dangerous place. Watch the news. Think with me for a minute. When the world has a catastrophe—and it doesn’t matter whether it is a tsunami, an earthquake, whether it is fire, pestilence, whether it is war—when the world has a catastrophe and dials 911, who is it that answers that call?

It is America, isn’t it? With our military. It is America that answers that 911 call. Now, how do we do that? It is because this country has the strongest, most reliable, affordable energy capacity and capability in the world.

America is able to produce goods. I often say the things that make America great are the things that America makes, and our fossil fuel energy supply is what underwrites that.

You don’t think that’s right? And I would argue that not only is it America’s security; when America is strong, the world is strong. You don’t think that is important? Try powering a tank or a jet plane with a solar panel, Mr. Speaker. You won’t get very far.

We must remain strong. As I said, for the world to be safe, America has got to be strong. This rule and this bill, H.R. 351, are important not only to America’s economy but also our national security and, I would argue, by extension, with the world depending on us, international security.

Yes, we need a stable, long-lasting reliable source of energy here in America. We have the opportunity to export that to our friends around the globe and help them to be safe, help them to be productive.

We will produce American jobs in the process. We will improve our balance of trade, as my friend from Corpus Christi said earlier.

LNG is helping not only with the economy, Mr. Speaker, but with national and, by extension, international security.

I have three plants in my district. The permitting process needs to be expedited and move forward. That is why I rise today in support of the rule, in support of H.R. 351.

Two LNG facilities in my district and one more on the books. They mean jobs. They mean security.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule to support this bill, put Americans to work, help America continue to be a leader, to be safe, and, indeed, help keep this world safe.

I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman stick around for a minute because, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he is most genuinely involved in trying to make sure that discussions about America and our allies and how the world sees us are well understood.

As a man who comes from not only Friendswood, Texas, which, like Mr. FARENTHOLD, is right in the center of this energy where we ship our natural resources around the world, I would really like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman to talk about the impact of foreign affairs.

The gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS, had asked a question about, well, why does this matter?

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Thank you. Great questions.

I didn’t talk about the fact that I have five ports in my district on the Gulf Coast of Texas, more than any other Member of Congress. Some have four. I have five LNG plants, LPG plants.

Sixty percent of the Nation’s jet fuel is produced in my district, 60 percent of the Nation’s jet fuel. An extremely large amount, a classified amount of the military’s fuel. They won’t tell us how much, but a large amount of the military’s fuel.

Strategic petroleum reserves abound in my district. Again, we can’t find out how much, but it is a huge amount.

From a foreign affairs initiative—and I have been over to Japan, I have been over to the Philippines; I have been to Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan—they want our LNG. They would much rather buy it from us than from the Russian bear.

Don’t you know the people in Ukraine would much rather be dependent on us because we are not a dictatorship, at least not supposed to be, and we are not going to cut off their fuel because we have a disagreement with the way the Russian separatists advocate or believe?

So it is a foreign affairs, it is a foreign policy initiative. As I said earlier, it helps make the world safer. It helps create jobs over here. It helps with our balance of trade, or imbalance of trade.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule, to support this bill, put Americans to work, help America continue to be a leader, to be safe, and, indeed, help keep this world safe.

I thank the gentleman from Texas.
Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Friendswood, Texas, who, Mr. Speaker, has a keen understanding about not only what is in America’s best interest, by serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but who is also a proud man who understands that people who have jobs—good jobs, natural gas, an opportunity for America to get the benefits of one of God’s greatest gifts to the United States that we can share with others.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there are a whole lot of us who look at not only what lies ahead with opportunity, but I think we can also look at some models of success, and one of them might be my home State of Texas.

My home State of Texas has incredible opportunities and benefits that have arisen from the ability to have energy abundance, the ability to have oil, natural gas, and other elements that can be used in this industry to make our country stronger, but what is happening is that we have also used it to Texas’ benefit and America’s benefit. That is right.

Just to tell a story, if it weren’t for Texas, net job growth over the last 7 years in America would be flat. That means you take all 49 States, level it out—the minuses, the pluses, net it out—America would not have net positive job growth at all because of Texas. I can tell you that we now have created a net increase of 1.2 million jobs in America, net, and that has come because of Texas. So it is literally entirely a Texas product.

The essence of this has come from not just lower taxes, not just better roads, great schools, better education, good people, but it comes from a philosophy of understanding that we need to utilize these natural resources for the benefit of our world. To make jobs, job creation important, instead of delaying things, Texas had to make sure that what we did is we used it to our advantage.

So instead of not making decisions, like this Federal Government does by delaying major initiatives, we signed them into law. We got them done. We made things happen. So by doing that, when you do that, then you stand a chance to better everybody’s life.

I would now like to give the gentleman from Florida a chance to finish his time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, I don’t want to in any way disparage the lovefest of my friends from Texas. I recognize that everything is big in Texas.

Also, as a child, I even learned the songs of Texas, “The Yellow Rose of Texas,” “Deep in the Heart of Texas,” a whole bunch of them which I hold dear from my childhood.

I would like to have the gentleman who was called upon as a foreign affairs expert—because he serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee—to know, then, that I guess I too am a foreign affairs expert since I served on that committee for 8 years, served on the Intelligence Committee for 8 years. All of the countries that the gentleman mentioned, I have had to deal with.

I explicitly never got an answer from the chairman or anyone else regarding whether or not... "Ukraine"—if it is, if it is not, “Ukraine” didn’t get an answer as to whether they were prepared to receive liquefied natural gas in Texas.

I also know that we are mindful of the sanctions on Russia and how it is impacting them.

I didn’t only just go to Ukraine. In their first election after the Orange Revolution, I was the lead election monitor for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

I don’t come to this dance without having some understanding, and I will tell you that, although my friend, the chairman, seemed to suggest that the President is deserving of something that he earns, my belief is that the President has allowed for more gas leases than I would have had him do.

I would note that just off the press, embargoed until noon today, is a press release from the United States Department of the Interior, which receives a lot of negative comment from my colleagues regarding regulations. “Interior Department Announces Draft Strategy for Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing.”

The draft proposal program includes 14 potential lease sales in eight planning areas—10 sales in the Gulf of Mexico, three off the coast of Alaska, and one in the portion of the mid- and south Atlantic.

Now, let me make it very clear. That might make a whole lot of people happy. It does not make me happy because they are discussing leases in the Gulf of Mexico where, I believe, there is substantial infrastructure from areas like Louisiana and Texas in the western portion of the Gulf. I guess we just ignore things like the BP oil spill, and we ignore the potential for those kinds of disasters.

So I can’t disagree very much with the chairman regarding much of his statistics, but I want the administration and my friend from Texas, the chairman, to know that, as I have said many, many times, I am a Texans. It is interesting, as the first 10 sales in the Gulf of Mexico, three off the coast of Alaska, and one in the portion of the mid- and south Atlantic.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motions to suspend the rules on H. R. 469 and H. R. 246, each by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 169, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—241
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MISSING CHILDREN’S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 246) to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were 41 ayes, 0 nays, not voting 22, as follows:

(Roll No. 48)

[YEAS—41]
SEC. 2. DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.
(a) GRANT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and in consultation with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall award, on a competitive basis, a grant to an eligible school under which such school will—
(1) not later than 6 months after receipt of the award, develop best practices for health care professionals—
(A) to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking; and
(B) to respond appropriately to such individuals;
(2) in developing best practices under paragraph (1), survey, analyze, and evaluate, in consultation with law enforcement personnel, social service providers, and other experts in the field of human trafficking, existing best practices that foster the practice of interprofessional collaboration, including those used by industries other than the health care industry, to determine the extent to which such existing best practices may be adapted for use as part of the best practices under this subsection;
(3) develop curricula, training modules, or materials to train health care professionals on the best practices developed under paragraph (1);
(4) not later than 12 months after the receipt of the award, make a subgrant to one entity located near an established anti-human trafficking task force initiative in each of the 10 administrative regions of the Department of Health and Human Services—
(A) to design, implement, and evaluate a pilot program using the best practices developed under paragraph (1) and the curricula, training modules, or materials developed under paragraph (3);
(B) to conduct the pilot program at one or more eligible sites within the respective region, which may include an eligible site that is not currently receiving assistance under subsection (c); and
(C) to complete the implementation and evaluation of such pilot program within a period of 6 months;
(5) not later than 24 months after the receipt of the award, analyze the results of the pilot programs conducted through subgrants under paragraph (4), including analyzing—
(A) changes in the skills, knowledge, and attitude of health care professionals resulting from the implementation of the programs;
(B) the number of victims of a severe form of trafficking who are recognized under the programs;
(C) of those recognized, the number who received information or referrals for services offered through the programs; and
(D) of those who received such information or referrals—
(i) the number who participated in followup services; and
(ii) the type of followup services received;
(6) determine, using the results of the analysis under paragraph (5)—
(A) the extent to which the best practices developed under paragraph (1) are evidence-based; and
(B) submit a comprehensive assessment of the pilot programs conducted through subgrants under paragraph (4) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including an identification of—
(A) the best practices that are determined pursuant to paragraph (6) to be evidence-based; and
(B) the best practices that are determined pursuant to such paragraph to require further review in order to determine whether they are evidence-based.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.
In this Act:
(a)(7) submit a comprehensive assessment of the pilot programs conducted through subgrants under paragraph (4) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including an identification of—
(A) the best practices that are determined pursuant to paragraph (6) to be evidence-based; and
(b) the best practices that are determined pursuant to such paragraph to require further review in order to determine whether they are evidence-based.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALONE) each will control 20 minutes.
The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the Record on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the ongoing domestic problem with human trafficking. H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act, will create a program dedicated to training our Nation’s health care professionals in order to identify the early warning signs for the act of human trafficking.

Oftentimes, members of the medical community encounter these individuals but they are still being trafficked. By training health care professionals and equipping them with the right knowledge, we are enabling them to identify hallmark signs of this despicable act for early intervention.

This pilot program will test and examine the best practices needed for determining the protocol used for implementing human trafficking awareness within the medical community.

As a nurse, I know that our country’s medical professionals already play a significant role in caring for victims of human trafficking. This legislation will better prepare those on the front lines, so that they can identify and care for those being trafficked.

Most Americans are unaware as to how prevalent and pervasive human trafficking is within our own borders, but it is time we acknowledge this fact and stand up against this heinous crime.

Our medical base is in a position to help these victims break free, and I am proud to push forth legislation further empowering them. This legislation trains health care workers to recognize the hallmark signs of human trafficking, thus allowing professionals to intervene on the patient’s behalf. I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, for helping me introduce H.R. 398 in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can all agree that human trafficking is an important problem that deserves Congress’ attention, and that all of us support efforts to ensure that our health care workers are better prepared to identify and assist victims of human trafficking.

H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015, would set up a grant, facilitated by the Department of Health and Human Services, to create and address best practices for health care providers to use in the field. The program would then test those practices in 10 pilot programs across the country.

The goal of this legislation is laudable and would certainly take important steps to improve our ability to address the spread of human trafficking in our local communities. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the process that brought this bill to the floor.

This legislation has not gone through a subcommittee or full committee markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee, neither in the 114th Congress nor the previous session. Going through the normal committee process would have allowed Members and staff to make substantive and technical changes to ensure that the Department of Health and Human Services is able to implement this legislation effectively. The Energy and Commerce Committee desire the opportunity to deliberate on legislation within the committee’s jurisdiction and offer amendments to strengthen the bills that we consider.

Additionally, the bill authorizes a new grant program, it does not authorize any additional appropriations for the Department to carry out this initiative. HHS may not be able to do this work within their limited existing resources. Advancing legislation with no authorization of funds to implement them is not a good precedent to set.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support new legislation that has not gone through the regular order process, but I will not object to considering H.R. 398 on suspension today and advancing the bill by voice vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and my colleague Congresswoman ELLMERS from North Carolina for rising today in strong support of the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015, a bill on which I was honored to join as the Democratic sponsor of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and my colleague Congresswoman ELLMERS from North Carolina and rise today in strong support of the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015, a bill on which I was honored to join as the Democratic lead with my colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

I thank Congresswoman ELLMERS for her leadership on this bill and her willingness to shine a light on the scourge of human trafficking.

I was telling my staff the other day, Mr. Speaker, that it is a truly remarkable thing to have a bill in our Congress to find a Member who not only reaches across the aisle but who is also willing to work tirelessly to fight for what she believes in and has a staff willing to match that effort. It has been a pleasure working with you and your team on this legislation, as well as on my EARLY Act signed into law just a month ago, on which you served as the Republican lead on that legislation, and I look forward to what we may do together in the future.

Mr. Speaker, after passing legislation that made human and sex trafficking a State crime in my home State of Florida, I knew that, while that was an important step, and I believe a good one, we were just scratching the surface.

I joined Congresswoman ELLMERS on this bill because, though there is still much that we need to learn about the way human trafficking works in the United States, we know enough to know that it is far too prevalent, it preys on the most vulnerable in our Nation, and addressing it requires a comprehensive approach that encompasses prevention, treatment, and going after criminals.

We know that best guesses estimate there are 100,000 to 300,000 American youth currently at risk of being trafficked in the United States. We know that those most likely to be targeted are young people, and younger girls, and girls and women with a history of abuse and estrangement from family. And we know that once a girl is sex-trafficked, she has a life expectancy of just 7 years, during which she would be raped on average by 6,000 different buyers.

If the horror of human trafficking is not a problem that deserves a comprehensive response from all legal, social service, and medical sectors, then I don’t know what is. Health care providers are often the first line of defense in these situations, sometimes being the only interaction with an outsider that a victim’s trafficker may allow.

The Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act develops evidence-based best practices for, and training of, health care providers to be able to identify and properly respond to victims of trafficking, training that means when a girl 12 to 14 years old, the age range that is most at risk of being trafficked, when she is brought into a health care provider for a routine checkup by an older man who is not related to her, that a red flag goes off in a nurse’s head or a health care professional is shining a light on what is going on.

Best practices will mean when a woman comes into an ER for a broken arm but a doctor discovers bruises and scars indicating a pattern of abuse, that that doctor doesn’t just simply treat her broken arm and send her home. And recognize knowledge means doctors and nurses cannot only identify potential victims but can respond appropriately to ensure that victim will one day become a survivor.

This bill joins many other bills on trafficking being heard today on the House floor, including Representative BASS’ bill to support youth most at risk for trafficking and Representative...
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to join my colleagues and Congresswoman ELLMERS in the battle to eliminate human trafficking, for my constituents, who are 11 and 15, for my constituents in south Florida, and for the betterment of our world. I might add, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I can assure the gentleman that while I share and understand concerns on the process, as far as the appropriations, we are going to pursue unobligated funds so that we can make sure that there are the resources available to make sure that this program is funded.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say again to my good friend and colleague from Florida, thank you for putting forward this effort to work with us.

To the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, I too, believe that we need to work together. So just know that my door is open, that we will continue to work on these issues together, and I am just so glad that in a bipartisan effort today we are all coming together to stand up for victims of human trafficking and again get them on a path to recovery.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, my good friend, who is bold, dedicated and passionate to advocate for women and families and children who are affected by human trafficking really long before many of us were even aware that it was an issue here in this country.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may address. Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very important bill, and I do hope my colleagues will support it. Again, I thank Mrs. ELLMERS for her leadership on it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers at this time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I just want to say again how proud I am of our Congress and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle coming together to work on very, very important legislation dealing with those who have been trafficked. Human trafficking is a travesty, it is a heinous crime, and it is today's modern-day slavery.

This is something that we must eradicate in this country. This is what the American people need for us to be a part of and work on.

I am just so happy that we are dealing with an issue that is going to affect so many people in this country who do not have a voice right now. We have the opportunity now to stand up for what is right. We have the opportunity to do what is right, and by us working together and having legislation that will be sponsored in the Senate, as many of us do, we feel very strongly that this will become law, and we will be able to enact it and help those victims so that they can be looking towards recovery and empowering their lives.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important day with 12 different bills that we are addressing. I am just so proud to be a part of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015.

I wish this bill and others related to trafficking today were not necessary. But the sad reality is that according to the U.S. Department of Justice, human trafficking is the second fastest growing criminal industry—just behind drug trafficking. Adding to the urgency is that approximately half of all victims are children. It makes you sick.

Human trafficking is a serious crime and a grave violation of human rights. Too often, this is a crime that goes unidentified and unreported. The model that does exist is one that is not well understood. It is simply too hard to imagine that a crime this horrendous could be happening right here on American soil, let alone in your own backyard. But it is. Not only does human trafficking occur in the United States, it is a lucrative business with billions of dollars in profits. It continues because victims are not easily identified and they are afraid. It happens in our own communities, because we are unaware. Today, we stand up and say no more.

In order for victims of trafficking to break free, they need help. Health care professionals are one of the few groups to interact with trafficked women and girls and can be one source of help as twenty-eight percent of trafficked women sought treatment from a health care professional while being held captive. Recent studies show that health care professionals are well positioned to be first responders when they have the training and skills to identify and help victims.

The Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act would provide for the development of evidence-based best practices to help health care providers to identify and assist victims of human trafficking. The bill requires HHS to award a grant to a medical or nursing school to develop best practices for medical personnel. These best practices will be tested in a pilot program conducted at Community Health Centers (CHCs) in each of the 10 administrative regions. The results of the pilot will be shared with the medical community for their consideration. This bill offers us an important opportunity to work with the medical community to improve awareness and ensure that human trafficking education and practice becomes a part of basic health care training.

I thank Rep. ELLMERS for her hard work this important piece of legislation and urge its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 398.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMAND THE RELEASE OF NADIYA SAVCHENKO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the immediate release of Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya Savchenko, who remains illegally jailed in Russia.

Ms. Savchenko was captured by Russian-directed forces in eastern Ukraine in June of 2014 and transferred to a prison in Voronezh, Russia. She is still imprisoned there today, now in her second month of a hunger strike that
demonstrates to the world the inhumanity of her capture.

We recall the shocking footage of her interrogation in which she was handcuffed to a metal pipe, and yet we are assured by Russia she is "being treated well."

Why, if Russia is not invading Ukraine, as we were so often assured by Russia, should they hold Ms. Savchenko at all?

Yesterday, January 26, was Free Savchenko Day, a global, digital effort to raise awareness to her ongoing fight. The campaign shines a light on the disrespect for international law the Kremlin continues to demonstrate.

I was honored to participate in that campaign and introduce, along with our colleagues from the Ukrainian Caucus, House Resolution 50, calling to mind her struggle and demanding her immediate release.

The hunger strike began on December 13 and her health continues to deteriorate.

Mr. Speaker, Nadia Savchenko has been a beacon for liberty. I salute her bravery in the face of overt Russian aggression. Her courage shines like a brilliant, brilliant beacon for liberty-loving people everywhere.

God bless her. God bless America, and God bless Ukraine.

HONORING WILHELMINA HENRY, A PIONEER IN EDUCATION

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pioneer in education, Ms. Wilhelmina Henry, who will be 95 years old this month. Ms. Henry is from Stockton, California’s, first Black teacher.

Born in South Carolina, she graduated from high school at the age of 16 and went on to earn a degree from the Tuskegee Institute—one of our country’s oldest and most prestigious Historically Black Colleges. She began her teaching career after World War II in segregated schools in South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama before moving to Stockton in 1947.

Though she faced discrimination and resistance, Ms. Henry persevered with courage and dignity, retiring after almost 50 years of educating our children. Her legacy is carried on by both her daughter, Rachelle Mimms, who is also a Stockton teacher, and at this Stockton elementary school that is named in her honor.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Henry’s courage in breaking the color barrier for teachers and in paving the way for many others who have followed in her footsteps.

FIGHTING YOUTH HOMELESSNESS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, this week, as we consider measures aimed at combating human trafficking, I remind my colleagues of the estimated 1.6 million runaway or homeless youths under the age of 18 in the United States.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act was enacted in 1974 to help combat these growing numbers, and it is the sole Federal law targeting unaccompanied youths. Through this law, we are able to fund important local programs to serve our homeless youths. They provide shelter, counseling, family reunification, and aftercare, and they reduce the chance that young people will become victims of human trafficking.

I am proud to have introduced and to have helped pass the reauthorization of this important funding in 2008, but that 5-year authorization expired in 2014, and now action must be taken. Congress has a responsibility to help ensure that homeless young people in America have a place to seek shelter and to find safety while laying a foundation for new opportunities.

I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting a reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and help the hundreds of thousands of children who sleep on our streets every night.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a voice for the thousands of human trafficking victims both abroad and in this country. These voiceless victims are often beaten, starved, and forced to work as prostitutes or to take grueling jobs as migrant and domestic workers. Time and time again, we hear terrible stories of violence, death, and trauma against innocent men, women, and children who have been trafficked through organized crime rings and even terrorist organizations.

As Members of Congress, we must stand up for justice and human dignity. The bills we are considering today will improve collaboration between government agencies, will cut down on human trafficking, and will better protect victims. Ending human trafficking is a bipartisan issue that must remain a priority.

This country was founded upon the notion of “equality and justice for all.” That is why I cosponsored a bipartisan bill with my North Carolina Republican colleague, Mark Walker, H.R. 460, the Human Trafficking Detection Act, prioritizes training for the prevention and the detection of trafficked victims, and it brings us one step closer to finding a solution to this terrible tragedy of human trafficking.
DEFENSE DEPARTMENT WEAPONS FUNNELED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican border bill, originally scheduled for this week, contains a provision buried on page 78 that would expand the Pentagon’s 1033 program. This program transfers billions of dollars of Defense Department equipment to law enforcement agencies without any congressional oversight or community input. The bill adds a border security activities priority to the program that will quietly funnel military-grade weapons to law enforcement for this new, fully defined priority.

It appears some of my colleagues did not learn the tragic lessons of Ferguson, Missouri, last summer as the Nation saw the devastating result of a militarized police force. If this bill is brought back up, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment in order to curb the expansion of this program.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA: INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Jenkins of West Virginia). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. Garamendi) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, this chart has been up, really, for the last 4 years, and I keep bringing it back because this is pretty important. This is about American jobs, about how we can rebuild the American economy, and about how we can, at the same time, provide employment opportunities—those middle class jobs that we all want to talk about—and do it in a way that actually improves our environment.

Today, I want to focus on one part of this. I have asked some of my colleagues to join us, and Congresswoman Hahn will be joining us in a few moments to talk about a piece of this.

In the Make It In America agenda, we have these items: international trade, which is critically important that we do right; tax policies of all kinds for energy policy. Oh. By the way, in the last 5 years, the energy policy of the administration’s has almost made the United States energy independent. We are actually producing 4 billion more barrels of oil a day now than we were 6 or 7 years ago, so we do have an energy policy—green energy, moving away from the greenhouse gases; a labor policy; education, the training of our workers; research, which is critically important. We may come to that later today, but I really want to focus on this one which is at the bottom because it is foundational. The foundation of the economy of the United States is the infrastructure.

Way, way back, the Founding Fathers—everybody around here wants to talk about the Founding Fathers and what the Founding Fathers would do and how they would act. I will tell you what George Washington did in his first weeks in office.

He turned to Alexander Hamilton, the Treasury Secretary, and said: Hey, Alex. Develop an economic development plan for me. How are we going to grow our economy?

‘‘Treasury Secretary Hamilton came back—the former president of one, and he came back with a plan of, maybe, 30, 40 pages, and in that plan was fundamental infrastructure development.

He said the role of the Federal Government is to make sure that we have postal roads, to make sure that we have ports and canals—the infrastructure of the day.

So, for those who like to harken back to the Founding Fathers—they ought to also consider the mothers. In any case, infrastructure was fundamental.

Today, I want to talk about infrastructure, and I want to do it in a way that will really, hopefully, excite this body into passing a very robust, complete surface transportation infrastructure bill.

Now, President Obama and Department of Transportation Secretary Foxx have made a proposal called “Build America.” It is a good proposal that covers all of the elements that we need—the highways, the ports, the railroads, freight. All of those things are in that bill. Unfortunately, it didn’t have a hearing last year. Hopefully, it will be foundational this year as we consider in the next 3 months a surface transportation infrastructure bill for the United States because, in May, the world comes to an end as the programs of the Federal Government’s for transportation expire. We need a new law going forward, so what we want to talk about today is that issue.

I am going to take just a few seconds. Every now and then, somebody sends brochures and studies to us. This one came from Duke University, the Center on Globalization, Governance &Competitiveness: ‘Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs,’ and they have got this little executive summary which is really helpful to us:

Out and broken transportation infrastructure makes the United States less competitive than 15 of our major trading partners and makes American manufacturers less efficient in getting goods to market.

Representative Hahn, that is where you want to come in and talk about ports.

This is Duke University: The underinvestment of infrastructure costs the United States over 900,000 jobs, including 97,000 American manufacturing jobs. Maxing American-made materials when rebuilding infrastructure has the potential to create even more jobs. Relying on American-made also mititates safety concerns related to large-scale outsourcing.

One of the things that really, really bothers me about my home State of California is the way in which the State of California decided to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. We are talking about a multibillion-dollar project, $3.9 billion, 12 years late, and the steel in that bridge came from China. How brilliant was that?

One of the principal reasons for the delay was the steel was delayed, the steel was faulty, maybe were faulty. There were 3,000 jobs in China and zero jobs in the United States. By the way, the Chinese demanded that they be the inspectors on the job—not good at all. This kind of tells us about why making it in America is important.

There is another example. I don’t like to brag about New York, since that is a long, long way from my district, but the Tappan Zee Bridge in New York was built with American steel, had a $3.9 billion total project cost. 7,728 American workers were hired, and it was designed to last 100 years without any major structural maintenance.

I know Ms. Hahn is going to come up here and probably carry on some bragging. We have got a lot to brag about in California, but we cannot brag about what happened with the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge because it was a financial disaster. It was a jobs disaster for the United States, for American workers. Even today, there are continuing reports coming out about the faulty bridge construction.

Infrastructure investment creates American jobs, and if we require that those investments be made in America, we are going to be talking about Americans going back to work. All of us talk about the middle class. Well, let’s build the infrastructure, let’s use American-made materials, and let’s really build American jobs for the middle class.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for having the leadership, and really, on Make It In America, but really reminding our colleagues and all Americans how important these projects are in terms of repairing our infrastructure, as well as creating good American jobs.

I am here today to join you and many of my colleagues in really pressing Congress this year to take action to improve our Nation’s outdated, underfunded ports and to repair and replace our crumbling roads and dangerous bridges.

I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I founded and cochair our congressional bipartisan PORTS Caucus, so I work closely with not only Democrats, but I am working very closely with Republicans.

I do know—and I believe this to be true—that this is one area that we can
agree on, and that is our infrastructure and transportation. I am really hoping that we can work together across the aisle and understand that making these essential investments in America's transportation and infrastructure will create good-paying jobs, will help America compete globally, and it will improve the quality of life for families in every single congressional district.

As you said—and I will take bragging rights—I represent the Port of Los Angeles, the gateway to America. I represent the Port Long Beach. Together, we consider them America's ports. They are the largest port complex in the country. They account for about 40 percent of all trade that comes through this country, it comes through our ports.

I am a big advocate for these ports. As the co-chair of the PORTS Caucus, I am an advocate for all ports in this country because the entire port network, the entire network of highways, roads, bridges, and infrastructure that move freight across this country, needs some champions here in Congress.

This freight network is important for moving goods across our country. It is important for our small businesses, and even if you live hundreds of miles from the nearest port, whether you realize it or not, everyone depends on our ports to get the goods to the stores, to the factories, and to the businesses that many of our colleagues represent.

Maybe you live or work in an agricultural or industrial area. We know that they produce something that America exports to foreign markets.

You may also have a direct interest in making sure that our freight network—our Nation's transportation system—is in good condition, is modern, efficient, and safe so that cargo can travel to the ports where it is loaded on the ships to get overseas.

I love to talk about the State of the Union last week. President Obama said that "21st century businesses need 21st century infrastructure." The deteriorating infrastructure, crumbling roads, and collapsing bridges that are part of our current national freight network are a threat to America's prosperity and our global competitiveness.

Policy makers here in Congress need to recognize the need to make repairs and upgrades, but we have been stuck on how to pay for them. I introduced a bill last Congress that I am going to reintroduce this Congress that will create a dedicated funding stream for these vital projects—and listen to this—without raising taxes or imposing any additional fees.

I have come up with an idea how to fund our national freight network, and I am hoping I can get broad support in this Congress. Let me repeat: it does not raise taxes one penny, and it does not increase any fees to any businesses in America.

What it does is divert 5 percent of the fees that we already collect on imports in this country—money that currently goes to the U.S. Treasury's general fund—and we can create a new national freight trust fund.

We collect $39 billion a year nationwide in these import fees. Setting aside just 5 percent of those would give this freight trust fund about $1.95 billion a year that we could use to repair roads, highways, and bridges—the last mile to ease congestion into our ports across this country. Again, it is not going to raise taxes or increase any fees to any businesses.

I know, as you mentioned, Mr. GARAMENDI, we need to pass a surface transportation bill. I am working with Chairman SHUSTER and some of the committee members on our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to see if my legislation can be a part of that as a way just to fund our freight network.

It is different than funding the highway trust fund, which is our normal roads and bridges. This is different. This is about the network that moves goods in this country. I hope you will support me.

Thank you for allowing me to speak on this very Special Hour. This is an issue, Mr. GARAMENDI, I know that we agree on. I know that our Republican colleagues will agree with us on this.

Maybe this is the one thing that we can do as a bipartisan gift to the American people: find something in a bipartisan way, some common ground that we agree on, that will really repair infrastructure and create good jobs here in America. I think this is an issue that will, I believe, make the American people happy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much, Ms. HAHN. The proposal that you put forward almost seems magical. If it was magic, you would have figured it out—and you did—but to use money that is already going into the general fund and divert it back to what it was really intended to—that is the enhancement of our ports—is entirely sensible.

I suppose that I am a co-author. Ms. HAHN. I am sure you are. If you are not, you will be.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am sure I will be.

The rest of the story that we have is that we need to take a look at our transportation infrastructure specifically in a very holistic, universal way. It does not go to improve the interstate highway system when the link between the ports and the interstate highway system doesn't work.

For example, I-10 in southern California that you and I know so very well is the way you get out of those two ports onto the interstate highway system. It is rather inadequate. That is an example of that linkages that you are talking about.

We have many, many more things to talk about here. I welcome you to stay. We will probably circle back on it.

I see my colleague from Ohio. I think there are some ports in Ohio that quite possibly are in MARCY KAPTUR's district.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Speaking of bridges failing down that we need to look at is the interstate 5 bridge in northern Washington State that fell down 2 years ago. Interstate 5 is the main intercontinental highway from Mexico to Canada through California, Oregon, and Washington. It created a bit of a traffic jam when it went down.

Ms. KAPTUR. What a pleasure it is to join you this evening, and thank you for your continuing leadership on jobs, infrastructure—jobs in America, not outsourcing our jobs elsewhere—and to also be joined by Congresswoman HAHN, such an incredible leader who has made such a difference not just in California, but in communities across this country.

We really appreciate everything that she has done legislatively over these last 5 years to help our ports develop, to connect rail to ports, highway to rail. It is really amazing what her leadership has done in forming the PORTS Caucus. Thank you very much, Congresswoman HAHN.

I rise this evening to join both of you. Obviously, I am in a different part of the country, but we understand what it means to Make It In America. I think the last company in Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, was the old Government Printing Office, that used to print some of its goods here, but it doesn't anymore.

To Make It In America creates jobs here, and what is interesting to look at Congressman GARAMENDI talks about the transportation and infrastructure bill. No bill that this Congress could pass would create more jobs than that bill. We hope to have it cleared.

I know Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO are working very hard on that. I know Members like Congressman GARAMENDI are helping lift them across the finish line.

The Make It In America agenda will create tens of thousands of jobs across this country. Look at every community you go to, and look at what is unfinished. Old bridges are falling down. They used to be a song, "London Bridge is Falling Down." Well, I think they are falling down in America now. Highways are not complete. We have old airports.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Speaking of bridges failing down that we need to look at is the interstate 5 bridge in northern Washington State that fell down 2 years ago. Interstate 5 is the main intercontinental highway from Mexico to Canada through California, Oregon, and Washington. It created a bit of a traffic jam when it went down.

Ms. KAPTUR. I can only imagine. We have so many unmet needs in my own community that spans a river called the Maumee River, the largest river that flows into the Maumee River. The Maumee River is a source of water for the Toledo, Ohio area.
Caucus here and how much gets imported into our country and what gets exported. Well, here is a chart that gives you a sense of how many more imports come in here than exports go out.

Since the mid-1970s and then the passage of NAFTA here, this represents the growing share of imports over exports into our country. Since about 1975, our country has amassed $9.5 trillion in red ink with the world.

That is hard to imagine for most people. So the United States, a once great country with which we have held a massive deficit since the passage of NAFTA. NAFTA passed back in 1993. Our country moved into a gigantic deficit with Mexico.

Recently, I don’t know if the—and this is what American jobs, and our places, and our people struggling, wages not rising, more part-time work, fewer benefits.

I don’t know if the gentleman was able to see what happened with the recent common denominator for the continuous foreign corporate interests that would trump the safety of the American people. And we know that flawed trade deals cost us jobs. They harm our economy, and they put people at risk on both sides of the border. So it is in quite likely, will further harm the middle class by hollowing out the American manufacturing sector.

You put that chart up so very clearly. Associated with that chart are real lives, real middle class families. We had just over 19 million middle class families in manufacturing in 1990. It went down to just over 10 million as a result of these trade deals that you talked about. We are now beginning to come back up, principally because of cheap energy in the United States, natural gas specifically. So we have got a ways to go here.

We need to be really, really careful, as Members of Congress, representatives of the American people, that we don’t give away even more American jobs.

Ms. KAPUR. Yes, I thank the gentleman so much for pointing that out. You and I are both from solid middle class families. We've been talking and others about this latest NAFTA deal, they are calling it the TPP now. They always give it initials or something—NAFTA, CAPTA, KORUS—It is always initials so the American people really can’t quite understand what all that is about.

This one they are calling TPP.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Ms. KAPUR. And the last deal we had was Korea. With Korea they promised, they said, we will be able to sell 50,000 American cars in Korea.

Well, what has happened is they have sold, the Koreans have sold 500,000 here. We never got the 50,000 in there, didn’t get it—closed market, deal not kept.

I have a bill that I have introduced in several Congresses called the Balancing Trade Act, which basically says to the executive branch, for any country with which the United States has amassed a $10 billion trade deficit, let’s go back and figure out what is the problem? Why do we have a deficit rather than a balance or a surplus? And before we pass any more trade deals, fix that first.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, one of the problems—we spent a lot of time talking about this 2 years ago, and it has dropped off the discussion table, although it should come back—is the manipulation of the Chinese currency so that China is able to maintain a very, very significant trade advantage vis-a-vis the United States by the pricing of the Chinese currency. Grossly unfair, something that we need, as representatives of the American people and the middle class, and the manufacturing sector, to forcefully address in legislation such as you have just described, where the administration is required to look at the problem, and then make suggestions, or correct the problem if it does not take an act of Congress.

We just can’t give it away. We are talking about American jobs. We are talking about the middle class.

The President stood here less than 10 days ago in his State of the Union and talked about the middle class. He called it a middle class economic policy—absolutely correct.

But, at the same time, this trade issue permeates in that program, and, quite likely, will further harm the middle class by hollowing out the American manufacturing sector. So let’s be careful here about these trade deals.

You talked about the transportation from Mexico. A few years back, I was the insurance commissioner in California, elected by the people of California, and we were discussing with the Mexico the insurance policy in Mexico that would transfer into the United States and these trucks that were in the United States. They said it wasn’t necessary.

Well, my staff and I looked at the details of the insurance and we said, this isn’t worthy insurance. This isn’t going to protect somebody that is run over by a Mexican truck. So we demanded, and at that time, we actually stalled.

But it appears now that the Department of Transportation is moving forward, and I surely hope that this insurance issue has been solved.

Now, if I might go back to a little bit of infrastructure and the transportation issue, as we pointed out in our discussion thus far, we have to come to grips, within the next 3 months, with a new transportation, surface transportation program for the United States.

And these are real jobs. For every billion dollars—again, this comes from Duke University, which produced this report, “Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs”—the Duke Center on Globalization, Governance and Competitiveness, in their summary, they point out that for every billion dollars invested in transportation infrastructure, there are 21,671 jobs created.

For every dollar invested in transportation infrastructure, $3.54 is returned to the economy.

I have one of those little charts here. This is an older study. I used this 2 years ago. I am going to have to rewrite this because some of the one says, for every dollar invested in infrastructure investment, $1.57 is pumped into the American economy. That came from Mark Zandi. But this now is 3 years old.

This new study by Duke University indicates that this number, $1.57, really ought to be $3.54. So, wait a minute, fellows. This is even better.
So let's get this transportation bill done. Let's pump it into the economy. And if we just met the minimum needs, as we see them today, it is about $111 billion a year for the next 5 years that we should spend on this infrastructure for transportation.

That is a lot of money. But even $100 billion, we would find that we would create 2,470,000 jobs. That is 58 percent more jobs than the current funding level would provide and over $400 billion in economic impact.

So if we want to build the economy, if we really want middle class jobs, we would pass a very robust surface transportation program so that the ports, as Ms. Hahn talked about, so that the highways and the trade programs that you talked about, so that all those things could come together, and we could really jump-start the economy and provide that middle class economic impact that all of us are now talking about, including the President. So this could be done, and we fully intend to do it.

I want to pick up another piece. If you would like to join our—to come back into our discussion, Ms. KAPTUR, please do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, I wanted to diverge just a moment, if I could, to tell the story of one valiant American who is a very hardworking American, and when we don't make it in America, what happens to our people.

And I want to encourage citizens who may be listening to call their Member of Congress if they have a story like this about someone in their family to please share it with us so that we can be a voice for these families across our country who have been harmed and are waiting for a transportation bill to be passed so they can go to work rebuilding America but, meanwhile, being hurt by international trade agreements that have outsourced their jobs.

Tonight, I would like to tell, very briefly, the story of Richard Hahn, a tradesman from northern Ohio whose job was outsourced to Mexico, one of the countries we talked about, and whose current job faces new trade threats as foreign steel floods our market.

Richard Hahn spent a long career with York International as an electrician, 23 years to be exact. He rose through the ranks to the status of 100th in seniority from his dedication and commitment to York International.

But in 2001, York International closed its Elyria, Ohio, facility and moved production to Monterrey, Mexico, leaving 900 workers without work, without a paycheck, without any assistance out of their jobs.

After uprooting production to Mexico, York reached status as the world's largest independent manufacturer of air-conditioning, heating, and refrigeration machinery, and this left it as a prime buy for Johnson Controls, which acquired the company in 2005.

Mr. Hahn and many of his colleagues were given no training or retraining to find a replacement job. But York International pursued its plans to go under.

Johnson Controls, even continues to receive Department of Defense contracts to manufacture the same air-conditioning, heating, and refrigeration machinery.

For an American, Mr. Hahn was forced to accept unemployment as he desperately sought work in Elyria, Ohio. Many of his 900 colleagues moved their families out of Ohio, not finding any hope for reemployment in their hometown when they wanted to stay.

Fast forward, a little over a decade now, and Mr. Hahn is facing the trade theft of his job all over again. Although currently employed with U.S. Steel as an electrician, his and 614 colleagues' positions are under threat of layoff. U.S. Steel will have to idle its plant in coming months because they cannot continue to secure contracts to keep it running.

They have had international trade complaints of dumping steel and, unfortunately, Mr. Hahn's story is not unique. In fact, he said, his story is depicted best by quoting Billy Joel: "We're all waiting here in Allentown, but it sure is getting hard to stay." And the promise of work and a better future lives better than your parents' is dissolving, and free trade deals are to blame for the shuttered factories.

Millions of Americans from across this great land have lived their own tale, in their own Allentown, and I encourage them to write or call their Member of Congress, just as Richard Hahn has bravely shared his story with me.

Tell us, tell the Members how trade has impacted your life and your ability to provide for your families. The more stories we receive from the American people, the more tales we can tell here on this floor and work with Congressmen GARAMENDI to free our Nation from these flawed deals and make goods in America, in which our people can lead a decent way of life and not have their futures taken from them.

So I wanted to thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order tonight. I used Mr. Hahn as an example of someone who has the finest work ethic, so highly trained, struggling out there to try to maintain work. It shouldn't be this hard in the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very, very much for bringing to our attention one of your constituents who faced this situation. There were 8 million other American workers who found themselves unemployed as these trade deals went into effect and American jobs moved to Mexico, China, and other places around the world. So we must focus on Mr. Hahn and on those who share that.
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Earlier, I think before you actually came in, I talked about steel. Again, this article was from Duke University, and they have a chapter here, "A Tale Two of Bridges." One is the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge—they have the Chinese flag behind the bridge—built with Chinese steel, almost a $7 billion project, of which $3.9 billion was over budget. It was 12 years late. There were 900 Chinese workers hired. Very serious questions have been raised about the quality of the construction.

The State of New York, the Tappan Zee Bridge, built with U.S. steel. The total project cost $3.9 billion. 7,728 workers were hired, and it is designed to last for 100 years without major maintenance. There is Mr. Hahn's job. It is that U.S. steel, made in America.

I very quickly want to give two examples of where Make It In America really, really counts. This is one I have often used. This is near my district—in fact, about a mile or two from my district in Sacramento, California.

In the stimulus bill, in 2009, there was a provision for some $600 million, $700 million for new locomotives for the east coast here. This is an electric locomotive. There was a sentence added to that $600 million, $700 million law for it to be 100 percent American made.

Now nobody was making locomotives in the United States at the time, nobody. But Siemens, a German company, looked at it and goes, 70, 80 locomotives; a $600 million, $700 million contract; made in America—we could do that. So they did. Their company, Siemens, used a plant that they had in Sacramento that was making light railcars and said: Okay. We are going to make light railcars, and we are going to make locomotives.

They are now producing the locomotives 100 percent American made. Hundreds of jobs in the Sacramento area. And then all across America, there are manufacturers that are making the wheels, probably making the door knobs or the spindles that attach to the electrical line overhead.

Made in America. Why? Because Congress wrote a law—by the way, no Republicans voted for it; this was the stimulus bill—made a law that said it must be 100 percent American made.

I don't have a picture. I wish I did. If I had thought about it earlier, I would have brought one.

We are now in the process of deciding how much of our natural gas we are going to export. It is liquefied natural gas, LNG, liquefied natural gas. There is an export plant, a $20 billion export plant built on the gulf coast in Texas, owned by a company called Cheniere. They are 3, 5 months away from the first export of that natural gas. There is a lot of discussion about how much we can export without driving up the price, and that would be very harmful to American consumers—home heating, manufacturing, and the like.

But what they do will export will be to export from that single export terminal, 100 ships.

And I am going: Let me see now. Natural gas is a strategic national asset
that has allowed for a reduction in the cost of energy in the United States, extremely important. American mariners are absolutely essential to our national defense, as are the domestic ships. Thirdly, the shipyards are essential for the U.S. Navy. There are 33 strategic shipyards in the United States.

I proposed an amendment last night in the Rules Committee that almost was adopted that said, if we are going to export a strategic national asset, then let us also build two additional strategic shipyards for the mariners, the captains, the mates, the seamen, let them participate in this export of natural gas, and let's build the ships in America.

There are five terminals that are presently authorized for construction. Cheniere has completed a second terminal of about the same size. It is going in near Corpus Christi, Texas. And there are three others. So we may be talking somewhere between 300 to 400 ships needed to export a strategic national asset.

So my legislation would say, okay, then let us enhance our Nation's security by building those ships in America. We are talking about hundreds of thousands of American jobs in our shipyards, in our manufacturing facilities in Ohio, building the pumps and the pipes and the valves and the compressors that are necessary. This is a big, big deal. And while we guarantee those jobs for the Americans, we also strengthen the U.S. Navy's ability to build ships at a reasonable cost.

We could do it. We could actually do this with one simple piece of legislation that isn't more than 20 lines long. Now, that is exciting.

Trains, planes, ships. It is in America's future. It has been in our past. And it is the policies, the policies of the American Government, that set these in place and in motion.

Isn't that exciting? We can do that, Ms. KAPTUR. We can do that. And we can move production to Ohio manufacturing, the shipyards on the gulf coast, the east coast, and the west coast. It is all there for us.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly so. Exac-tly so. It is absolutely critical to our national defense that we have a strong maritime industry. We used to have the biggest maritime industry in the world. We have just given it away for many, many different reasons. But it can be brought back.

I want to give one more example, and then I am going to wrap. And if you would like to participate in the wrap, then we can do that.

At this moment, Amtrak is out with a request for a proposal to build 30, 33 new trains, high-speed rail trains for the northeast corridor, from Washington, D.C., to Boston, high-speed trains that can go 160, 200 miles an hour, reducing the commute time. That is Amtrak.

I believe that the potential to manufacture around the world is coupled with a waiver of the Buy America requirements. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayer money and a waiver of the Buy America requirement. Because Amtrak said they don't build them in the United States. Well, that is true. We don't build high-speed rail in the United States, and we never will if we give waivers.

But if we set in place a solid requirement that American taxpayer money is going to be spent on American-made equipment, we will build in the United States facilities to manufacture high-speed rail. The same thing applies in California, the California high-speed rail system.

In our future, we will have high-speed rail. The question for us in our policy debates is: In our future, will those high-speed rail trains be built in America, or will they ever be built in China or Korea or Japan or Europe?

I want them to succeed. But, by God, I want America to succeed, too. And I know that if we stick to this Make It In America agenda, we will rebuild the American economy. Ms. KAPTUR.

I want to say, Congressman GARAMENDI, you are such a leader for jobs in America. I am sure your constituents are cheering not just tonight but every day for you and for your work here. You keep the Congress focused, both sides of the aisle, on Make It In America, on trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, research, infrastructure, and, over them all, jobs.

As we close this evening, let me say, this trade deficit looks like today when we know we aren't building, whether it is tubes or whether it is trains or whether it is enough trucks in this country, cars. Imagine if we were to turn it the other way and America started making it in America and exporting to the world rather than the reverse. We would have such an economic recovery, it would astound the American people. It is amazing what we have been able to retain, even with this homorhage that has occurred over the last three decades.

Thank you for drawing our attention to the importance of transportation and infrastructure as a key job creator in this country. If we could pass that bill early this year, what we would do for this economy, and add Buy America provisions to several of the bills that will be coming before us. I will join you in that effort.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is exciting, Ms. KAPTUR. It is very, very exciting that a policy statement worth by $35 of us here and 100 over in the Senate can really dramatically alter America's economy and do it in a way that doesn't really cost us more money but simply requires that our tax dollars be spent on American-made equipment so that American workers can prosper.

Now, if somebody wants to go out and United States factories buy goods from China, that is their business. Fine, go do it. But if it is your tax dollars and my tax dollars, then it ought to be made in America.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time. I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take some time on the floor of the United States Congress, the House of Representatives, to be specific—to honor and recognize the service of our law enforcement agencies across this great country.

You know, we have been dealing with the reactions from the tragic death of Michael Brown last August. Almost continually, every week, we hear of some tragic death, a shooting incident across this country. And we all understand and realize that all loss of life is a tragedy, but there has been an outburst of violence across this great country that is equally disturbing, resulting in the brutal assassination of two law enforcement officers just before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I was a law enforcement officer for 33 years in King County, which is a county in Seattle, Washington. I started when I was 21 years old in 1972. I worked in a police car, and I was a detective. I worked the street undercover for a short time. I never knew when I left home if I would see my family, when would be the next time that I would see my wife, my children. When I told them good-bye for a day at the office, I didn't know if I was coming back home and neither did they. But every law enforcement officer across this great country lives with that knowledge, and every family member lives with that fear.

I have missed holidays, birthdays, anniversaries, I would be called out in the middle of the day or the middle of the night. I remember one day missing my daughter's birthday. On Christmas Eve, I remember driving around in the middle of the
night patrolling, while others had their relatives parked in their driveways; and they were in, sharing Christmas dinner and presents with their family and friends.

But once a cop, always a cop, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I have been in Congress for 10 years, but I was a cop for 33 years.

A lot of people think “cop” is a derogatory remark, but it is actually a badge of honor. I was the sheriff for the last 8 years of my career. One thing I said was, I left. If the members of the King County Sheriff’s Office, which are nearly 1,100—it is the 12th largest sheriff’s office in the country—said that Dave Reichert was a great cop, that is what meant the world to me.

If they said I was a good sheriff, that was icing on the cake, but I just wanted to be known as a good cop working my district and my beat and doing the job that I was trained to do and serving the public.

Police officers do what they do because they care. They go to work every day because they want to save lives, not because they put up with ridicule and harassment, assaults, and even the ultimate sacrifice—death—always facing dangerous situations, putting their lives between their communities—the public—and danger.

Some would say, the ultimate sacrifice is made. During my career, I lost a partner and a good friend who was shot and killed in 1982. In 1984, I lost another partner and a good friend who was stabbed to death with a sword.

These men died serving and protecting their community, but they left behind family. They left behind sons, daughters, spouses, orphaned children, and widowed. The men and women who keep us safe find themselves in life-and-death situations far too often. In many instances, Mr. Speaker, taking down a bad guy means losing a good guy too.

Life-and-death situations are never easy. I remember one instance that I was working plainclothes and went in with a group of my team of officers on a drug search warrant. I was the sergeant leading that team.

My assignment was to go in the front door, turn to the right, and make sure that the bathroom in that small apartment was clear. We went in the front door. I kicked in the bathroom door, and I found a person sitting on the toilet.

As he stood, he revealed that he had a rubber band around his bicep and a heroin needle stuck in his arm. I could see that his eyes were glazed over. I told him to raise his hands; instead of doing that, he grabbed a gun.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could have shot that man. In a split second, he grabbed a gun, and my life was in danger, but I had to talk him out of that gun. I just had a feeling I could reason with this man, even though he was high on heroin.

I didn’t shoot, and I was able to talk him out of his gun. In fact, he dropped it in the toilet. What would you do, Mr. Speaker, if you were standing there with that decision? In an instant, you had to make a decision: shoot or don’t shoot.

Our men and women who wear uniforms every day have to make that split-second decision. Now, they don’t always make the right decision, but more often than not, they do. The men and women in uniform across this country are human beings, and they make mistakes, as we all do; we need to understand that.

When the mistakes are made, police officers expect to have scrutiny applied. They expect oversight, they expect to have the action they took reviewed, reviewed, and reviewed, and they respect the rule of law, the process of the review, the investigation, and the judicial process that needs to take place.

As all Americans across this country, we need to recognize that process too. Reacting to bad situations by disregarding the rule of law only makes things worse in this Nation. It creates harm in our communities, rather than harmony. Everyone must come together.

Communities and law enforcement should be partners, protecting our families. Communities and law enforcement should be partners. Just as I was a partner with my partners that I spoke about earlier, communities should be our partner, law enforcement’s partner.

What do good partners do? They trust each other. Communities must trust their police department. The police department and the sheriff’s office must trust the community, work with one another, and depend on one another.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we do that, if we can stop for a moment, listen to the facts of life that exists here in the United States of America—the greatest country in the world—yeah, we are not perfect, but we have the best system.

If we all come together and recognize we have the best system—and where it needs to be changed, let’s change it—but as the process goes through, let’s respect it. If we do that together, Mr. Speaker, we can continue to live in the greatest country in this world.

I want to make clear law enforcement statements just by saying that I really think it is important for us across this Nation to pause and remember to thank our law enforcement officers.

Every time we see a cop, let’s say thank you. It is just one of ways that we can support them and show that support, but I think, even more importantly, let’s pray for them and pray for their families, but let’s also pray for the communities that they serve, that the communities see the tough job they have to do and the sacrifices they make.

Pray for peace, understanding, cooperation, trust, and let’s pray, Mr. Speaker, that we have a partner in each other, a partner that we can trust that will back us up. Law enforcement backing up the community and the community backing up the police officers, that is where I would like to see this go, Mr. Speaker.

We have some other Members here tonight who want to share their comments about their community and their relationship with law enforcement.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Byrne).

Mr. Byrne. I thank my colleague, the gentleman, and I thank you for the time, but I thank you most of all for your service to the people of your community and what you have done for them and your proxy for hundreds of thousands of law enforcement officers that do that day in and day out, and we take them for granted.

I am glad you brought up the subject of families because we sometimes forget that these law enforcement officers have families. They have husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, and friends.

Literally, when they go out every day, those people and their family and their friends are not certain they will come back. How many of us, when we go off to work, our family and friends think, “Well, he may not come back.” What a terrible thing that must be, how difficult that is for the family.

My grandfather was a sheriff in Mobile County in Alabama in the twenties and thirties. I wasn’t alive during that point in time, but I remember my father telling stories about that.

When his father would go out at night and they had to do things on patrol or to go out and apprehend somebody who committed a crime and somehow upset it would leave him as a child thinking: Where is my dad going? Is he going to be okay? We take that for granted, but the families don’t take that for granted because they have to live with it day in day out.

We so often think of law enforcement officers in terms of how they relate to a criminal. Well, oftentimes, the most important person or persons they are relating with are victims.

They are the protectors—in some cases, the saviors—of victims, people who are getting ready to be hurt by a criminal, and—but for a law enforcement officer—they would be hurt and maybe even killed.

Law enforcement officers rush into an inherently dangerous situation to keep those people from harm and maybe even save them from death. It may be a phone call that goes to 911 in the dead of night, a woman screaming in your ear: “My gun, and he is going to use it against me.”

A law enforcement officer is dispensed to that environment, not knowing in that highly emotionally charged moment whether that gun is going to take him or the person he has come to save.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again, law enforcement officers find a way to
defuse that situation. No one is hurt, the person that is about to commit a crime is apprehended and charged with a crime less than actually hurting somebody, but a person has been saved; a person has been saved from harm or perhaps even their life.

If you have ever been in that moment and been someone who has been a victim, when a law enforcement officer comes up and saves you in that moment, you realize that but for those law enforcement officers who do that every single day, we could all be victims of a horrible crime, and we take that for granted.

My wife, Rebecca, and I were victims of a violent crime. We were stopped one night by three young men who tried to rob us. They had a knife and said they had a gun. My wife was pregnant. They took our jewelry and then threw her to the ground which could have not only hurt her, but hurt the baby. Fortunately, some of the people involved realized it was time to run, and as they did, we could scream out. As we screamed out, neighbors called the police. They came very quickly.

I can tell you when you are in that moment and you feel that sense of fear because people have weapons that they want to use against you and they have already used physical violence against you, when that squad car comes up and the man or men or women in uniform step out, you feel safe.

When they step out of that squad car, they are not safe because they have to go out. Their official duty is to try to apprehend that person and do whatever it takes to protect the rest of us. We take that for granted, and we should never, ever take that for granted.

Mr. Speaker, last year, over 100 law enforcement officers in the United States lost their lives in the line of duty. So far in this young year in the United States already, nine law enforcement officers have lost their lives in the line of duty.

One of them was lost last night in my home county, Baldwin County, Alabama, a police officer—a fine police officer—with the city of Loxley, and we take that for granted. He got in his car at the beginning of the day, kissed his wife, went to work, and didn’t come home.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we in America can do this to remember what we gain from people who put on the uniform of law enforcement to serve us and to protect us. “Serve and protect,” that is the motto.

All of us tonight, millions of us as Americans tonight will go to bed, will put our heads on that pillow, and will go to sleep safe, knowing that these men and women are patrolling the streets of our country to keep danger away from us.

Before we go to sleep every night, perhaps we should do one more thing: let’s say a little prayer for those men and women who patrol the streets of our country to protect all of us and maintain the quality of life that we all too often take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this time tonight, your service to your community and to our country, and hope you will continue to remind us in the days to come of what we owe to the men and women who wear law enforcement uniforms throughout America.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments and for being here tonight to share his support of our law enforcement officers across this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank Congressman REICHERT not only for yielding me the time, but also for his service as a law enforcement officer because when he speaks on the floor of the House on behalf of our Nation’s law enforcement officers—the men and women who put their lives on the line every day—he speaks from personal experience. I have heard those experiences a number of times, and I thank you for that.

There are others here in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, who have served in law enforcement, and we thank them as well. I am particularly pleased that Dave is hosting this Special Order tonight to show our respect and deep gratitude for the thousands of law enforcement officers across the country who serve our communities and the American people daily.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the rule of law, and every day, law enforcement officers carry out this legacy. They protect our neighborhoods from criminals, fight crime, ensure justice, and keep the peace. They patrol neighborhoods late at night and early in the morning while we sleep in the comforts of our homes.

Since 9/11, our Nation’s law enforcement officers are now the first to respond to terrorist attacks. On that tragic day nearly 14 years ago, NYPD officers and other first responders were running into burning towers to save people as everyone else was running out.

In 2010, an NYPD officer was the first on the scene when a terrorist attempted to ignite a car bomb in Times Square.

The same was true during the Boston Marathon bombings in April 2013. The Boston police responded immediately. Mr. Speaker, our Nation’s law enforcement officers are now the first to respond to terrorist attacks. On that tragic day nearly 14 years ago, NYPD officers and other first responders were running into burning towers to save people as everyone else was running out.

In 2010, an NYPD officer was the first on the scene when a terrorist attempted to ignite a car bomb in Times Square.
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The same was true during the Boston Marathon bombings in April 2013. The Boston police responded immediately to aid the wounded and implement emergency plans.

Sadly, many law enforcement have made the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf. Last year alone, 120 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty, including three from the Commonwealth of Virginia. These are sober reminders that our Nation’s law enforcement professionals face danger every day as they carry out the duty to protect the American people.

As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I have the privilege to work with Federal law enforcement agencies. All too often, we fail to recognize how the dedicated men and women of law enforcement make sacrifices—some sacrificing their lives—to preserve law and order and keep our communities, our States, and our Nation safe. These brave men and women are heroes and deserve to be recognized and honored for their service to our country.

Again, I thank our law enforcement officer, Congressman REICHERT, for taking this time to have this law enforcement Special Order.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank you, Mr. GOODLATTE, for your comments and for your hard work as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I thank you for coming tonight and sharing your comments.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS). I am sure she wants to talk about her great sheriff in Spokane.

CATHY, it is good to see you.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. That is right, and the former great sheriff from King County, whom I have the privilege of serving with now in the United States House of Representatives. Thank you, Congressman REICHERT, for your leadership and your service both as sheriff and local law enforcement officer, and also for bringing us together tonight.

I see another former sheriff from Florida, RICH NUGENT. We are grateful for those who have served and those who currently serve.

In our darkest hours, we turn to law enforcement to keep us from harm’s way. It is easy to take those who serve for granted. Tonight, I am privileged to stand here and to say thank you. Thank you for your service, thank you for your commitment, thank you for the sacrifices and all of the acts of heroism.

When we drop our kids off at school, buckle up our seat belts and hit the roads or kiss our children good night, we know that our first responders will be there if we ever need them, and they will do everything they can to keep us safe. Sometimes it is nice to know they are out there on the roads in case something happens. Our police officers and firefighters get up every morning not knowing what their day will look like, not knowing with certainty if they will be home for dinner.

At a time when there are growing threats facing America, growing unrest around the world, these men and women are ready to answer the call of duty at any moment. They do it out of a great sense of service and commitment, to serve and to protect. Men and women in uniform across eastern Washington and throughout this country put their lives on the line every day.
leadership, effective leadership, bringing down overall crime rates. It is really a testament to them. I actually have the privilege of working with 10 sheriffs in eastern Washington who are having a tremendous impact on keeping our community safe. Their families, too, take on tremendous sacrifices for it is their loved ones who go out into the streets to keep us safe. These are husbands, wives, moms, and dads whose sense of honor and whose commitment to our country is worth far, far more. I yield to the gentleman from Washington State for putting on this hour tonight. We need to spend more time celebrating the fine men and women who have sworn to protect and serve.

I thank the gentleman from Washington State for putting on this hour tonight. We need to spend more time celebrating the fine men and women who have sworn to protect and serve. I have attended so many of these events which have been a model for the rest of the Nation, have kept crime rates low, and is something we should be celebrating, that department and the state of Washington. Dickson, for example, is a very diverse police department, among the most diverse anywhere. I would also like to point out one other sad tragedy that we dealt with this year in my own State. It was the beautiful fall foliage of Pennsylvania’s Pocono Mountains that was the backdrop of a horror that many northeastern Pennsylvanians had to deal with for several weeks. We Pennsylvanians recently mourned our own loss on September 12, 2014, when State Police Corporal Bryon Dickson was murdered under what appears to be similar circumstances to those in New York. He was shot to death because of the badge that he wore.

Trooper Alex Douglass was seriously wounded in that same incident. We are pleased to hear that Trooper Douglass is recovering steadily, and we wish him the best in his long road to a full recovery. But what followed that horrific attack and assassination was a truly impressive 7-week manhunt for Eric Frein, the shooter and self-trained, self-described survivalist. Over 1,000 officers from State and local law enforcement agencies from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York teamed with the FBI, U.S. Marshals Service, and ATF, and it was amazing. What we witnessed was an amazing testament to police work, the commitment of the entire community. And, of course, the family and the children and the community. And, of course, the family still lives on with the loss of their father and husband.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS). Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you so much for your leadership and for calling it a critical evening to express the will of so many Members of Congress who hopefully is the will of the American people. I thank you for your service not only here in Congress, but also for serving the people of North Carolina just as you have.

Mr. Speaker, when we get to call out some of our dear friends who are sheriffs or police chiefs, many times we
Mr. Speaker, of people who put politics aside and put the interests of their community first.

Whether it is a Democrat or Republican, they all work together to make sure that what happens is that their community deserves the professionalism about them, but when you do a better job by standing by our law enforcement officers each and every day to thank them, to go out of our way, to make sure that we thank them for their service, thank their families for their sacrifice.

There are birthday parties that are missed, anniversaries that are missed, dinner engagements that are missed because when the phone rings or when the call goes off or when the beeper is alert, they are always there. Not answering that call is not an option for them. They are always available.

Yet in my district back in North Carolina, we have sheriffs who are getting involved to make sure that the homeless have a place, a warm bed, and a hot meal; a sheriff that has actually gone out in his community in one of my counties that makes sure that those that are in need have a place on Halloween night to come and celebrate in a safe environment; dedicated volunteers over and over; a sheriff back home that works tirelessly to make sure that the needs of those that are most needy in his community are taken care of—story upon story, Mr. Speaker, as has been shared previously, sometimes, they don't come home. They do a better job of protecting the lives of their fellow officers, law enforcement officers, law enforcement leadership to set the right tone and to provide for the safety of their communities while they also provide for the safety of law enforcement officers that risk their lives every day, officers like Charles Kondek.

I would encourage this Congress, as we continue to look for ways not just to pay tribute to law enforcement officers, but to support the work they do every day, to consider this legislation that ensures this program will continue to provide the technology to law enforcement officers and says: You know what, we, as a Congress, trust our law enforcement back home because they know best how to provide for the safety of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Washington having this Special Order and allowing me this time to recognize the gentlemen who risk their lives every day, and his staunch support of 1033. We will work together on that, and I am sure other Members of Congress have an interest in working to make sure that that legislation gets passed.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Mr. LaMalfa from California.

Mr. Speaker, thank you to my colleague from Washington, Mr. REICHERT, for this opportunity and, really, privilege to be able to speak about those in law enforcement that are really on duty for us every day and being able to support and show my gratitude for them across our country because we know that they are there daily to keep us safe and secure in our communities.

They have an incredibly important role and a vital responsibility to uphold this even rule of law, which is the core of our Constitution and ensures everyone is accountable under the law. Everyone needs to be accountable under the law. That is a huge responsibility.

It is up to us, whether it is in Congress or at the State legislative level or local government, to make sure that they have the tools that they need to do their job. In the time of budget cuts and other constraints put on them, their job gets that much harder; indeed, sometimes, they feel handcuffed in their ability to do their job.

When you speak to the officers sometimes—they always have an air of professionalism about them, but when you
they might be a little stressed on every day to help families—people don’t hear sometimes, they don’t feel very appreciated and that they don’t have the tools to do what they need because of things sometimes the government does or frivolous lawsuits, for example.

We sometimes see our elected officials participating in vilifying our people in law enforcement. That is really, really irresponsible because we are all in this together, us as lawmakers and those in the executive branch, and they have that responsibility. We are supposed to work together in upholding the law and making sure they have the tools, as well as providing oversight.

We want to make sure everybody is behaving the way they should. I am as we see so hyped lately with a tiny, tiny minority of incidents out there compared to the contacts—I heard a statistic the other day, much less than 1 percent of contacts that officers have with the public result in any kind of physical action needed, much less than 1 percent; yet you would think, from all the hype, from all the media, it was a much higher number than that.

The point of it is an officer helping you out. You have brushes with the law here and there, but they are very professional in what they do. What you really need to do is step into their shoes for a minute, think about where they have to come from to get where they are.

They had to have a very clean record to get through background to be accepted into academy and be accepted into whatever force that they are working on. It is a high bar. You can’t have a bad record in your background. They have chosen to come forward and put themselves at risk.

Look what they do every day in the line of duty. In some cases, they have made it through academy and were brought on to a force. If they are called into a situation, they don’t really have the option of saying: No, I am not going to go. If someone has called from a home, they had to have a very clean record to get through background to be accepted into academy and be accepted into whatever force that they are working on. It is a high bar. You can’t have a bad record in your background. They have chosen to come forward and put themselves at risk.

They have to get to a solution on that because we need them more so than ever in a country that is becoming less and less safe, it seems, from outside threats, as well as people within that don’t seem to understand the rule of law and sometimes governing officials that don’t seem to care about upholding it. We all have the responsibility as citizens.

Those costs have been high because, in the previous year, well over 100 officers have been lost in the line of duty—and that’s probably an underestimate. I am glad to be able to stand here today with my colleague from Washington to recognize their bravery, their devotion, and for all of us to remember how to make their job a little bit easier.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington, Sheriff REICHERT, that is a term of endearment. It is won, a title that you earn. It is an opportunity to lead a great body of men and women. So when Sheriff REICHERT wanted to do this hour, it was, like he said, we have each other’s back. We have been through issues that we can relate to.

When I first became a law enforcement officer, my mom said: You know, I could picture one of your brothers doing this, but not you. You just don’t have that temperament to be that bold, I guess is what she was saying, coming from my brother.

But at the end of the day, after 39 years, and the last 10 as sheriff before I got elected to this office, those were 39 of the best years, and I guarantee it that Dave REICHERT feels the same way with his tenure in law enforcement. I started out as a cop outside the city of Chicago and saw issues that I would rather not even mention.
Coming down to Florida was quite a break, it was different. But at the same time, that changed over time too. From a small, sleepy sheriff’s office of about 40 individuals to, when I left, we had over 500 folks that served this great community.

You hear a lot on the news about law enforcement in that they want to make it sound like we are not human. In reality, I have been to those scenes where a law enforcement officer has been involved and he turned his back when he had to take somebody’s life. And that officer was so emotionally distraught, because that is not why they got into the business. It is not why I ever got into the business. You got into the business because you wanted to help people, you wanted to be there to protect people. That is what law enforcement is about.

And, unfortunately, sometimes bad things happen to good people. Sheriff REICHERT mentioned the fact that sometimes police officers and deputies can take a mistake. We are only human. But when things are moving fast as the speed of light, you have got to think back as to what and why that officer did or didn’t do what he did at the time.

And I worry about when elected officials see it as a political expedience to condemn police officers for something that occurred before they ever get the facts. DAVE REICHERT and I sit on the committee where we review the fact that some day they might have to deal with their own family, so I would take the shifts so they could be with their families. But it didn’t always work out that way. There was a time that the sheriff had to go to the midnight shift, and walked in my house at 6 o’clock in the morning. And what I had just seen the night before, you would have a hard time going to sleep, where you would grab your child, you could remember my youngest child at the time, my only child at the time—grabbing him and hugging him because of what I just saw some other parent do to their child that was unspeakable.

Our men and women, they all serve in the military. Our middle son is a Black Hawk pilot in the Florida Army National Guard. He is also a deputy sheriff in one of the major counties in Florida. He wasn’t sure if that was the right job because, when they went through the class on child abuse, it struck a chord as a new dad: How could anyone do that to them? But do you know what? He has turned out to be a pretty good cop. And we say that with reverence; it is not a derogatory term. There might be some people back in Congress, when they read that so that these young men and these women that suffer the most.

When I was a rookie officer outside of Chicago, right out of the academy, one of my classmates was shot and killed by a 12-year-old in our first year on the job. You never know when it is going to hit.

When Officer Kondek down in Tarpon Springs went to work on the 21st of December, he kissed his wife and his kids goodbye, expecting to be there for Christmas. Little did he know that that was the last day of his life. The person who killed him shot him and then ran him over with a car. This is not what we sign up for.

Where we want to see the America that I love is, the same respect that we give our soldiers returning from war, that we give that to our police officers. That when you see them in a restaurant or you see them on the street or you see them on a call, thank them for what they do. They will be absolutely surprised and amazed, but grateful.

When my sons are in uniform and people come up to them in the military and thank them for their service, there is no reason we can’t do the same for our law enforcement officers.

Congressman REICHERT is probably the most humble guy I know in the stories, and he would never brag about himself, but he is a consummate professional. His bravery is unmatched, and his leadership, I am sure, at that sheriff’s office in Washington State is better for him being sheriff than not.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the sheriff. There might be some people back in Washington State that might disagree with you.

Mr. NUGENT. Well, I guarantee there are a lot of them.

Mr. REICHERT. Absolutely. But I think that what you and I, and everyone who has spoken here tonight, have tried to do is to bring the person-ality, the humanness in the human heart, of a police officer to America tonight. And I think with two sheriffs here, it is a powerful way from the floor of the House of Representatives to share with people across this Nation through this media our thanks and gratitude to each and every man and woman who wears the uniform, who puts their life on the line, who knows that some day when they leave they know there is a possibility that they may not come home, and the families live with that too.

One quick story. I was stabbed in 1973 or ’74. I had my throat slit with a butcher knife at a domestic violence call that we talked about a little earlier. My wife actually found out that I had my throat slit when I was sitting in the hospital watching the news, and they showed me being wheeled into the hospital out of the ambulance. She finally got a phone call, but she didn’t know if I was going to live or die.

That happens every day in this country, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, that happens every day here. An officer is injured, hurt, or killed somewhere across this Nation. And we need to be there, Mr. Speaker, to support them, we need to be there to pray for them and their families, and we need to be there to pray for our communities that they come together and be true partners in protecting our children and our families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we thank you for the opportunity to gather as
Democrats in this 30-minute Special Order opportunity to discuss our Nation’s recent free trade agreements. And I will note that nomenclature: free trade. There are concerns about fair trade being the outcome, and we will be talking about that here in this format.

This is more important now than ever before as our United States Trade Representative Ambassador Michael Froman testified before the House and Senate today. The Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations are being held as we speak this week in New York City. And some Members of Congress have suggested a trade promotion authority bill, better referenced as a “fast track,” that may be introduced in the near future, a fast track that would deny the checks and balances of Congress, one that would not allow us to actively overview the impact of these negotiated settlements, these contracts, and would require a simple thumbs down vote without, again, that interactive quality that serves that responsibility to the Members of Congress.

But before we give away Congress’ ability to conduct proper oversight and review these trade agreements that are currently being negotiated, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we need to discuss how free trade agreements from the past two decades have not delivered on their promises. These trade deals will have far-reaching impacts on American life. They could include impacts on food safety or perhaps affordable medicine or perhaps regulations with the banking industry, the financial industry.

Let’s not be reckless and allow these deals to move forward without thorough and proper consideration by Congress. Frankly, these deals have not lived up to the hype. President Obama indicated as much in his recent State of the Union message: “I’m the first one to say that past trade deals haven’t always lived up to the hype.”

So whether it was NAFTA—the history of agreements in past trade pacts—it is easy to infer the shape of the whole TPP, and it doesn’t look good. There is a real risk that it will benefit the wealthiest sliver of the American and global elite at the expense of everyone else.

Tonight, I hope we can have a thoughtful discussion about jobs, about wages, about environmental standards that could be labor laws that could, perhaps, be thrust upon us that have been promised for every FTA in the past two decades. Sadly, our constituents are looking for that sort of progressive outcome that has not been realized, and, certainly, our workers have been impacted. I represent a district that is tremendously impacted by these trade negotiations.

So, tonight, it is a pleasure to work with my colleagues in order to get out the message about the broken promises of our trade treaties.

I see my good friend and colleague who has been a very passionate voice on speaking out about these issues. He is Tim Ryan, our Representative from Ohio’s 13th District. Let me yield to Mr. Ryan so he can share some thoughts with us.

Welcome.

Mr. Ryan of Ohio. Thank you so much. I want to thank the gentleman from New York. It is always fun to be here with you in the later evening hours.

As I am listening to you talk about fair trade versus free trade and about some of these agreements, you have just got to go to the communities. I mean, this is not rocket science. Go to the communities that have been impacted over the last 20 or 30 years, going back to NAFTA and CAFTA and all of these other agreements, and look at the damage. Look at what has happened in places like Youngstown, Ohio, or in up-state New York or in Connecticut or up and down the east coast.

Mr. Speaker, we have, in Ohio, several companies that after the NAFTA agreement, started moving, wholesale, their manufacturing facilities from Warren, Ohio, or Youngstown, Ohio, to just over the border in Mexico—to just over the border with cheaper labor and no environmental or labor standards to be seen—and shipping the products right back over, decimating communities across Ohio, like the ones that we represent.

There is a State route in Ohio, State Route 7. It goes from the lake all the way down the Ohio River. If you want to see what these trade agreements have done in the heartland, go take a ride down Route 7, especially the southern part. Go through Steubenville, Youngstown, East Liverpool, and return to Portsmouth; go through Athens County, and you will see the erosion of what used to be the industrial might of the United States of America. They have eroded communities.

The ripple effect—the job aspect of it—is of unemployed people. Now there is no one to support the schools. Now there is no one to support the mental health levy. Now there is no one to support the library levy—no one to throw $20 in the basket at church on Sunday. The ripple effect throughout these communities has decimated the middle class, our communities, and has reduced opportunity for our young people, whom we want to thrive in manufacturing in the United States.

I don’t want to see the GDP. I don’t want to see numbers. I want to see what it is doing for average Americans and middle class people of this country. How does it help them? Drive through the communities, and you are going to see the evidence that we have not negotiated these agreements. If there is growth and if there are increased profits and if the stock market is going up, where is that money going? It is not going to the middle class people. There used to be middle class people in our congressional districts, and I have told this story before. We have a $1 billion steel mill that is located in Youngstown now. Why? The company asked us to fight to put tariffs on the dumped Chinese steel tubing that was coming in, and the President, to his credit, put the tariffs on. They built the steel mill.

So, when you level the playing field—if you are dumping or if you are manipulating your currency, which is something that we have got to get in this agreement, real teeth into the currency manipulation issue—or the environment or labor, then people and companies will reinvest back in the United...
States, and you can reinvigorate State Route 7, going north and south in Ohio. To me, that is the most important part. What are we going to do? How are we going to write agreements? How are we going to structure our trade to operate in a way that draws investment into the United States?

One last piece. The small- and medium-sized manufacturers get hammered in this. Do you want pro business? Do you want to be pro middle-class, small business, medium-sized businesses, tool and dye makers, mom-and-pop manufacturers that operate in communities like ours—the people who treat their employees like they are family and are the ones who sponsor the Little League team or the soccer team? They are getting wiped out in these agreements, and we are not factoring them in.

If we want a small, robust middle-class business community in the smaller and mid-sized cities in America, these are the kinds of things we need to factor in when we are operating. Yes, we have got to invest in roads. Yes, we have got to invest in infrastructure. We have got to do research. We have got to make sure that we have an educated, skilled workforce, and we should invest in manufacturing and all the rest; but the trade agreements are key. If you look at what Korea has done to our auto industry and to our trade deficit with Korea—just those two things—we have lost tens of thousands of jobs because of the Korea trade agreement, and our trade deficit with them has skyrocketed. The proof is in the pudding. If we want to bring back the State Route 7s in the Ohio of America, then we need to do exactly what you are saying, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Tonko.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a good friend and colleague who is a very outspoken voice for social and economic justice, who has spoken to the unfairness of these negotiated arrangements for trade, and who has led us as a Democratic Caucus in this House to speak out forcefully about the fast-track process and about fair trade versus free trade. She is none other than my good friend and colleague from the Third District of the State of Connecticut, Rosa Delauro.

Ms. DELAUNO. Thank you so much to my colleague from New York and to my colleague from Ohio, Tim Ryan, who is just leaving the floor, and we have got Wisconsin in the House with Mr. POCAN.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you for taking the lead on this effort. I can’t tell you how proud I am to join with men and women in this body who understand what is going on in the lives of working families today.

Mr. Speaker, they are struggling. We need to walk in their shoes. That is what our job is—to represent their interests in this body. What do we know? We know there are jobs in the future today that don’t pay them enough money to survive. That is why we are organized and are taking on a process which can do nothing but harm them in the future.

All of us who are engaged in this effort have been long supporters of the President’s and the administration’s, and we believe genuinely that he wants to improve the lives of working Americans; but one of all of us will oppose the administration because they are following the exact same trade policy that has failed in the past.

The administration claims that the Trans-Pacific Partnership will bring jobs back to the United States, will raise our wages, but experience tells us that far too many trade agreements have done the exact opposite. The TPP is based on the same model as the Korea agreement, negotiated just 2 years ago. Since that time, the United States’ trade deficit with South Korea has exploded by 50 percent. That translates into 60,000 lost jobs. This is a familiar picture: Korean products flood in, and American jobs flood out. When adjusted for inflation, our wages continue to slide.

Princeton economist Alan Blinder estimates that as many as a quarter of Americans are now in the foreseeable future, and we know from past experience that the people who are laid off will see a significant drop in their wages—that is, if they are able to find another job.

The trade agreements we have signed over the last 25 years have done nothing to ensure fair competition. Let’s take one example. The deals have failed to address the problem, which our colleague Congressman Ryan mentioned, of currency manipulation. It is an unfair, artificial practice that has been devastating our automotive industry for a generation.

Morgan Stanley estimates that currency manipulation gives each imported Japanese car an effective subsidy of between $1,500 and $5,700. That is neither free nor fair.

Leading economist Fred Bergsten of the Peterson Institute wrote in Foreign Affairs just within the last several days:

The United States has paid a major economic price for not having established an effective currency manipulation policy.

In the last Congress, 230 Members—both Republicans and Democrats—wrote to the United States Trade Representative to demand the inclusion of a strong and an enforceable currency manipulation chapter in the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. So far, we have been ignored and dismissed. Put simply, if the agreement does not address currency manipulation, it will not be worth the paper that it is written on. It will be a green light to those who seek to compete unfairly with American manufacturing, and it will take away American jobs.

The administration’s arguments about jobs have failed. They know that there are no jobs in the future in those agreements, and we are taking a stand against them. So, instead, as with past trade agreements, we hear the fallback arguments based on foreign policy.

I am very thankful for the invite here, and I appreciate your passion and how you and I understand, of currency manipulation. It is neither free nor fair. The proof is in the pudding. If we want to bring back the State Route 7s in the Ohio of America, then we need to do exactly what you are saying, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Tonko.
Earlier today, the U.S. Trade Representative told our colleagues in the Senate that he expected a deal “in the next small number of months.” How can the Congress give guidance on a deal that we have never seen, a deal that is, for all intents and purposes, already done?

Once again, we see fast track for what it really is. It is an attempt to cut the Congress out of the process altogether. We should not stand for this, and when we get that fast-track bill, we should vote it down. Bitter experience tells us that bad trade deals devastate jobs, devastate wages. That is why we should say “no” to this deeply flawed Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I can’t thank you enough for taking on this job of being here at 7 at night, all of us together, to say “no.” I think what we want to convey to the American public is that we are committed to work on their behalf and to make sure that they have a decent shot at the American Dream. The people in the town I come from and represent. That town used to be a thousand jobs in that region. With trade deal after trade deal, I have watched the number of products made in the United States diminish. T-shirts, it is almost impossible to find a mill that still makes T-shirts and apparel in the United States. Almost everything is done overseas, even things like pens and our emblem pins. It is almost impossible to find American-made pens.

In my area, just 45 minutes south from Madison, Wisconsin, is the city of Janesville, where the assembly of General Motors Ryans is done from and represents. That town used to have a thousand good, family-supporting wages at a company called Parker Pen which made quality, American-made pens. At one point, that was a thousand jobs in that town.

With trade deal after trade deal, finally, a few years ago, we watched the last 150 of those jobs go to Mexico, those family-supporting wages that no longer exist in the community. They were then hit by GM closing down, which allowed even further job loss in that community.

As Representative Delauro said, it is those people that used to make $25 an hour in a manufacturing job who lose so much, now, the best that might be available to them is a $10-an-hour job. You can’t pay your mortgage when you go from $25 an hour to $10 an hour. You can’t send your kids to college when you used to make $35 an hour and, now, you are making $10 an hour.

Those are the jobs we have seen all too often leave because of bad trade deals; whether it be New York, Connecticu, Ohio, or Wisconsin, we have all seen some bad thing happen across our communities.

As much as I do agree with the President when he said in the State of the Union, Look, I’m the first one to admit that past trade deals haven’t always lived up to the hype—I think we all agree on that. What we have seen is that those jobs promised don’t happen, and that is why we have concern.

Tonight, I want to talk specifically about fast track authority. That is where we give up our right as Members of Congress, which means we give up our constituents’ right—a say—in these trade deals. This isn’t a Democratic issue. It isn’t a Republican issue. It is an Independent issue. It is in the Constitution. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution says the Congress has the sole power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations.”

For 200 years, that is the way it was, but President Nixon changed that when he seized those powers through a mechanism called fast track. It is a legislative technique used to kind of skid the way through for these trade deals.

The problem with that is, when we do fast-track authority, we give up our rights as Members of Congress and, therefore, the public’s right to question what is in one of these trade deals, the next trade deal that can have even more jobs leave the United States.

We give up our ability to debate and to amend these agreements, and that is what fast-track authority is. That is very likely the first vote we would see on the floor of Congress, which the President asked for in the State of the Union, that gives our sole authority to the President.

Now, I have a lot of respect and I agree with so much of what President Obama has done, but this isn’t about President Obama, and it is not about President George Bush, it is not about President Nixon or any other President who has tried to get these powers. It is about our ability as Members of Congress and the public to have a say through these trade deals.

When you look at this and you think about the history of the fast-track process, the last time we authorized fast track was in 2002, at 3:30 in the morning, right before a congressional recess, to bring this antiquated mechanism into place, and it was approved by only three votes.

Since 2007, Congress has refused this extreme procedure, even after it was getting renamed to try to make it sound a little more palatable. The reason is so many reasons why we shouldn’t give up our authority. If you think about it, people say: If we don’t give the President authority, we won’t get trade expansion.

Well, fast track isn’t needed for that. In fact, President Bill Clinton was denied fast-track authority for 6 of his 8 years in his office, but he completed more than 100 trade investment pacts without fast track.

We are giving away our ability to actually see this document which, as you know, we haven’t seen. There are 29 chapters, only of which about five affect trade, and everything else from currency manipulation to medicines to food safety, all those things now are thrown into these deals that go way beyond what it was originally in place for, and we would have no say in that. Fast track has been used 16 times in the history of this country, and usually, it is to enact more controversial trade deals.

Bottom line, we know that the U.S. Trade Representative right now is redoing their Web site to make it more transparent. Here is transparency to
me: show us the text, show Members of Congress the text, show our staff the text, show the public the text.

If this deal is as good as they have promised, then show us how great it is; but if this is nothing more than warmed over fast track or something else that is going to cost us jobs and depress our wages, then that is usually when this procedure is put in place. No offense to this President or to any President, but Congress has to have its say on fast track.

I just want to commend you, again, for doing this. I just wanted to come by for a very few minutes to talk about that, but as this procedure could be coming before us in the coming month or months, we have to be ready.

We are going to work together, as we have been, to make sure we do everything possible to make sure the public knows what is in this deal, and that means Congress has to have our say, and that is why we have to oppose fast track.

Again, I thank the gentleman for this time. I continue to look forward to working with you on this issue.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative POEAN. I again urge the general public out there to engage in this process. Let your Representative know if you believe we should have overview authority and that we should have the chance to know what is in these negotiated agreements.

This affects our American economy, the American jobs. It is about jobs. It is about wages. It is about critical labor standards. It is about critical environmental standards. We can make it happen. We can work on trade issues and have fair trade out there that will grow our economy and grow the American Dream for America’s working families.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

179. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for 2015, pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 6, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

180. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Cuba: Providing Support for the Cuban People (70 FR 60699, October 26, 2005; AG42) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 501a(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.


182. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a report on a real estate lease transaction for a Charter School within the Sherman Building, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 411; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.


219. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-519, “Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper committee, as follows.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper committee, as follows.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 181. A bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking (Rept. 114-7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 265. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers commercial sex acts (Rept. 114-8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCGRATH. Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 399. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-10, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCULHOLLAND. Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCULHOLLAND. Committee on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 350 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCULHOLLAND. Committee on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 350 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCULHOLLAND. Committee on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 350 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. KELLY of Illinois (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):
H.R. 540. A bill to amend part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for lower income individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELISON, Mr. GARCÍA-PRYCE, and Mr. SCOTT):
H.R. 540. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOEBSACK, and Mr. POLIS:
H.R. 541. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students to transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPERS:
H.R. 542. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of doctors of chiropractic in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BOURNE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FLISCHMANN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):
H.R. 543. A bill to repeal title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):
H.R. 544. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions of the families of the New York Police Department Detectives Wenyen Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:
H.R. 545. A bill to add engaging in or supporting hostilities against the United States to the list of crimes for which United States nationals would lose their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Ms. CAS-TRO of Florida, Mr. BEUTLER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RHECKETT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BILIRakis, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):
H.R. 546. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children’s Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that major professional sports leagues from qualifying as tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):
H.R. 548. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to exclude the application of such title to employment practices that are in compliance with Federal regulations, and State laws, in certain areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):
H.R. 549. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to authorize the EEOC to approve commencing or intervening in certain litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WALL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. HERSHEY):
H.R. 550. A bill to amend the National Employment Opportunity Commission to maintain up-to-date information on its website regarding charges and actions brought by the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 552. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate all Federal-imposed mandates over the local budget process and financial management of the District of Columbia; and to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BRAT):
H.R. 553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of 529 plans and Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. BRAT):
H.R. 554. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of 529 plans and Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. MEEK):
H.R. 555. A bill to require an Exchange to establish or authorize an Exchange to establish a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):
H.R. 556. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapy services to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KATKO, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FUDGE, and Mr. JOYCE):
H.R. 557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, as part of the National Urban Search and Rescue System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. PENNIKER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GABRAM, Mr. GARCÍA-PrYCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ORourke, Mr. REED, Mr. RISSE, Mr. VISCO, Mr. WINTER, Mr. BUMKUS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STIVIRS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROE, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):
H.R. 558. A bill to amend the War Powers Resolution to limit the use of funds for introduction of the Armed Forces into hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 559. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to assess the impact of school start times on student health, well-being, and performance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 560. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce the amount of time a patient has to wait for treatment for cancer.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 561. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to assess the impact of school start times on student health, well-being, and performance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):
H.R. 563. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Merchant Marine Equity Compensation Fund to provide benefits to individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. SCHRADE):

H.R. 564. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reduce predation on endangered Columbia River salmon and other nonlisted species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FUCAN, Ms. ROYAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SPIREI, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 565. A bill to stimulate collaboration with respect to, and provide for coordination and coherence of, the Nation’s science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, for education for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 566. A bill to award grants to improve equality of access to technology-enabled education innovations and understanding of how partnerships of educational agencies and research institutions design and implement such innovations in ways that improve student outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 567. A bill to provide that a former Member of Congress receiving compensation as a lobbyist shall be ineligible to receive certain Federal retirement benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. McNINNEY):

H.R. 568. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on the impact of thermal insulation on both energy and water use for homes built after July 1, 2017, to provide for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 569. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on portions of the Outer Continental Shelf located off the coast of New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 570. A bill to discontinue Radio Marti and Radio Free Cuba, to provide for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services, and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 571. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of whistleblower complaints by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 572. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. G RIFFITH, Mr. D EFAZIO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. G ARRETT, Mr. N EUGEBAUER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 573. A bill to make competitive awards to national estuary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HOEVEN of Michigan, Mr. LUNSTADT, Mr. STEUTZMAN, Mr. MULVANY, Mr. HULTHORN, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 574. A bill to prohibit contributions by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to the Housing Trust Fund and the Capital Market Fund for the expense of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, or receivership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. MILLER of Arizona):

H.R. 575. A bill to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 576. A bill to amend the definition of “homeless person” under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 577. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs acquiring authorities to purchase mobile dental units to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 578. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to restore service standards in effect as of July 1, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 579. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ethics in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STIVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. POR of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COOK, and Ms. BORADALLO):

H.R. 580. A resolution affirming the support of the United States for Macedonia’s accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LIFINSKI, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. KAPURT, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MINGO):

H.R. 581. A resolution urging the Secretary of State that in 2015, a year of significant anniversaries for the Jewish people, United States embassies in appropriate countries should commemorate this anniversary year with significant public events including the message that the opportunities for remembrance and reflection contained in these anniversaries are applicable to all peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERY:

H.R. 582. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

1. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 42, requesting the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the state legislature to amend the constitution to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 589. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Taxing Clause, USC Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States[,]"). The Action for Dental Health Act would use federal tax dollars to provide grants to oral health professionals to purchase mobile dental units to provide free dental services to underserved
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:
H.R. 540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:
H.R. 542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLACK:
H.R. 543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:
H.R. 544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the Sixteenth Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:
H.R. 545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARTON:
H.R. 546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII, Clause 1.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:
H.R. 548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 US Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:
H.R. 549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution.

By Mr. BARTON:
H.R. 550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WALBERG:
H.R. 551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:
H.R. 551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MESSIER:
H.R. 553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MESSIER:
H.R. 554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. BLACK:
H.R. 555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:
H.R. 557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:
H.R. 558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:
H.R. 559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power... (7) To establish Post Offices and post Roads..."

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:
H.R. 559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8. "Congress shall have the Power... (7) To establish Post Offices and post Roads..."

By Mr. CHABOT:
H.R. 560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIBSON:
H.R. 560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:
H.R. 563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:
H.R. 564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:
H.R. 565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:
H.R. 566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ISHIBASHI:
H.R. 567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution states that: a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:
H.R. 569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power... (7) To establish Post Offices and post Roads..."

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:
H.R. 571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. MULLIN:
H.R. 572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:
H.R. 573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
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Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROYCE:
H.R. 574.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and with the Indian Tribes”), and 18 (“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”).

By Ms. SINEMA:
H.R. 575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. STIVERS:
H.R. 576.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. ZINKE:
H.R. 577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H.R. 20: Mr. Veasey.
H.R. 21: Mr. Jones, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Nugent, Mr. Perry, and Mr. Bridenstine.
H.R. 131: Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. DeSaulnier of California, Mr. Long, Mr. Jenkins of West Virginia, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Costello, and Mr. Schweikert.
H.R. 173: Mr. Rouzer.
H.R. 174: Mr. Bost and Mr. Hurt of Virginia.
H.R. 181: Ms. McSally.
H.R. 196: Mr. Lipinski and Mr. Lowenthal.
H.R. 190: Mr. Peters and Mr. Crowley.
H.R. 217: Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Womack, Mr. Miller of Florida, Mr. Rohrabacher, Mr. Boustany, Mr. Brouillette, Mr. Crenshaw, and Mr. Schweikert.
H.R. 242: Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. McNerney, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mrs. Kirkpatrick and Ms. Roybal-Allard.
H.R. 246: Mr. Gibson and Ms. Herrera Beutler.

H.R. 5758: Mr. Lowenthal.
H.R. 263: Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 264: Mr. McNerney and Ms. McCollum.
H.R. 268: Mr. Salmon.
H.R. 285: Ms. McSally, Mr. Russell and Ms. Sinema.
H.R. 287: Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas.
H.R. 317: Mr. D rush.
H.R. 333: Mr. Courtney, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Jolly and Mr. McGovern.
H.R. 348: Mr. Russell.
H.R. 349: Mr. Collins of New York.
H.R. 350: Ms. Sinema.
H.R. 351: Mr. Westerman.
H.R. 359: Mr. Cartwright and Ms. Sinema.
H.R. 367: Mr. McGovern.
H.R. 383: Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania and Mr. Gosar.
H.R. 391: Mr. Maxine Waters of California.
H.R. 398: Mr. Kilmer, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Bishop of Michigan, Ms. McSally, and Ms. Herrera Beutler.
H.R. 400: Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Wehr of Texas, Mr. Grayson, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Smith of New Jersey.
H.R. 401: Mr. Schrock, Mr. Wittman, Mr. Zinke, Mr. Coffman, Mr. Messer, Mr. Pompeo, Mr. Rokita, Mr. Latta, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana and Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas.
H.R. 413: Mr. Dent.
H.R. 419: Mr. Massie, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Gosar and Mrs. Lum limbs.
H.R. 420: Mr. Gosar and Mr. Mulvaney.
H.R. 424: Mr. Welch.
H.R. 426: Mr. Duncan of South Carolina, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina and Mr. Farenthold.
H.R. 427: Mr. Reed and Mr. Schweikert.
H.R. 430: Mr. Yarmuth.
H.R. 431: Ms. DelBene, Ms. Tsongas, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Polis, Ms. Esty, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Kuster, Ms. Tittus, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Ms. Bustos, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Honda, Ms. Eshoo, Mrs. Torres, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Takano, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Fattah, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mrs. Mimi Walters of California, Mr. Garbarino, Mr. Larsen of Connecticut, Mr. Crenshaw and Mr. Ping.
H.R. 437: Mr. Hoven, Mr. Ellisson, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Hurd of Texas, Mr. Rush, Mr. Clay, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Pallone, Ms. Norton, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Veasey, Mr. Norcross, Ms. Moore, Mr. Himes, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Ms. McGovern, Ms. Kaptur, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Grayson, Mr. Gutiérrez, Mr. Hinojosa, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Schiavoni, Mr. Neal, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Mcdermott, Mr. Foster, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Israel, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Barea, Mr. Peters, Mr. Heuck of Washington, Ms. McCollum, Ms. Cárdenas, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. Sires, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Kind, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. H. Bowler of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Price of North Carolina and Mr. Loessack.
H.R. 438: Mr. Peters.
H.R. 443: Mr. Amodei.
H.R. 459: Mr. Westerman.
H.R. 460: Ms. McSally and Ms. Herrera Beutler.
H.R. 461: Mr. Miller of Florida and Mr. Poe of Texas.
H.R. 473: Mr. Hultskamp.
H.R. 484: Mr. McHenry.
H.R. 494: Mr. Messer.
H.R. 509: Ms. Fudge, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi and Mr. Higgins.
H.R. 518: Mr. Joyce.
H.R. 519: Mr. Wittman, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, and Mr. Burgess.
H.R. 525: Ms. Titus and Mr. Hufman.
H.R. 527: Mr. Curbelo of Florida.
H.R. 529: Mr. Paulsen, Mr. Gibson, and Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. DesJarlais and Mr. LaTta.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. Ben Ray Luján of New Mexico.
H.J. Res. 25: Mr. Veasey.
H. Res. 11: Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Wehr of Texas, and Mr. Rogers of Alabama.
H. Res. 17: Mr. Hult of Virginia.
H. Res. 26: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Risch, Mr. Forbes, Mr. Hult of Virginia, Mrs. Hartleroe, and Mr. Russell.
H. Res. 28: Mr. Schiff.
H. Res. 32: Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Waltz, and Mr. Crowley.
H. Res. 45: Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Yoder, and Mr. Mulvaney.
H. Res. 49: Mr. Smith of New Jersey.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 26, 2015]

OFFERED BY Mr. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 341 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY Mr. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agricultural in H.R. 399 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.
The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

O Lord, our rock. You are our shield in the time of storm. We give You our hopes and dreams, knowing that You know what is best for our Nation and world.

Sustain our lawmakers. May integrity and uprightness be the standards for their conduct so that they will not be put to shame. Lift the light of Your countenance upon them and be gracious to them. Give them fresh strength and wisdom, as You renew the drumbeat of Your Spirit in their hearts, empowering them to march to the rhythm of Your righteousness.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will resume consideration of the Keystone bill. This is the third week of floor consideration for this bipartisan jobs and infrastructure measure. Senators from both sides have been able to offer amendments and get their ideas voted on. I know Chairman MURKOWSKI is here, and she is working with colleagues to get their amendments in the queue. It is now time to get through the remaining amendments and to vote up or down on passage of the bill.

KEYSTONE JOBS BILL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Keystone jobs bill is a bipartisan infrastructure project the American people deserve, so the vote last night to filibuster was certainly disappointing. The Keystone jobs bill has been considered and reported out of the energy committee. It has been subject to weeks of open debate. Senators on both sides have been able to offer and vote on amendments—two dozen so far and counting. Our Democratic friends have had more amendments considered on this bill than Republicans, more amendments than all of last year combined.

Just a few days ago we offered our friends the opportunity to have even more of their amendments voted on. Unfortunately, they rejected that offer. So today I am asking them to reconsider, join us, and work with the bill managers, Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL. Let’s get your amendments processed, and let’s make progress for the American people.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senators who are working on the amendments on the Keystone Canadian pipeline. This is the highest priority of the new Republican majority, a pipeline that is being built on behalf of a Canadian company.

You would think there would be a lot of other possibilities here to create jobs for America, but the Senate Republicans are focused on this one. Ultimately it will produce 33 permanent jobs in America, and this is their highest priority. Had they taken up instead the Federal highway bill—a bill which is looming in terms of a deadline this year—we literally could have created thousands of American jobs across America, not just in one pipeline location. But they chose instead to help this Canadian company build this pipeline.

Sadly, it won’t produce products that can help America. We had an amendment offered here on the floor that said any refined products that came from this pipeline would be sold in America. It was defeated. Every Republican voted against that amendment.

Then we offered an amendment that said this pipeline, if it is going to be built in America, should use American steel. Every Republican voted against that, save one.

The notion that we are going to use foreign steel to build a pipeline for a Canadian company so that the refined products from that pipeline can be exported overseas is somehow, in the eyes of the majority in the Senate, an American jobs bill. I don’t think the American people would agree with that. They would understand, if we were taking up the Federal highway bill, that is an American jobs bill. We put construction workers across the United States to work and create an infrastructure that would build on the economy, creating more jobs in communities from Arizona to Illinois, from Florida to the State of Washington. But instead we are focused on the Keystone Canadian pipeline, the highest priority of the Senate Republican majority.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in a little more than a month the Department
The Department of Homeland Security more than any other single agency is responsible for keeping America safe from terrorism. They supervise and manage the TSA officers and airports. They collect weapons that people try to bring on airplanes. It is hard to imagine that people still do. They try to keep us safe at a time when we know terrorism is a threat not just in the United States but in countries all over the world.

Yet the Republicans in the House and Senate do not want to give regular funding to the Department of Homeland Security. They put it on temporary funding. As Mr. Johnson, the Senate department, said, it puts them at a real disadvantage at the Department of Homeland Security in keeping America safe. Yet the Republicans have insisted on this. Why? Why would they withhold regular funding for this Department, a Department that is exercising the President's decision to issue Executive orders on immigration? Their anger over the President's action has led them to jeopardize the immediate funding of an agency of critical importance to the United States. So they set out in the House of Representatives to add five riders to this appropriations bill which they insist must be passed if we are going to fund this agency. When you look at these five riders, I think you can understand why many of us think this is nothing short of an outrage.

One of the things which they have set their sights on is a program I have worked on for 14 years here in the Senate. I introduced a bill 14 years ago called the DREAM Act—14 years ago. The concept behind it was very basic: Children brought to the United States by their parents who are undocumented deserve a chance—a chance to make an honest living if they have not committed serious criminal issues, if they have graduated from high school, if they are prepared to step forward, go to college, and serve in the military. The DREAM Act was introduced 14 years ago with a basic concept: Don't hold children responsible for decisions or wrongdoing by their parents. Give these young people a chance.

Sadly, in the House of Representatives there is an anger against these young people that is almost difficult to describe. We think there are almost 2 million of them in America, and 600,000 have stepped forward to qualify for the DACA Program, an Executive order by the President that spares them from deportation while they are living in the United States. But the House of Representatives has insisted that we repeal the DACA Program, not issue any renewals for DACA protection, and not issue any new DACA protection for the 1.5 million who may still be eligible. That is one of their conditions before they will fund the agency that deals with terrorism to protect the United States from terrorism.

This last year there were several very unusual and important meetings involving the American political scene. One was in California hosted by the Koch brothers which attracted three of our Senators on the other side of the aisle who were at least considering, if not aspiring to be President of the United States. The Koch brothers called them in for a presentation and questions as part of the process of deciding whether the Koch brothers would support them to be the next President of the United States. That is not the first time that has happened. Others representing special interest groups I am sure have called candidates before. This is a very overt effort by two very powerful men to spend almost $1 billion in the next political cycle to control the political future of this country.

As troubling as that is for most Americans to hear, there was another forum that I think was equally disturbing for the American people who may still be eligible for the DREAM Act. This was a forum called by Congressman STEVE KING. He called it a freedom forum. He attracted a large array of Republican aspirants to the office of President. Included in those were Governor Christie of New Jersey; Senator Cruz of Texas; former Senator Santorum of Pennsylvania; Scott Walker, the governor of Wisconsin; former Governor Palin of Alaska; Donald Trump; former Governor Perry of Texas; and former Governor Mike Huckabee of Arkansas. They all came to Iowa to be part of this freedom forum. This freedom forum was sponsored by Congressman STEVE KING.

Without question, Congressman King has made some of the most outrageous statements about the DREAMers, whom I described earlier, of any Member of Congress. He has compared them to dogs. He has referred to DREAMers as the deportables—whatever that means.

He has one oft-quoted statement: For every valedictorian among the DREAMers, there were 100 who had developed cantaloupe-sized calves carrying illegal narcotics across the border into the United States. That is a kind of rhetoric which might cause David Duke to blush, but it didn't stop these Republican Presidential aspirants from trekking out to Iowa to pay homage to Congressman STEVE KING.

I would suggest that the Grand Old Party, which I do respect—the party of Abraham Lincoln—would be a party that would be embarrassed by the comments of Congressman King rather than pay homage to him in the State of Iowa.

I wish to tell the story of one of the DREAMers whom Congressman King particularly would come to dislike because he is an undocumented person and one of the DREAMers who would be disadvantaged by the Republican action in the House of Representatives which would literally remove the protection this young lady has from deportation.

This is Ola Kaso. Her story is amazing. She was brought to the United States from Albania in 1998 at the age of 5. She grew up in Warren, MI, and her dream was to become a medical doctor and to treat cancer patients. Ola was the valedictorian of her high school class. She took every advanced placement class offered by her school and had 4.4 grade point average.

She was treasurer of the student council and president of the International Honor Society at her school. In 2011, I held a hearing on the DREAM Act. Ola Kaso had just graduated from high school and she came to testify at that hearing. She was the first ever undocumented immigrant to testify before the Senate.

In the fall of 2011, Ola entered the honors program at the University of Michigan where she is a premed student. What has happened to Ola Kaso since the DREAM Act was established in 2007? Ola has become involved in nanotechnology, a cutting-edge field that holds great promise for future technological breakthroughs. Ola is now conducting research at the Michigan Nanotechnology Institute in the Departments of Chemistry and Electrical Engineering.

Keep in mind that she completed this degree without any financial assistance from our government. Ola is not eligible for Pell grants or student loans because she is undocumented. She has become involved in nanotechnology, a cutting-edge field that holds great promise for future technological breakthroughs. Ola is now conducting research at the Michigan Nanotechnology Institute in the Departments of Chemistry and Electrical Engineering.

Now, that is a mouthful, but it gives you a sense of how much Ola Kaso has to contribute. Next, Ola plans to attend medical school, but if the House Republicans have their way and we pass in the Senate the legislation which was introduced by the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, Ola Kaso will never have a chance. She will be deported back to Albania, a
country she does not know at all. She will be forced to leave the United States.

We will basically give up on the investment we have made as Americans in her education and her potential and tell her to go. In the words of Congressman STEVE KING, she is one of the “deportables”—one of the “deportables.” Ola sent me a letter recently. Here is what she said about her dreams for the future:

I aspire to ultimately become a surgical oncologist, but more importantly, I intend to work for patients that cannot afford the astronomical fees accompanying life-saving surgeries. Patients are denied the medical treatment they deserve. My goal is not to increase my bank account; my goal is to decrease preventable deaths. I wish to remain in this country to make a difference.

Ola is not alone. There are so many DREAMers across this country just like her who want to be part of our future. It is clear this DACA Program works for America. That is why I am asking DREAMers around the country to join me, post their stories about what they have done with DACA on Twitter and Facebook using the hashtag “DBCashtags.”

I want the American people to understand the human cost of the bill that was passed by the Republicans in the House of Representatives and is now pending before the Senate. If this bill becomes law, DACA will end. Hundreds of thousands of DREAMers will risk deportation to countries they can barely remember. Will America be stronger if we deport Ola Kaso and others like her, young people who want to use their talents to give back to America, deporting them to countries they have some loose connection to by family ties?

Of course not. It is shameless—shameless to play politics with the lives of these young people. They grew up in this country, attended school in this country, put their hand over their hearts in their classrooms every day to pledge allegiance to the only flag they have ever known. It is shameless for the House Republicans to put homeland security funding at risk in pursuit of punishing these young people. The House Republicans feel so strongly about deporting DREAMers, they are willing to hold our homeland security funding hostage.

The House Republicans are telling the Senate and the President: Deport the DREAMers or we will shut down the Department of Homeland Security. I hope the Senate majority leader will reject this blackmail and bring a clean homeland security appropriations bill to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible.

For our part, the Senate Democrats will insist that the Department of Homeland Security be funded and that the President have the authority, which every President has, to establish America’s immigration policies. The Presiding Officer was part of an effort, as I was several years, to try to resolve this issue in a thoughtful, balanced, comprehensive way.

The ultimate bill that was considered before the Senate was not perfect. Parts of it I did not like at all, but we reached a compromise. Over a year and a half ago, we sent that bipartisan bill to the House of Representatives asking them to call it for consideration and amendment, revised for more than a year and a half to call that bill. Instead, what they have done is launch these attacks on young people such as Ola Kaso.

Is that what America is all about? Is that the best we can do? For the dozen or more Republican Presidential aspirants who made that journey out to Iowa to pay homage to Congressman STEVE KING and his views about immigration, I would ask them to think, when they return home: Look around you. There are young people just like this young woman who are only asking for a chance to be part of America’s future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Vitter-Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf.

Murkowski (for Sullivan) amendment No. 67 (to amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate methane emissions.

Cardin amendment No. 75 (to amendment No. 2), to provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone Pipeline.

Murkowski amendment No. 98 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities.

Plake amendment No. 103 (to amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs.

Cruz amendment No. 15 (to amendment No. 2), to promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports.

MORAN/Cruz amendment No. 73 (to amendment No. 2), to delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Daines amendment No. 132 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments.

MR. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is International Holocaust Remembrance Day, commemorating the genocide that took place in the last 1½ years of the Second World War, when nearly 6 million Jews by the Nazi regime. On this day in 1945, the allied forces entered Auschwitz, a complex of concentration and death camps in Nazi-occupied Poland. They liberated more than 7,000 prisoners. Auschwitz was made up of 3 main parts: more than 40 subcamps covering over 15 square miles. Between 1940 and 1945 nearly 1.3 million people were deported to Auschwitz and at least 1.1 million were murdered.

By January 1945 the allied forces were closing in. To eliminate witnesses to their crimes, thousands of prisoners were killed at Auschwitz, and 60,000 were forced to march west days before the liberation.

During these marches SS guards shot anyone who fell behind or could not continue. More than 15,000 died in that march. In the midst of that liberation, an elderly French inmate urged a young Jewish prisoner named Ola to watch everything she saw, and when the war was over, to tell the world what she had seen. Ola wrote her memoirs in the years that followed and gave voice to those who could no longer speak.

Yesterday, the Washington Post featured the horrific stories of four Auschwitz survivors, including those who suffered under the sadistic Nazi doctor Josef Mengele, known as the Angel of Death. GEN Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of the allied forces in Europe also understood the importance of documenting what he saw. After visiting a recently liberated Nazi camp, General Eisenhower urged Washington to send a congressional delegation to witness Nazi crimes firsthand so in the future there could be no attempt to dismiss these allegations as mere propaganda. With the remaining eyewitnesses in their twilight years, the responsibility to ensure that future generations never forget these atrocities falls to us. Recently I joined my colleagues Senators MIKULSKI, CARDIN, KIRK and others and introduced a resolution commemorating this important anniversary. This resolution calls on us to be generous to the 1.1 million innocent victims murdered at Auschwitz and honors the legacy of the survivors of the Holocaust.
Last Congress I chaired the Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights. Although I am disappointed that the Republicans chose to change the name of that subcommittee under their leadership, I am going to continue to focus on protecting human rights and civil rights.

When I chaired the subcommittee, I tried to give a platform to voices that are not often heard and to examine what needs to be done to protect human rights. Our responsibility in Congress is to focus on legislation, not lamentation. So we wrote legislation and passed bills to hold the perpetrators of serious human rights violations accountable for their crimes.

In 2007 my Genocide Accountability Act was enacted, allowing prosecution of genocide committed outside the United States or by someone other than a U.S. national outside the United States. The following year President Bush introduced the Accountability Act, which I also introduced. In 2010 the Child Soldiers Accountability Act was used to deport Libyan warlord Dr. George Boley.

I have also authored the Trafficking in Persons Accountability Act, the Human Rights Enforcement Act, the Child Soldiers Accountability Act, the Child Soldiers Prevention Act, the Child Marriage Prevention Act, Congo Conflict Minerals Act, all legislation aimed at protecting human rights in terrible situations, all of which became law.

Our hearts go out to the survivors who mourn their families and the millions of others murdered in the Holocaust. Today many of the survivors will return to Auschwitz. They will recall that moment when they first arrived more than 70 years ago and passed under a sign that mockingly read, in German, “Work makes you free.” Standing before them was Josef Mengele to await their fate. Turning right in the gas chamber, turning left may have meant survival, for a few weeks at least. So many voices were silenced that now we have to tell their stories.

As the memory of the Holocaust passes from those who were there to the generations that were not, we cannot forget the importance of remembrance and speaking out against intolerance wherever and whenever it occurs. Unfortunately these horrible crimes still take place. Consider Boko Haram in Nigeria, ISIL in Syria and Iraq, and the barbaric systems of gulag in North Korea. We cannot be silent.

As Holocaust survivor Ruth Eglash said in yesterday’s Washington Post: “I used to be an optimist until a few years ago, but the situation in the Middle East has changed and the world does not notice anything. . . . The bottom line is, it can happen again and it is happening again in many places, not necessarily to the Jews, but to anyone.

Our promise to hold accountable those who commit the most unspeakable crimes will ring hollow unless we lead the world in punishing those responsible for the gravest human rights violations. I look forward to continuing with my colleagues in the Senate to make progress toward ending genocide and human rights abuses everywhere they exist. We must all proclaim in one voice: Never again.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FUNDING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today on the important issue of funding the Department of Homeland Security. It is clear that he will veto any policy riders that undo his Executive action and harm millions of students and their families. The House Republican bill tells DHS to come together and pass a clean appropriations bill with regard to this agency.

The Department of Homeland Security, or DHS, is charged with border security and immigration enforcement. They are responsible for aviation security, emergency management, response, counterterrorism, and cybersecurity.

Democrats and Republicans have long worked together to make sure our hard-working Federal officers on the border, in our airports, and at our ports can continue their critical work that keeps us safe.

Now the Republican-controlled House would irresponsibly risk shutting down the Department of Homeland Security to score political points over the President’s immigration actions. Today I object to the effort to shut down DHS over the President’s immigration Executive action because it is not only an irresponsible strategy from a security point of view, but it comes with a real cost in the everyday lives of students and parents.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security is set to expire February 27. The President has been clear that he will veto any policy riders that undo his Executive action and harm millions of students and their families. The House Republican bill forces DHS to go after families and deport children and families. This is an untenable choice.

Looking at the votes in the House, it is clear some Members of Congress would on the one hand say our immigration focus should be on securing our border, while on the other hand they risk turning off the lights at Border Patrol stations because they disagree with the President’s immigration policies.

Last year I led a congressional delegation to McAllen, TX, and to Lackland Air Force Base to see the humanitarian crisis on the border first-hand. My colleagues and I were heartbroken after seeing children as young as 7 years old in Customs and Border Protection facilities.

But what we also saw were hard-working border agents doing the best they could under the circumstances in an already stressed immigration system. These agents should know that we in Washington are going to give them the resources they need to do their jobs, not irresponsibly shut down the Department of Homeland Security for whom they work.

Instead of threatening to shut down the government’s primary homeland security agency, we should be working together to once again pass bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform. Republicans and Democrats agree our immigration system is broken.

With his Executive action President Obama took a step to bring millions across the country out of the shadows and keep U.S. citizens and their families safe. His Congressional action that puts families first is needed if we are to permanently fix our immigration system.

The President’s Executive action helps millions of people across America who are working hard to make life even harder for these people, this indefinite action puts families first is needed if we are to permanently fix our immigration system.

Those who oppose the President’s action, which is reflected in the House Republican bill, say that the President and enforcement officers must act with absolutely no discretion. This position contemplates and, in fact, supports the removal of nearly 12 million undocumented people from our country. This is paramount to a policy of mass deportation.

If mass deportation were enacted, DHS would need an exponential increase in funding and resources. Billions in increased spending without any permanent fixes or reforms is not a viable option. Even if we somehow have the resources to enact the policy of mass deportation, doing so would devastate our economy, removing millions of hard-working people who would no longer be working, running businesses, buying our goods and products. That would lead to over $2.5 trillion of economic loss to our country in just a decade.

Mass deportation is not a serious solution for immigration reform. It simply is not possible for DHS to remove every undocumented person from this country.

Passing the House bill would just make life even harder for these people, many of whom are already some of the hardest working people in our Nation. As I’ve mentioned, there are nearly 12 million undocumented people living in communities across America. Many have been living here for years or decades. They are parents, they are small
business owners, and they are our neighbors and our children’s class-
mates at school.

They are people such as Bianca, a woman who lives in Hawaii with her family. After moving to the United States over a decade ago, Bianca met her husband. They moved to the place where they had always dreamed of living—Hawaii, naturally—and began a family there.

Bianca’s work visa and her husband’s work permit, temporary, and like many immigrant families they faced a tough decision to remain after their visas expired and to continue building a life here in America. Bianca and her husband started with nothing. Today they have two small businesses on Oahu and four American children—children born in the United States. Their businesses employ American citi-
zens. They pay their taxes, and they work hard to provide for their families and be engaged in the community. Because of the President’s order, Bianca and her family no longer live in fear every single day of being torn from the life they have built in Hawaii.

The House Republicans’ mass deportation policy is a serious proposal in only one regard: it would result in serious, negative consequences for our economy, our government, and millions of families in our country.

In contrast, prioritizing deporting felons, not families and students, is simple and easy to understand, and that is what the President’s Executive order does.

Now is the time when we should be working together on commonsense and comprehensive immigration reform that the vast majority of Americans support. Comprehensive immigration reform is supported by 70 percent of the American people. In the past Congress, nearly 70 percent of the Senate sup-
ported our bipartisan immigration bill.

Our bipartisan bill was a compromise that modernized our immigration system, addressed visa backlogs, and allowed millions of undocumented people to step out of the shadows, get in line, and work toward becoming American citizens. Compre-
prehensive immigration reform would have spurred economic growth in our country by over $100 billion per year while helping to bring down the deficit.

The only thing that kept this bipartisan reform bill from becoming law was that the Speaker BOEHNER re-
fused to give the bill an up-or-down vote in the House. Recklessly shutting down the Department of Homeland Secu-
rit y will not fix our broken immigration sys-
tem. Undoing the President’s Executive action will not fix our broken immigration system. We must work together, and we must fund the Department of Homeland Security so that they can continue to protect our country, and we must come together to pass commonsense reform that Ameri-
cans support.

Both sides of the aisle agree that we are a nation of immigrants and our im-
migration system is broken. We don’t need to shut down the Department of Homeland Security or round up and de-
port millions of families and individ-
uals.

We can start that process with a clean DHS funding bill, and I urge my Republican colleagues to bring one to the floor quic-

click to the beginning of the file.
I stand in support of the Keystone Pipeline project. As an Alaskan, I feel it is important to talk about this bill and the importance of American energy infrastructure.

We live in a State with one of the world's largest pipelines. In 1973, after bitter debate—similar to the debate about Keystone—Congress passed a bill that led to the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System—what we in Alaska call TAPS. It almost didn't happen. The Vice President at the time, serving as the President of the Senate, cast the tie-breaking vote. Then, like now, opponents howled. They said TAPS would be an environmental disaster. They said bird and caribou populations would be decimated.

But none of that happened. In fact, birds and caribou flourished, showing we can develop energy infrastructure responsibly with the highest standards in the world. Alaska proves this every day. TAPS was completed in 1978. It has carried almost 17 billion barrels of oil to energy-thirsty American markets. It is a technological and environmental marvel and a critical component of America's energy infrastructure. It has been a resounding success for this country and for my State. It is the engine of growth for Alaska's economy. The proven safest, most environ-
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big dreams, and TAPS helps fuel these dreams.

In Alaska, the very air we breathe is bathed in promise. The people still speak the language of bold ideas and rugged adventure. It is these people of all colors and creeds who make up the tapestry that gives America its strength. It is the enormous opportunities of our natural resources—whether world-class fisheries or oil and gas reserves—that drive the economic engine of my State.

But despite this promise and opportunity, I also see anxiety and frustration, and even fear, in the eyes of my fellow Alaskans, just as I know others are seeing this across the country. Despite what we are hearing from this administration, Americans have real reasons to feel this way.

Business startups are at a 35-year low, as is the percentage of Americans actually looking for work. More small businesses failed than were started this past quarter. Half of Americans now believe their kids’ future will be less promising than their own.

Believing that we will leave our children a better tomorrow is the essence of the American dream. But for many, that dream is starting to fade. This does not have to be. We live in a State and a country with so much untapped potential, so many opportunities, and so much promise that can bring limitless possibilities for our kids and our grandkids. The reason Alaska and throughout America, people are feeling that the heavy hand of the Federal Government is not working in their interests.

The boldness of America is being bludgeoned by bureaucrats, with new Executive orders and regulations arising everywhere. And every time another one of those unneeded, often absurd, regulations is promulgated, a little bit of hope dies.

A little bit of hope dies every time a doctor, nurse, or pharmacist is barred from providing the care they were trained to give; every time someone loses health care because of the complexities and costs of ObamaCare.

A little hope dies when a rural community wants to build a road that will protect its citizens and is told by the Secretary of the Interior that birds are more important than their lives.

And a lot of hope dies when the people in my State are told that the resources that are rightfully theirs can’t be developed, and their lands and water cannot be used and hunted to put food on their table.

I support the Keystone Pipeline. It will create thousands of jobs. That is why it has the overwhelming support of American labor unions. It will enhance America’s energy infrastructure and contribute billions to our economy. That is why it has the support of the American people.

But just one bill, one pipeline, one project is not enough. It is not nearly enough.

Since the founding of this country we have had important debates right here, on this floor, about the role of the Federal Government in our lives. Judging from what Americans are telling us, the reach of the Federal Government has hit its limits, it has exceeded its limits. Our citizens are telling us that their government—and it is their government—has gone well beyond deriving its powers from the consent of the governed. The American people are telling us, what Alaskans are telling me is they want a Federal Government that helps ignite their hope, not smother it.

We have a job to do. We must work to address the anxiety and frustration of the people we serve. We must work to once again unleash the great potential that is Alaska and America. And we must work to reinvigorate faith in the American dream.

How do we do this? Let me suggest two ideas.

First, we must stop delaying economic projects that benefit our citizens. Purposeful delays and roadblocks have been the hallmark of this administration in infrastructure projects that benefit Americans, and Alaska has been ground zero for such delays. Bridges, roads, mines that take years simply to permit, not to build; oil wells that cannot be drilled on Federal lands; billions of dollars of leases from the private sector to the Federal Government; a state-of-the-art clean coal plant that sits idle for over a decade despite the dire need for lower cost energy throughout Alaska.

The Keystone Pipeline project that has been studied for 6 years, is just the latest example of the willful delay that has been the weapon of choice for this administration for killing projects they don’t like.

Enough is enough. We are Americans. We know what we are capable of. We built the 1,700-mile Alaskan-Canadian Highway, the Alcan Highway, through some of the world’s most rugged terrain, in less than a year. We built the Empire State Building in 410 days. The Pentagon was built in 36 months. There is no reason that Keystone should have been studied for 6 years.

If the executive branch continues to dither on America’s economic future, Congress can and should act to expedite such projects. That is what we are doing with Keystone, and that is what I will be pressing the Congress to do for Alaska’s and America’s next great energy infrastructure project—the Alaska LNG project—which will create thousands of jobs and provide clean and affordable energy to Americans and our allies for decades.

Second, we need more, not less, access to our Federal lands. As Americans, these are our lands. We own them. They are not the Department of the Interior’s or BLM’s lands. Yet this administration is adamant on keeping us from responsibly developing them. Once again, Alaska is ground zero for their efforts.

Through Executive orders of various dubious legal merit, this administration locked up half the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska. This isn’t a national park. NPRA is an area specifically set aside by Congress for oil and gas development. And just this weekend, in another brazen action, the Obama administration announced they are working to lock up millions of acres of land on Alaska’s coastal plain, an area where the Nation’s richest oil and gas prospects.

This is an affront to Alaskans and Americans who cherish security—energy security—the rule of law, and the strength of our Nation, and it is an affront to Members of Congress regardless of party. How we develop Alaska’s lands is an area where Congress, not the Executive, has preeminent authority.

I think the Obama administration needs a reminder of what article 4, section 3 of the Constitution states:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . .

This brings me to my third point: We must get back to the rule of law. The rule of law, carefully built up and nurtured for centuries in America, is a fundamental pillar of our great Nation. Most countries don’t have it. We do. It is a gift. But if we continue to erode this rule of law, we ultimately undermine what it means to be an American, and it will be hard to get it back.

But I hope, because there are still enough of us here who respect the rule of law and see the Constitution not as a mere suggestion but as the foundation for the structure of our government and our individual liberties. There have been cracks in the foundation recently, but the people sent us here to repair those cracks.

Fourth, while I believe in a limited Federal Government, it is important to recognize where the Federal Government does not have the authority to take. We need to carry out its duties with more efficiency and compassion, particularly toward the most vulnerable in society. This is especially true when it comes to honoring the sacred trusts of responsibility we have toward our veterans.

That is why I cosponsored the Clay Hunt suicide prevention bill. I am confident my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will quickly vote on this important measure and move it on to the President’s desk.

It is also why I will support effective programs where the Federal Government and States can work together to address our problems throughout this country with regard to sexual assault and domestic violence.

Fifth, and finally, we must challenge the conventional wisdom that has existed in this town for decades that the Federal Government’s power and intrusiveness should always be expanding like some inevitable force of nature. Nowhere is this more important than reforming the overgrown regulatory thicket that strangles our future.
According to the President’s own Small Business Administration, Federal regulations impose an annual burden on our economy of close to $2 trillion. That is roughly $15,000 per year per American family. Federal regulations are sapping our strength as a Nation. They undermine our common sense, and others are not authorized by law or the Constitution as they must be. And, increasingly, those who promulgate and enforce them are showing less and less restraint for the well-being of American families. Federal regulations impose an annual burden on our economy of close to $2 trillion. That is roughly $15,000 per year per American family. Federal regulations are sapping our strength as a Nation. They undermine our common sense, and others are not authorized by law or the Constitution as they must be. And, increasingly, those who promulgate and enforce them are showing less and less restraint for the well-being of American families.

The recent Obama administration ANWR assault is the latest example, and I will use all of my power to protect the economic growth and prosperity of Alaska. That is why I have already filed amendments with Senator Murkowski to rescind the Obama administration’s ANWR order. I have also filed an amendment that seeks to check another abuse of Federal power. When the EPA was initially authorized, no one thought it necessary to arm its employees with weapons. But today, in a classic case of Federal Government power creep, close to 200 armed EPA agents are roaming our country. It is a disturbing fact. But it is particularly disturbing for a small group of miners who, during the summer of 2013, prospecting for gold in Chicken, AK, were swarmed by armed EPA agents. This wasn’t some huge mining conglomerate. This was a small mining operation in interior Alaska—sluice boxes with specks of Alaska gold, and EPA agents armed with rifles, body armor, a helicopter overhead, looking for Clean Water Act violations. They found none. And apart from terrifying the miners, they accomplished nothing.

As Alaska’s former attorney general and commissioner of Natural Resources, I have worked with many fine Federal agents, and I understand the importance of responsible regulation that is based on the directives of Congress. But problems arise when regulations become excessive—and big problems arise when regulators are given guns to enforce these regulations. It is our responsibility to say: Enough; to stand up for those we serve, and to roll back Federal power when necessary. I am all for a country with an armed citizenry. As a marine, I have taken an oath to defend and fight for this critical constitutional freedom. However, I am not for a country with an armed bureaucracy.

Let’s give my State and the rest of the country a little hope that we are doing the jobs they sent us here to do. One concrete step in that direction would be to pass this simple amendment I am offering to disarm the EPA. They can certainly do their job without having guns. They have done so in the past, and they should be able to do so in the future.

Finally, I will close with a few words on how I view my mission here. I suspect it doesn’t differ greatly from what most of us hope to accomplish. We all want the best for the people we serve and the States we represent. We want to be strong here at home, which will help us be respected once again by our allies and feared by our adversaries. We want our children to be safe and secure, and we want the same for our neighbors.

We want to live in a country of unlimited opportunity—a country of Alaska-sized dreams. We want a government that holds dear what our Founding Fathers knew—that all people are, by the Constitution, the consent of the governed. I think most of us can agree that we must unleash our country’s enormous economic potential once again.

I believe our government should be helping us, not hindering us from achieving these efforts. I believe unlocking our country’s vast energy potential is one of the best ways to rekindle the American dream. Despite challenges, despite big government creeping into our lives, and despite armed EPA agents, we continue to live in the greatest country in the world—in the history of the world. There is no doubt about that. The people who sent us here still have big dreams. Let’s help those dreams grow and their hopes flourish. I thank the Presiding Officer. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cruz). The junior leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President. I wish to congratulate our new colleague from Alaska on his initial address to the Senate and just comment that it could not be more timely, as his State is obviously under assault by this administration. His prescription for the way forward, both for Alaska and America, strikes me as entirely appropriate for our country, and I congratulate our colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I wish to thank the majority leader for his kind words and all my other colleagues who came to witness a new Senator’s maiden speech. I applaud the President’s Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell for working to secure the green light from the Obama administration to expand Indiana’s successful consumer-driven approach that empowers members and provides access to quality care.

This agreement will expand an existing program to more than 350,000 low-income Hoosiers and allow the State of Indiana to end traditional Medicaid for all nondisabled adults between the ages of 19 and 64. They will...
to be secure. North American energy independence is not a myth. It is real. But we have to have the will to make it happen—we certainly have the resources. We just need the ability, the opportunity to be able to develop them. So get out of the way and let us do this.

My colleague from Washington and I have been working all morning trying to see if we can’t identify a series of amendments that we might be able to move to this afternoon. We would like to give colleagues a sense of how we are going to be advancing through these additional amendments, get some additional amendments up pending, and really lay out that process. I think we have had really constructive conversation this morning, and I am encouraged. Obviously, we have a few more issues to work out, but I am hopeful we will be able to announce—hopefully in the short term—a glide-path that will give Members a little more certainty. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Hatch.

GUANTANAMO DETAINEES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise in support of S. 165, which restores many of the terrorist detainee transfer safeguards that were weakened in the fiscal year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, as well as imposes a 2-year bar on the transfer of detainees to Yemen.

This legislation has been authored by Senator KELLY AYotte, one of the Senate’s foremost leaders on national security, and its cosponsors include the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, and the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator RICHARD BURR, as well as the Senate’s preeminent expert on military law, Senator LINDSKY GRAHAM.

I am honored to add my name to the list of Senators who have cosponsored this legislation.

Mr. President, the effect of this legislation is to preserve the ability of the
United States to detain at our facilities at Guantanamo Bay members of Al Qaeda and the Taliban—the organizations responsible for the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Why is keeping Guantanamo open so important?

Simply put, Guantanamo affords our military a safe and secure location to detain those individuals held under the law of war or for violations of the law of war.

If an enemy combatant is captured during an armed conflict, that individual can be held under the law of war. It is a generally accepted legal principle that a captured combatant is either to be released, tried and punished for a crime, or executed. This principle, reiterated in the Supreme Court case Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, recognizes that enemy combatants can be held under the law of war.

In sidestep of law of war detainees in the United States. However, if these detainees are held under the law of war, they can be held indefinitely until the threat they pose is amply demonstrated; and as long as they are confirmed or suspected of rejoining the fight against the United States.

The detainee population of Guantanamo contains battle-hardened terrorists. The threat they pose is amply demonstrated, specifically since 29 percent of Guantanamo detainees released so far are confirmed or suspected of rejoining the United States.

Mr. President, if Congress and the American people are truly to understand the risks inherent in this administration's insistence on releasing Guantanamo Bay detainees, we must consider this combined number. How can that be deeply flawed?

Mr. Sloan goes on to state that the level of recidivism is much lower since 2009. However, this lower rate, if accurate, undoubtedly does not include the five senior leaders who were illegally released to Qatar and whose 1-year travel ban is about to expire. Unless the Qatari Government prevents it, soon these terrorists will be free to go wherever they wish.

I am also concerned that this new number might not fully incorporate the activities and future actions of those detainees who have been transferred in recent months. One of the major advantages of locating our detention operations at Guantanamo Bay is that it is well-settled law that the United States can hold individuals held under the law of war or for violations of the law of war at our facilities there.

But the Obama administration, bent on an ideological crusade to empty Guantanamo no matter the cost, succumbed to the temptation to relax transfer restrictions less than 6 months after the enactment of the Fiscal Year 2014 Defense Authorization Act. The newly weakened provisions permitted the transfer of detainees overseas as long as the Secretary of Defense determined that the individual is no longer a threat to the national security of the United States.

Clearly there are ample and compelling legal and national security reasons to maintain our detention operations at Guantanamo Bay. Senator AYOTTE's legislation is necessary to ensure the individual cannot threaten the national security of the United States.

While the statute does require the Secretary of Defense to take into consideration a number of factors before making this decision, the reality of the new regime is that the Secretary has far more ability to transfer detainees overseas.

The Obama administration quickly seized on this new power. In the past year the number of Guantanamo Bay detainees has been decreased from 155 to 122. And despite this new transfer authority, the Obama administration had the audacity to violate even the relaxed transfer restrictions less than 6 months after the law's enactment—specifically by transferring five senior Taliban commanders to Qatar without providing Congress 30 days of notification. Since then, the administration, after a brief lull, has continued and even increased the pace of detainees being transferred overseas.

The Obama administration quickly seized on this new power. In the past year the number of Guantanamo Bay detainees has been decreased from 155 to 122. And despite this new transfer authority, the Obama administration had the audacity to violate even the relaxed transfer restrictions less than 6 months after the enactment of the law. Specifically, it requires the Secretary of Defense to certify in writing, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that the individual cannot pose a threat of recidivism.

While the statute does require the Secretary of Defense to take into consideration a number of factors before making this decision, the reality of the new regime is that the Secretary has far more ability to transfer detainees overseas.

The Obama administration quickly seized on this new power. In the past year the number of Guantanamo Bay detainees has been decreased from 155 to 122. And despite this new transfer authority, the Obama administration had the audacity to violate even the relaxed transfer restrictions less than 6 months after the enactment of the law. Specifically, it requires the Secretary of Defense to certify in writing, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that the individual cannot pose a threat of recidivism.
Yemen is one of our most critical partners in the fight against terror, and we cooperate closely with the Yemeni Government in the fight against Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. But because of the presence of this menacing group, the Yemeni border and the security situation there are dire, and it seems to be deteriorating as we speak.

Just last week the Houthis, a Shia rebel group, seized control of Yemen's Presidential palace, forcing the resignation of President, Prime Minister, and Cabinet. In December of 2013 AQAP launched a well-coordinated assault on the Yemeni Ministry of Defense that left 52 dead, not to mention a number of jailbreaks from the Yemeni correctional facilities in which, according to press reports, numerous members of AQAP were freed.

The unvarnished truth is that it will take many years and much effort to bring about the security improvements in Yemen we need before we can be confident that detainees returned there will not return to the battlefield. That is why this section of Senator AYOTTE's legislation is so important.

Our policies must be based on defeating the threats facing our Nation, not pacifying the ideological passions of an extreme few, which is why I was so disappointed by another recent New York Times editorial about this legislation. The Times called Senator AYOTTE's proposal "odd." If you believe that, for citing the very real threat of a Paris-style attack on the homeland and termed her description of Yemen as "the wild, wild West," as "odd." I cannot imagine a better way of Yemen as "the wild, wild West," as "odd." I cannot imagine a better way of "odd." I cannot imagine a better way of the security situation in Yemen. And based on years of evidence, one can only conclude Senator AYOTTE is right. Frankly, I believe the New York Times owes Senator AYOTTE an apology, and I hope they will be big enough to do that.

We need this legislation because it restores proper protections from the threats posed by released detainees. I hope the rest of my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to make a statement about the Keystone XL Pipeline. This comes before this body some 4 years ago. I said at the time that the pipeline was a good idea. Why? Because it would create construction jobs. It would reduce America's reliance on Middle Eastern oil for our energy. I said also that the pipeline must be built right. What does that mean? It means two things. First, Keystone must be built to the highest of safety standards. That only makes sense. And we must have respect for private property rights when that pipeline is built. Just like everything else in Washington, the Keystone was eventually made into a political football, and it has dragged on for 4 years. It has taken on a life of its own. And to be straight and level with you, folks on both sides of the aisle have turned it into something much bigger than it really is.

At the start of the 114th Congress, I was hopeful that there would be enough momentum behind the pipeline to finally get it done and begin construction. But since the swearing-in ceremony 3 weeks ago, my faith in our ability to have a deliberative debate has been shaken. Last week's political stunt is unacceptable. We can't tell the American people we are going to responsibly govern when in fact we stopped Senators from even speaking on the floor about amendments they have offered.

The majority decried these kinds of practices last Congress. Many of us agreed. But to start with these kinds of actions in the new Congress is discouraging, to say the least. I hope this week we can have an open debate, make a few more votes, and finally approve the Keystone Pipeline for building.

Ten days ago an oil pipeline burst in eastern Indiana. It spilled about 40,000 gallons of oil into and around the Yellow River. Residents in Dawson County, MT, had their water cut off for 5 days after oil got into the local water treatment plant. Cleanup crews are slowly making progress removing oil from an ice-covered river.

What is more, it was completely preventable. The pipeline that burst last week was nearly 60 years old. It had not been inspected in at least 2 years. Pipelines, just like roads and bridges and railroads, get old and they wear out. If we want pipelines to operate properly, they need to be regularly inspected and upgraded.

In December, during the lameduck Congress, legislation had been offered by Senator MENENDEZ stating that TransCanada can only acquire land from willing sellers. But there are Members of the U.S. Senate who put profits of a foreign corporation above the constitutional rights of American citizens. If someone had told me in January of 2007, when I was first sworn in, that my colleagues would one day vote against such an amendment, I simply would not have believed it, but that is exactly what happened. I am disappointed that amendment failed, but I do believe we can improve upon this bill by including commonsense reporting requirements that would ensure this pipeline is built in a transparent way.

Senator KIRK has an amendment to do just that, and I for one support it. Private property rights should not be a partisan issue, and I would hope my colleagues would join me in supporting this measure. Let's not race to cloture. Let's not race to trample private property rights. Let's get this bill passed, and let's do it in the right way.

This pipeline is not a long-term solution for our energy problems, but it is one piece of the puzzle. We must make meaningful investments in research and development so we can make carbon-neutral energy sources more accessible and affordable. Until we do that,
the reality is that this economy still runs on oil.

This pipeline helps get us to the next step. I still believe in this pipeline. I believe Keystone can boost our energy independence and will create jobs in the short term. It will save money but we need a chance to make it better, to make the pipelines safer, and send a message to the American people that we are serious about investing in our long-term energy future. If we don't do that, we won't have this pipeline.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. 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. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the Keystone XL Pipeline. At the outset this Senator wants to say the conclusion of this Senator is that this is much more about politics as opposed to energy policy, than it is about the economy of this country, particularly so since the price of oil has gone from something in excess of $100 a barrel down to the range of $46 a barrel.

Likewise, the fact that the United States is now the No. 1 producer of oil in the world—in large part because of our brethren and sistren in the Senate who represent those Northern Plains States as well as the Southwestern States where they are producing all of this newly found oil from the shale rock which has strengthened the economic position of our country. Think about it, No. 1 producer in the world. That is us. As a result, we do not have to be nearly as dependent on the Middle East where we used to get at least 50, 60 percent of our oil or from other areas such as Nigeria or Venezuela.

I have just mentioned three very unstable parts of the world. Yet that is the position we have been in, but that has changed. It is now the 21st century. As a result of new technologies, we are the No. 1 producer of oil in the world. So back when we were not, when we were still dependent on foreign oil, there were political reasons in Canada—Western Canada—the ability to extract oil from the heavy tar in these tar sands.

The Canadians wanted an outlet for that. It made it much more appealing to us, to the United States back then, when oil was $100 a barrel and we were still importing a lot of it from abroad. But interestingly, the Canadians wanted and suggested a pipeline that would come right through the middle of the United States, from the north in Canada, through the middle of the United States, down to the gulf coast, to the refineries.

Why didn't they go west from the western States of Canada to the Pacific coast, to the refineries. When oil was over $100 a barrel and we didn't have an outlet. It made it much more appealing for them to sell that. It was those who are proposing what we are about to vote on, is going right down the gulf of America, right down the middle of America to the gulf coast, and it is going to be exported to foreign countries.

Mr. NELSON. No. Can do. This foreign oil, for those who are proposing what we are about to vote on, is going right down the gulf of America, right down the middle of America to the gulf coast, and it is going to be exported to foreign countries.

Mr. NELSON. This Senator said, back in the Presidential election of 2012: If you really want a bigger pipeline and you want to avoid all of the controversy over the environment, which this proposed route certainly has since it is extra large, why do you not just run it along the existing pipeline? The right of way is already there. Indeed, it is now complete all the way to the gulf coast. Why don't we just do it right along and you would have a lot less opposition?

But no. This Senator comes back to his main point: This is all about politics. It is all about trying to make some look as though they are anti-environment, and they look as though they are pro-energy. But it is what it is. It is 2 years later, and here we are.

The proposal is to still come across parts of Montana, South Dakota, further east in Nebraska, and join with the existing pipeline. So what is confronting a Senator such as this who certainly wants us to be energy independent? Well, then, if we are going to have additional oil supplies as a backup, maybe that would be a good consideration. So let's make sure this new source of foreign oil—that we have a chance to use it in this country, since it is going to come right down the middle of America.

Mr. NELSON. Why didn't they go west from the western States of Canada to the Pacific coast, to the refineries.

When oil was over $100 a barrel and we didn't have an outlet. It made it much more appealing for them to sell that. It was those who are proposing what we are about to vote on, is going right down the gulf of America, right down the middle of America to the gulf coast, and it is going to be exported to foreign countries.

Mr. NELSON. This Senator said, back in the Presidential election of 2012: If you really want a bigger pipeline and you want to avoid all of the controversy over the environment, which this proposed route certainly has since it is extra large, why do you not just run it along the existing pipeline? The right of way is already there. Indeed, it is now complete all the way to the gulf coast. Why don't we just do it right along and you would have a lot less opposition?

But no. This Senator comes back to his main point: This is all about politics. It is all about trying to make some look as though they are anti-environment, and they look as though they are pro-energy. But it is what it is. It is 2 years later, and here we are.

The proposal is to still come across parts of Montana, South Dakota, further east in Nebraska, and join with the existing pipeline. So what is confronting a Senator such as this who certainly wants us to be energy independent? Well, then, if we are going to have additional oil supplies as a backup, maybe that would be a good consideration. So let's make sure this new source of foreign oil—that we have a chance to use it in this country, since it is going to come right down the middle of America.

Mr. NELSON. Why did they go west from the western States of Canada to the Pacific coast, to the refineries.

When oil was over $100 a barrel and we didn't have an outlet. It made it much more appealing for them to sell that. It was those who are proposing what we are about to vote on, is going right down the gulf of America, right down the middle of America to the gulf coast, and it is going to be exported to foreign countries.
rather than being dependent on foreign nations for oil, nations whose interests are very different and sometimes hostile to our own.

No, 4, building the Keystone Pipeline is unequivocally better for the environment. Indeed, I have joked: If you are a bearded, tattooed, Birkenstock-wear- ing, tree-hugging, Green Peace activist, you should love the Keystone Pipeline. Otherwise, the pipeline is not built, it means we will continue to bring our oil in on overseas tankers and on rail, both of which are far more dangerous for the environment than a pipeline, both of which we know to a certainty that as long as there are tankers on the oceans there will be spills, as long as there is rail there will be spills.

Moreover, if the pipeline is not built north-south, it is not as though our friends the Canadians are simply going to leave the oil where it is, they are going to build the pipeline east-west, and instead of allowing it to be refined in America where it produces high-paying jobs here up and down the Gulf coast here, the alternative is it would be refined in Asia and China in far dirtier refineries that pollute the environment even more.

So this ought to be a no-brainer. This ought to be a truism. Republicans and Democrats come together in agreement. But, sadly, it is not, and it is not because the modern Democratic Party has made a decision between two traditionally favored children—Republicans and Democrats. The modern Democratic Party has made a decision that they care more about the campaign donations from California environmentalist billionaires than they do about the jobs for union members.

I suggest that the 100 Senators who are elected to the Senate ought to be fighting for the hard-working men and women. We ought to be fighting for the union members, for all of the men and women who work in the oil and gas industry. It used to be that the backbone of the American middle class was the blue-collar jobs where you could go back to his or her State and face the constituents and explain why he or she voted against that hard-working man or woman having a job.

Yet what is the Democratic Party doing? Marshelling every vote it can to vote against union members, to vote against hard-working men and women, to stand with the big dollars coming out of California. What a sad, sad statement of priorities that is.

So let me commend Majority leader MITCH McCONNELL for bringing up an open process, allowing Democrats amendments. I would be happy to vote on Democratic amendments all day long and Republican amendments on the merits. Let the majority—indeed become richer under President Lions and billionaires whom the middle class have gotten fat and happy. Indeed become richer under President Lions and billionaires whom the middle class have gotten fat and happy.

Today the top 1 percent earn a higher income than anywhere since 1928. Those who walk the corridors of power in the Obama administration have gotten fat and happy.

Yet for working men and women, union members, their lives have gotten harder and harder and harder. We have today, the lowest labor-force participation since 1978. Median income in this country has stagnated for two decades. For projects to non-FTA countries, right now there are no time limits and no standardized process by which the Department of Energy determines whether or not the project is "in the public interest" for receiving a permit. The amendment I have offered would allow expedited LNG exports because they want to continue receiving money from the California billionaires had better be prepared to return home to their States, look into the eyes of the manufacturing workers, and explain why they voted against 76,000 new manufacturing jobs. Geopolitically, let's take Ukraine. All of us sat not long ago in the House of Representatives for a joint session when the President of Ukraine addressed us both here and over—standing, quite literally, alongside Ukraine. If we want action to match those words, then every Senator should vote yes on this amendment.
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Ukraine currently relies on natural gas for 40 percent of its energy needs. More than 60 percent of the natural gas that Ukraine gets and depends on comes from Russia, and Russia uses that natural gas as a club to extract economic concessions from Ukraine. Last spring I traveled to Ukraine, Poland, and Estonia. As I visited with leaders throughout Europe, these friends of ours said over and over: Help us free ourselves from energy blackmail from Russia. As I reported, the Department of Energy has approved nine export permits to non-free-trade agreement countries within the past 2 years. Twenty-eight applications are currently pending stacked up on the desk, going nowhere. The increased energy production from allowing us to export the resources we have to friends and allies who want and need it would spur investment and create thousands of jobs for America. It would be a boon to our energy security. It would be a boon to Europe, and it would be a boon to the Baltics, which are watching what is happening in Ukraine and wondering: Are we next? It would be a boon to friends of ours, such as Germany, which depend on Russia for significant energy needs.

Today this body faces a pivotal question. Will we lead the world into a new generation of American prosperity and energy prosperity led by the American energy renaissance we are experiencing or will we instead shut off our borders, erect walls, and allow our friends and allies to be dependent on tyrants such as Putin or Maduro. We need to come together in a bipartisan manner to say we support jobs, we support economic growth, and we support standing united alongside our friends and allies in defense of freedom. I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Texas.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we all know, there is a big game this weekend, and I wouldn’t be surprised if our friends from Washington and from the New England area find themselves a little bit distracted beyond the “snowpocalypse.” I guess they call it, all the big games.

In anticipation of the big game, I am told that 100 million Americans will actually tune in to the Super Bowl this weekend. And here is a shocking statistic. Some 1.25 billion chicken wings will be consumed—1.25 billion chicken wings—enjoyed, of course, millions of Super Bowl fans, celebrating what has, of course, become in many ways an unofficial American holiday. I am still stuck on the 1.25 billion chicken wings.

Well, while many of us will tune in to cheer our favorite team in the Super Bowl, unfortunately—and what I am on the floor to talk about—there is the dark underbelly of events such as the Super Bowl that don’t get the attention they really deserve. Most of us would, perhaps, prefer to avert our gaze or think about other, more pleasant, positive things, but what I want to talk about briefly is the practice of human trafficking.

When many people hear about human trafficking, they think about something that doesn’t happen in America; it happens somewhere else. They might envision brothels in foreign cities or girls being smuggled across other borders. Human trafficking is a problem all across the United States and at all times of the year. But it is especially a problem surrounding big, public events such as the Super Bowl.

Yes, human trafficking is happening in our own backyard, and more than 80 percent of sex trafficking victims in America are U.S. citizens. They are not some person who has been brought to the United States from some foreign country. Eighty percent are U.S. citizens.

As the father of two daughters, one of the most disturbing facts is that the average age of a child who first becomes a victim of sex trafficking is 13 years old.

As I said, recent years have shown an uptick in human trafficking surrounding large events such as the Super Bowl. For example, in Dallas a few years ago, there was a 300-percent increase in sex-for-sale Internet ads. That was in 2011, of course. In 2012, in Indianapolis, police made 68 commercial sex arrests and recovered two human trafficking victims.

One of the worst problems associated with human trafficking is that many of the victims don’t actually consider themselves victims yet because they are so young and so vulnerable that they don’t actually realize they are being used and their future is literally being destroyed.

In 2013, in New Orleans, police made 85 arrests for suspected human trafficking. Of course, this year the Super Bowl is in Phoenix, and no doubt law enforcement in Phoenix will have a vigilant eye in an effort to identify and crack down on the perpetrators. But the truth is most of this is happening right under our nose and we don’t even see it.

We know the police are doing the best they can, but it won’t be enough—it won’t be enough—to stop each one of these crimes. Indeed, staggering numbers of these crimes will continue to be committed. The Super Bowl will be done and gone next Sunday, but after the confetti is cleaned from the field and the fans off their flights home, the work to end this heinous crime known as human trafficking will continue.

As a matter of fact, January is National Human and Drug Trafficking Prevention Month. Human trafficking is a form of human slavery. We thought that was eliminated from our history following the terrible Civil War that took the lives of 600,000 Americans. If you extrapolate the Civil War to today, in terms of population, that would be 3 million Americans who gave their lives. We had the Civil War in large part because of the bane and the abomination of slavery, but the truth is human slavery still exists in the form of sex trafficking.

Awareness is important. As we are driving around our city streets—particularly people driving around in Phoenix this week—we also need to call attention to the actual numbers of people who are actually victims of this crime, and so we need to be vigilant. We need to do what we can to be the eyes and ears of law enforcement and to call in suspicious circumstances. We simply need to do everything we can to stop human trafficking by all means necessary.

This is something that strikes close to home, in Texas, where I come from. Sadly, Texas, in part because of our proximity to the U.S.-Mexico border, sees more human trafficking than many other States. One out of 10 tips received by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center in 2013 involved incidents occurring in Texas. In 2013, over 10 tips were reported more than 1,000 suspected human trafficking incidents in 2007.

So this is a big challenge and a big problem, and it is not going away. According to law enforcement authorities, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime and the third largest criminal enterprise in the world.

And here is something I really don’t understand. When we talk about the criminal organizations—the transnational criminal organizations that smuggle people across the border—most recently in the context of these unaccompanied minor children who came from Central America whose parents paid human traffickers—the cartels, really—let’s say $5,000 apiece, these parents have no knowledge of what will happen to their children once they turn them over to these cartel members. Indeed, these criminal organizations are engaged in the money business, anything that will make a buck. They will traffic in children, they will smuggle immigrants, they will smuggle drugs.

With regard to these same criminal organizations, somehow, some way, we tend to compartmentalize our brains and say: Well, sex trafficking is different from illegal immigration and smuggling. But it is not. It has the same corridors funded by the same people and operated by the same transnational criminal organizations.

Now, back to sex trafficking after that parenthetical comment. This is one of those bipartisan subjects where one of those bipartisan subjects where one of those bipartisan subjects where one of those bipartisan subjects where one of those bipartisan subjects where one of those bipartisan subjects
local community organizations—that are designed to help victims of human trafficking escape, with the aid of law enforcement, and then somehow helping victims to rebuild their lives.

Earlier this month, I partnered with the Sergeant Major, Mr. Senator KLOUCHAR from Minnesota, and Senator KIRK of Illinois to introduce a bill we call the Justice For Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015. I have talked to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, and have underlying to give this bill an early markup in the Judiciary Committee so it will be eligible to come to the floor as soon as we can get it here, because I am going to be asking the majority leader to schedule floor action so we can have a debate and a vote on this important legislation.

What does the legislation do? It provides additional funds for human trafficking support victims, with tens of millions of dollars of additional funds each year that could be financed entirely by criminal fines and fees. This wouldn't be tax dollars, this would be taking basically the fines and the fees paid by people who plead or are convicted of other crimes and putting those funds into a crime victims fund that could be used to help these organizations—these human-trafficking victims support programs.

Again, this legislation would be financed entirely by fines on predators convicted of child pornography, human trafficking, child exploitation, and commercial human smuggling.

This legislation would also assure that victims would have greater access to restitution by requiring the Department of Justice to use criminally forfeited assets to compensate them through a process known as victim restitution.

It is no secret the victims of this terrible crime end up with a lot of psychological and other challenges. We need to help them get on with their lives and to address the terrible things they have experienced.

This legislation would also enhance law enforcement tools to target both sophisticated criminal networks that engage in human trafficking and the predators who increase demand for sex slavery by purchasing innocent children.

This bill now has 20 bipartisan co-sponsors. Some others believe the cynics who say that nothing happens up here on a bipartisan basis. It is just not true. There are some things—and this is one of them, and perhaps one of the most important things—that happen on a bipartisan basis.

The good news is the House of Representatives is voting on companion legislation today, so this legislation should be ready for Senate action. I hope, soon. I hope we can work with our House colleagues and get it to the President as soon as we possibly can.

The bottom line is we need to take a stand against this modern-day slavery and lift up the victims of these crimes whoever and wherever they may be. Again, this is obviously not a political issue. This is something we have the power to address and we must take action to combat this human trafficking all around the world, and the place to start is in our own back yard. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader, Mr. DURBAS, President, let me first commend my colleague from Texas. We sit on opposite sides of the aisle, but there are many things that bring us together, and I certainly support what he has said about the impact of human trafficking.

I took a hearing from the subcommittee on the Constitution, which he now chairs, during this session of Congress, we brought in law enforcement victims and talked about some of the outrageous things which are occurring in our country. I don't know particularly young women. One of the points which my colleague has made, and I have listened carefully, is that we should consider these human trafficking victims as victims.

Many times, sadly in the past, they have been prosecuted as if they were complicit, and many times they are children. They have no knowledge of their rights or obligations and being exploited, as a consequence, they are very reluctant to cooperate with law enforcement if they feel they too might end up in jail, having been victimized twice in the process.

I thank him for his leadership and I look forward to working closely at his legislation and I hope we can work closely together on that.

Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about a pending amendment which troubles me. If there will be much time for debate should we actually consider this amendment, and I want to make my feelings a matter of public record.

This is amendment No. 67 offered by Senator SULLIVAN. This amendment would require—would require—the disarming of Federal law enforcement officers who work for the Environmental Protection Agency.

There are currently about 180 law enforcement agents working for the Environmental Protection Agency. They are trained professional officers and are tasked with investigating and enforcing our Nation's environmental laws. These officers investigate, execute warrants, and make arrests for misdemeanors and felonies under the laws of the Environmental Protection Agency.

This is law enforcement work and it is dangerous work. Many times these officers face the same threats as all law enforcement officers face. According to the Bureau of Justice statistics, there are 73 Federal agencies with law enforcement officers, ranging from the FBI to the Food and Drug Administration and NASA.

EPA's criminal investigators were given law enforcement powers in a law signed by President Reagan in 1988. President Reagan stated his administration actively sought this authority and he was pleased to sign it into law.

The amendment No. 67 of Senator SULLIVAN would prevent these EPA law enforcement officers from being armed while they are carrying out their law enforcement responsibilities. A lot of what these EPA agents do is to investigate suspected cases of illegal dumping of hazardous materials. This can lead to very dangerous situations. The EPA reports its agents have frequently encountered weapons and armed individuals when they have conducted their work.

I take a look at some of these cases. Many people mistakenly believe the Environmental Protection Agency is a group of government employees sitting behind desks and computers in Washington and regional offices who don't have actual violations that are taking place. They are mistaken.

Let me give a few examples for the record. In Marathon, FL, EPA special agents, along with local sheriff's deputies, shot and arrested Mr. Baggett, a Federal fugitive from Utah, after he pointed an assault rifle at them. Baggett was initially arrested by the EPA on pollution-related crimes in the State of Utah. During the initial arrest of Mr. Baggett, a knife and handgun were recovered off his person. Mr. Baggett was considered armed and dangerous due to the amount of firepower he had in his possession.

Firearms recovered from Mr. Baggett included an AR-10 assault rifle, a 12-gauge shotgun, several rifles and handguns, and hundreds of rounds of ammunition. Mr. Baggett was ultimately sentenced to 13 years in prison for his assault and conviction and his environmental crimes conviction.

The Sullivan amendment would say the environmental officer who was trying to arrest this man had to be disarmed. In other words, the environmental law enforcement officer would have no firearm while Mr. Baggett would be holding an arsenal. That is what the Sullivan amendment would do.

During a Mississippi search warrant, seven handguns and a sawed-off pistol-grip shotgun were secured during the warrant. During that same warrant, two handguns were removed from the sweatshirt pocket and hip holster from one subject. Another handgun was removed from the purse of another subject. The sawed-off pistol-grip shotgun was found stored in the cavity of a desk where a drawer was removed and the weapon was pointed directly at the agents of the Environmental Protection Agency when they entered.

If you read the amendment offered by Senator SULLIVAN, he has removed the ability and right of these agents to be armed to protect themselves and to enforce the law, but he continues to require them to do the most basic things under the law. He requires them—continues to require them—to execute and
serve any warrant or other process unarmed. He continues to require them under the statute to make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States, including felonies. Under the Sullivan amendment, so unarmed, they would not be able to do their job.

I can go through a lengthy list here of real-life circumstances where people working for the Environmental Protection Agency literally risked their lives, and they did it at least with the consent of their employer. Investigators with the Federal Bureau of Investigation literally risked their lives, working for the Environmental Protection Agency. If Senator Sullivan wants to maintain in good faith that EPA Criminal Investigators should conduct their criminal investigations unarmed in support of the FBI Joint Terrorist Task Force?

Each Cabinet entity has an Inspector General’s office, and high-traded Criminal Investigators to investigate allegations of excessive force or misconduct. This includes the EPA. In reaching his ill-advised conclusion, Senator Sullivan ignored the fact that Criminal Investigators, did Senator Sullivan’s letter to the Inspector General report to substantiate his conclusion to disarm EPA Criminal Investigators?

EPA Criminal Investigators are a highly trained group of law enforcement officers equipped with firearms to protect themselves and enforce the laws of the United States. Senator Sullivan maintains in good faith that EPA Criminal Investigators should conduct their criminal investigations unarmed in support of the FBI Joint Terrorist Task Force?

In closing, I reference a statement a FLEOA member who serves honorably as a Criminal Investigator with EPA: “We conduct search warrants, arrest warrants, and interviews which brings us into contact with individuals who may be armed or have access to weapons. There is no way we can accomplish our mission safety without a means to protect ourselves.”

Respectfully submitted,

JON ADLER.
such as carbon capture and storage, which can be used not only to reduce the environmental footprint and the greenhouse emissions of oil produced in the Canadian oil sands, but that is technology then that will get adopted in this country and around the world because it produces more energy more cost-effectively, more dependably, and with environmental stewardship. So that is a win on both counts, and here is a place where it is being developed. So let’s empower that investment in new energy with better environmental stewardship as we go forward into the future.

Then the third area I want to touch on for just a minute is pipeline safety because some of the recent spills have been brought up. It is so important that we have the new infrastructure to replace older infrastructure.

For example, the pipeline spill in Poplar, MO, near Glendale, MO, has been brought up. It is a pipeline that I think was originally built and put in place in the 1950s. So we are talking about a 50-year-old pipeline with 50-year-old technology. Whether it is roads or bridges or pipelines or transmission lines or any kind of infrastructure—new infrastructure for this country, but we have to update it. Think about building a road 50 years ago and then not putting in a new one to replace it. We have to replace it with new technologies that have been developed to make it better.

When we talk about trying to get these new infrastructure projects going—again, paid for 100 percent with private dollars—this generates revenue for the taxpayer. This doesn’t take one penny of taxpayer money. This is an $8 billion state-of-the-art pipeline. It is important for all the reasons we have talked about, but it also is the kind of thing that will replace some of the older technologies and give us that updated new infrastructure we need.

So when we hear about a spill, wherever it may occur, we want to make sure it is taken care of and fully remediated and take precautions so it doesn’t happen again. But we have to understand we have to put the new infrastructure in place if we want to reduce the number of spills we have as we continue to rely on infrastructure that is 50 years old—when we don’t make or allow these new investments to be made.

So I will touch on all those for just a few minutes.

Again, I know the bill managers are hard at work. They are having great dialogue. If they come out and are ready to go, I will yield the floor right away to that. Again, the priority is to keep the process moving and get amendments up and have them voted on.

The first issue: It is a Canadian project. It is not a U.S. project. The first point I would make on its face is it is going to move domestically produced crude as well as Canadian crude. Everybody talks about the fact that it starts up in Hardisty and says it is going to move Canadian oil, and then they stop there. But it is not only going to move Canadian oil, it is going to move oil from North Dakota, Montana—light, sweet Bakken shale oil—from this region of our country. So it is going to move more domestic crude as well as Canadian crude. So when somebody says it is just a Canadian project, that is not true. That would be akin to somebody saying it is only a U.S. project because it is moving U.S. oil.

For beginners, it is important that people understand it is not just Canadian oil, it is oil we produce in our country that needs to get to refineries as cost-effectively and safely as possible.

What is happening is because we are being blocked from getting these kind of pipelines developed because they can’t get through the regulatory process, the oil production we are producing is having a difficult time getting to market. We have North Dakota, Montana, and the Bakken area, as well as other areas of the country is all having to move by rail.

For example, right now my State of North Dakota produces 1.2 million barrels of oil a day, second only to Texas, and that number has been growing. That growth I think will slow down right now because the price of oil has come down so much. But the point is we are having to move 700,000 barrels a day by rail because we don’t have the pipelines, such as the Keystone XL Pipeline, approved.

That creates other problems as well. We produce a tremendous number of ag commodities and ag products. We actually are the leader of 14 different major ag commodities in the country—things such as wheat, for example, and many other farm commodities as well. All of those things are tried to be moved up on the rail system because we are trying to move so much oil on the rail that we can’t handle all the congestion.

So it is not just an issue in terms of energy for our country, but it is affecting our other commerce, our farmers, and other goods that are trying to be shipped. It is not just goods that originate from our part of the country but all the goods that go back and forth and are trying to go through that bottleneck.

But the biggest reason it is very much a U.S. project is because it is about getting to energy security and energy independence.

Right now the United States consumes about 18 million barrels of oil a day. We produce about 11 million barrels a day—which is up tremendously in recent years because of production on private and State lands in places such as North Dakota. That means we still import about 7 million barrels a day. We use 18 million barrels of oil a day, and we import 7 million barrels a day. We import 7 million. The amount of oil we get from Canada is increasing. We are up to more than 3 million barrels a day that we import from Canada. So if we take the 11 million we produce plus the 3 million we get from Canada, that is 14. That leaves us 4 million short of what we use on a daily basis. We get that from places such as OPEC, Venezuela, and others. They don’t have very different interests in many cases than our own.

I think the American people very much want to get to a position where we don’t have to rely on OPEC anymore. In fact, the oil we are getting there. We are getting there. As I say, we are at the point now between ourselves and Canada where we have 14 million of the 18 million a day we use covered.

If we can continue to develop our energy resources and work with Canada, we can truly have North American energy security—meaning we don’t have to rely on OPEC anymore for our oil. That is a national security issue. It is an energy issue. It is a jobs issue. It is an economic growth issue. It is a national security issue. Look at what is going on in the Middle East. Americans do not want to rely on OPEC for their oil anymore.

Look at the benefit. As we produce more energy in this country and work with Canada, look at what is happening at the pump. Oil prices are down more than $1 from 1 year ago because we are producing so much more. Basic economics: More supply helps bring prices down. So it is not just about energy independence and energy security for our country. It is about lower energy costs for consumers, for small business. It is not only good for our hard-working Americans as they pull up to the pump and benefit every day from those lower gas prices, but it helps make our economy grow because energy is a foundational industry.

When we have lower-cost energy produced in this country that we know we can rely on, that makes us competitive in every other industry sector in a global economy.

So when somebody says: This is just about a pipeline or it is just about a Canadian issue, it is not the case. This is very much about our energy future in this country and how we are going to build it, both to be energy secure and to make our economy go when we have to compete globally.

The second issue—and I often show this chart because it makes the second part of that energy security point. If we don’t work with this oil comes to us and we control that oil and control our energy future, Canada is going to make other arrangements. They are going to build pipelines to their west coast, and that oil is going to be sent over to our West Coast and then be sent to China from OPEC. That is how life works. We either take advantage of this opportunity with our closest friend and ally in the world or somebody else will.

The next one I want to touch on for just a minute is the environmental. We hear about this so much, the environmental aspects of this project. I have
Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. As we mentioned earlier, we had a very productive morning trying to discern the universe of amendments we may have before us. I think it is very clear that there is genuine interest on both sides of the aisle to find that path forward so we can come to a conclusion on S. 1 and do so in an orderly way—a way that respects the legislative process and a way that allows Members to have opportunities to advance issues they feel strongly about and issues that merit debate on this floor.

We have encouraged Members over the past couple weeks to present their amendments to us. At this point in time we have processed 24 separate amendments. We do have some amendments that are pending on the Republican side—seven to be exact. I do know that there are others that Members would like to be made pending. I have one myself, and I know the Senator from Washington will be speaking to have additional amendments which they would like to offer on their side. So I think we have discussed a process here to get us moving in that direction so that we can get the amendments pending, and then hopefully perhaps by this evening—I don’t want to make any promises—we can begin voting on these amendments.

What I would like to do at this time is turn to my colleague to not only speak to the gentlewomen’s agreement we have in so far as a way forward but also to allow for a couple of amendments to be made pending on her side, and then we will come back and provide that opportunity on the Republican side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for her work on this process and for her legislation. As she said, she and I have a gentlewomen’s agreement to move forward, and we would like to do that so we can finish business on this legislation, and we are working in good faith on that process. Just as she said, we are going to work on getting the next amendment before us. I thank the Senator for her hard work.

I would like to turn to my colleague from California to call up her amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank both of my colleagues for working so hard. I am trying to be a facilitator in this process as well, as the Chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I want to remind everyone that this bill deals with environmental law.
So we know this company had to go and get a number of permits. What this bill does is it says: Once you get a permit, TransCanada, no one can take it away from you.

Imagine. We don’t do that for our companies. You have to walk the walk and talk the talk.

All we say here is, if you violate your permit, it can be revoked. You cannot will-nilly get permits from the Commerce Department, EPA, the Corps of Engineers, utilities, etc., and then violate them and know that the permit can never be taken away. I was stunned when I learned this.

So this would very simply say that if, in fact, there is new information that requires a permit to be changed or modified, it can be done. We do not waive protecting the health and safety of the American people.

Let me give an example. Back home I have a bridge that was built, unfortunately, with foreign parts, and those parts failed. It is a nightmare to try to fix it.

If TransCanada violates their permit and uses the wrong materials—let’s say the bolts rupture—they still get to keep their permit. We are saying: No. Your permit can be revoked.

Another example: This is the handling of hazardous waste. We know this is filthy, dirty oil, and we know what is in this oil. It is toxic. Peer-reviewed research established significantly higher levels of cancer.

We know that we have met with the people who live in Canada who have had to breathe in that air. Data collected by the Texas Cancer Registry indicates that cancer rates among African Americans in Jefferson County, Port Arthur, TX, are 15 percent higher than for the average Texans. They live right near the refineries.

We know these permits are only as good as they are enforced. If they are enforced, we find they haven’t lived up to their commitments on the handling of hazardous waste—by the way, to get their permit from Commerce, they also have to put out a plan that deals with a spill. Let’s say there is a spill and they don’t live up to the permit. They still get to keep the permit.

This is an extraordinary piece of legislation. I have never ever in my time here or ever in history known of any American corporation getting a free pass in terms of the health and safety.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, before recognizing the Senator from California, I failed to say that there is no way this legislation would be where it is today, moving forward in the process, without the Senator from California. She has been a great adviser. All through this process and a great protector and advocate of the issues we are interested in on the environment, on security, and on safety. I thank her for her leadership and look forward to supporting her on this amendment.

I would like to turn to my colleague from Michigan, if I could. We are going to offer a couple of amendments on our side and go back to the Senator from Alaska, but at this point in time I would like the Senator from Michigan, who has had a very devastating personal experience related to tar sands, to talk about his amendment and call up that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2
Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 70, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. PETERS], for himself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 70 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require that the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration make a certification and report to Congress on the results of a study before the pipeline may be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PHMSA GREAT LAKES RESOURCES AND STUDY.

The pipeline described in section 2(a) shall not be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained until the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration certifies to Congress that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has sufficient resources to carry out the duties of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration for pipelines in the Great Lakes; and

(2) submits to Congress the results of a study on recommendations for special conditions for pipelines in the Great Lakes, similar to the recommendations in Appendix B of the environmental impact statement described in section 2(b).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, this is a very comprehensive amendment based on a simple premise. Before Congress intervenes to approve this new pipeline that is before us, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, the Federal agency which oversees pipeline safety, should certify that it has the resources required to carry out its duty.

Specifically, the amendment before the Senate requires PHMSA to confirm that it has the resources to oversee pipelines in the Great Lakes and provide recommendations for special conditions for pipelines in the Great Lakes. It provides recommendations for special conditions for the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The people of Michigan know why it is so important that we ensure these pipelines are safe. We had a pipeline spill in Kalamazoo in 2010 that spilled over 800,000 gallons of tar sands into the Kalamazoo River. The cleanup has now taken over 4 years at a cost of over $1.2 billion. A pipeline accident in the Great Lakes, where we have some of these pipelines located now, would be absolutely catastrophic.

We have to ensure that the pipelines that operate in the Great Lakes, particularly in the Straits of Mackinac, which connects the Upper Peninsula with the Lower Peninsula, have the protections they need.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to make sure we protect the Great Lakes, not just for today but for future generations.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maine to bring up an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2
Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I may call up amendment No. 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 35 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To coordinate the provision of energy retrofitting assistance to schools)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ___. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

(a) Definitions.—In this section:
(1) School.—The term “school” means—
(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1166));
(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 102(a)));
(C) a school of the defense dependents’ education system under the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;
(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;
(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and
(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090(b))).

(2) Secretary.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) Designation of Lead Agency.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

(c) Requirements.—In carrying out coordination and outreach under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—
(1) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies, to determine the energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;
(2) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach program to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enable States, local educational agencies, and schools—
(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and
(B) to form partnerships with Governments, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities to support the initiation of the projects;
(3) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools for the development and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects;
(4) develop and maintain a single online resource website with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, State educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and
(5) establish a process for recognition of schools that—
(A) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and
(B) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

(d) Report.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding to me for this purpose and commend her, as well as the Senator from Washington State, for their extraordinary management of this bill.

I am pleased to report that the amendment I have called up and made pending is actually a bipartisan initiative. It is cosponsored by my colleague from Virginia, Senator WARNER, and its purpose is to help school officials to learn more easily about Federal programs and incentives that are available to improve energy efficiency and thus lower costs for our Nation’s schools.

There are a number of Federal initiatives already available to schools to help them become more energy efficient, but in many cases schools are not taking full advantage of these programs. The reason for that is because they are scattered across several agencies and are difficult to access.

I want to make it clear to my colleagues that Senator WARNER and I are not proposing any new programs to help schools become more energy efficient but rather to have more coordination and to streamline those programs which already exist.

Our amendment would require the Department of Energy to be the leader of these programs and help schools identify and navigate them, and that in turn would be a great service to our Nation’s schools.

As such, by providing a streamlined coordinating structure, this amendment would help schools navigate available Federal programs and financing without authorizing new programs or funding. Decisions about how best to meet the energy needs of their schools would appropriately remain in the hands of States, school boards, and local officials.

Specifically, the amendment would establish the Department of Energy as the lead agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal energy efficiency programs and financing options available to schools for initiating, developing, and financing energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects.

The amendment would also require DOE to review existing Federal programs—scattered at the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Treasury, the IRS, and EPA—so schools know what is available.

It would also streamline communication and outreach to the States, local education agencies, and schools and the development of a mechanism for forming a peer-to-peer network to support the initiation of the projects.

Finally, the amendment would require the Department of Energy to provide technical assistance to help schools navigate the financing and development of such projects to better ensure their success.

Assisting our nation’s schools in navigating and tapping into existing Federal programs to lower energy usage and save money makes good common sense.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Collins-Warner amendment No. 35. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Amendment No. 166 to Amendment No. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up Amendment No. 166.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill clerk reads as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 166 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To release certain wilderness study areas from management for preservation as wilderness)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. RELEASE OF CERTAIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) Bureau of Land Management Land.—

With respect to Bureau of Land Management land identified as a wilderness study area and recommended for designation under section 603(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(a)), if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation Congress has not designated the wilderness study area as wilderness, the area shall no longer be subject to—

(1) section 603(c) of that Act; or
(2) subparagraph (b) of paragraph (2) of Section 5319 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

(b) Fish and Wildlife Service Land.—

With respect to land designated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service that has been recommended by the President or the Secretary of the Interior for designation as wilderness under section 610 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation, Congress has
not designated the land as wilderness, the land shall no longer be managed in a manner that protects the wilderness character of the land.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering this afternoon is pretty straightforward. It would effectively release wilderness study areas if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation, Congress has not designated this study area as wilderness.

There has been a lot of discussion in the news of late with the President's announcement on Sunday that he is seeking to put an additional 12 million acres in the ANWR area—Alaska's North Slope—into wilderness status, including the 1002 area which has specifically been designated for oil and gas exploration. I want to make sure people understand this is not just an ANWR process through its land use planning to identify areas to be proposed as wilderness.

There is some history as to how we got to dealing with these wilderness study areas. Congress has designated 109.8 million acres of Federal land as wilderness. Just over half of this wilderness is in my State of Alaska. We have over 57 million acres of wilderness in Alaska. Ninety percent of the wilderness under the management of the Fish and Wildlife Service is in Alaska.

As a practical matter, there is more out there. There are more acres that are proposed for wilderness designation. For example, the Bureau of Land Management—BLM—has 528 wilderness study areas containing almost 12.8 million acres located primarily in the 12 States in the West as well as Alaska.

We also have the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which has a wilderness study process through its Janet use planning to identify areas to be proposed as wilderness.

There is some history as to how we got to dealing with these wilderness study areas that are identified by agency officials as having certain wilderness characteristics—as identified under the 1964 Wilderness Act—were classified as wilderness study areas. BLM received specific direction in the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 to inventory and study its roadless areas for wilderness characteristics. By 1980 the BLM completed field inventories which designated about 25 million acres of wilderness. Since 1980 Congress has taken a look at some of these. Some have been designated as wilderness and others have been released for nonwilderness use. The BLM has also taken it upon itself to designate wilderness study areas through its land use process.

The point here is that once an area has been designated under the BLM or the Fish and Wildlife Service study regime, it effectively becomes de facto wilderness. The designation then limits and restricts federal land use ability to do just about anything for fear that it might impair the suitability of the area for preservation as wilderness.

Until Congress makes a final determination on a wilderness study area, the BLM or the Fish and Wildlife Service manages these areas to preserve their suitability for designation as wilderness. Even if Congress has not acted—because it is Congress's purview to do so—they have designated it as de facto wilderness.

My amendment says we are going to change this, and we have to change this. Congress needs to reassert itself into this equation. As the final arbiter of what is designated as wilderness, Congress can and should make the decisions in a timely manner about the wilderness status.

What my amendment does is pretty simple. If Congress doesn't act within 1 year to designate as wilderness an area recommended for wilderness, the designation is released. It just goes back to multiple use. That way the agencies are not managing areas to preserve a possible wilderness designation as an option for Congress. Instead, they can get on with looking at a broader range of options for how to manage that land with the local people and other interested stakeholders through the land use planning process that applies to each of the agencies.

Some may argue that Congress needs more time on this. I would say we had plenty of time to review these areas. Some of the wilderness study areas have been pending since the 1980s. That is plenty of time to file out whether or not the area should put in wilderness status. Congress needs to make decisions.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment and take a look at what is contained and not just think about the ANWR situation but think about the applicability within their respective States.

I know that Senator SESSIONS was seeking recognition. As Members are seeking to get their amendments pending, we would like to allow them to have recognition. At this point, I believe we need some clarification from the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I will wrap up in 2 minutes and will then yield the floor to the Senator from Alabama.

I have been talking about a number of different things. I would like to keep it short now. I would like to defer. I will be back on the issues as we continue this debate. Again, I thank the bill managers, and I am very pleased to see that Senators are coming down and making these amendments pending. That is what we need do now. I thank Senators on both sides of the aisle for doing that.

With that, I yield the floor to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator Hoeven for his hard work on this Keystone XL Pipeline bill, as well as Senator Murkowski and others who have worked together on it on both sides of the aisle.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SESSIONS. We have been talking about global warming and climate change. I have been on the Environment and Public Works Committee for 4 years, and we have had a number of good hearings on the subject. I wish to share some thoughts on climate change because so much of what is driving our energy policies in America today is entirely dependent on a fear of the threat of global warming in the years to come.

There have been a number of votes on global warming. I was asked by a reporter today: You voted with the Whitehouse amendment; why did you do that? Well, I just have this to say. It is true, to my understanding, and according to the best science we have, that the Earth has warmed by a degree in the last 100 years, and exactly what is causing that, we are not so sure. If that were to amount to a significant degree, it would be a cause for concern. It would be a cause for America and the entire world to really begin to evaluate what our future is and what action might be taken. That is what has happened.

The world has been engaged mightily in the effort to drive up the cost of electricity, drive up the cost of gasoline, drive up the cost of the production of products that use energy, and drive up the cost of transportation items that you go to the grocery store and buy.

I will just say this. The scare tactics we have been hearing are not coming to fruition. Over a time period, they were predicted to come to a fruition, but they just are not. As public servants—as elected officials who represent 320 million Americans—we need to ask ourselves: Should we press down an excessive, increased burden of energy costs or should we allow Americans to meet the fears that we have been hearing about? And if we do that, how much can we afford to do? How much can we afford to ask of them?

We are reducing CO2 emissions in the United States and doing a pretty good job of it. But the fear is—at least the concern from so many of us—is that we are now projecting—the President is projecting massive increases in regulations that will significantly and further hammer coal and hammer the price of energy in America.

Many Members of Congress want to take drastic action that would increase the cost of electricity and gasoline from fossil fuels. It would do that. There is no doubt about that. And it would virtually end coal production in the United States, a product we have a lot of.

They claim the science of global warming is settled, but I suggest questions remain. Global climate change advocates have, over many years, relied upon a number of climate models. These models are designed to predict the temperature over time, and they
have done that, and I will show my colleagues the result of these models in a minute. They predict not only increasing temperatures but increasing droughts, increasing flux—droughts and flux—increasing severe weather events, hurricanes and tornadoes. These models have long predicted this. So we have a history of how well the models have performed over time. An easy measure, a critical measure, of the validity of any model is how well it correlates actual data. So the increase in weather data, I tell my colleagues, is proving that the models have not been accurate.

There are other facts we are dealing with that give concern to those of us who are less than certain about what the climate will do in the future. Last week, NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies claimed that 2014 was the hottest year on record. Perhaps my colleagues will want to verify this, but it was their analysis of 3,000 ground-based thermometers around the world. They backtracked on that claim the very next day, however, because the increase was so small that the ground-based system fell within the margin of error.

There are other problems with those assertions. Data gathered at the Earth’s surface has limitations in measuring the temperature. It is a relatively small sample influenced by human construction. Instead, the best data, I think most scientists agree, for determining warming of the atmosphere is a method that can objectively gather far more data, and that is satellites.

There are two research groups that track atmospheric data, one satellite and one balloon. They both show temperature data that has barely risen for 35 years. The balloons validate the accuracy of the satellites and the satellites tend to validate the accuracy of the balloons. So there is a wider and wider divergence over the years from what the models claim and what the actual temperature is doing. There just is.

Other evidence can be seen in the Earth’s ice coverage. A few years ago former Vice President Al Gore claimed the Arctic might be ice-free in the summer-time by 2014. That was last year. That was a prediction. Another study said it would be ice-free by 2029. But this past summer, the ice coverage in the Arctic Ocean was 43 percent greater in 2012 than in 1982.

Senator Murkowski, that is an increase in the size of the State of Alaska, which is a pretty sizable State, for heaven’s sake. It has become well-known that ice coverage in Antarctica is also recorded levels. There have been odd predictions made about extreme weather events. On the Weather Channel on our TV, they love to talk about storms, and it is exciting, and people watch it. I have had people call from Alabama and tell me, Have you gotten your food in? You are going to have a big storm. You are going to be shut in.

When temperature data stopped supporting the applicants’ claims of warming, they started claiming that storms and droughts would worsen; we would have more of them. We all heard that many times. It is hard to know what to think about it when we heard that over the years. It has now been nearly 3,400 days since the last major hurricane hit the United States. This is no little matter to me. I remember moving to Mobile in 1979, and that year we had Hurricane Frederic that slammed the city. Trees were down everywhere. Power was off for weeks. I believe it was a category 3 hurricane. Earlier we had Hurricane Camille hit, and that was in the 1960s. Then we had Hurricane Katrina that hit New Orleans and hit my hometown of Mobile a very significant blow. But it has been nearly 3,400 days since the last major hurricane hit the United States. That is a category 3, 4, or 5. That is a 300 percent greater than in the last 35 years. The balloons validate the accuracy of the satellites.

In summary, there continues to be a lack of evidence and thus low confidence regarding the sign of trend in the magnitude and/ or frequency of floods on a global scale.

According to the Palmer Drought Index, there is a statistically insignificant decrease in global droughts from 1982 to 2012. So, remember, CO2 is increasing in the atmosphere. It is a small part of the atmosphere. It is a clean gas. There is no damage to us. It is a gas that is plant food. If we understand photosynthesis, plants breathe in CO2, grow, and release oxygen, which is good for us. So in itself, CO2 is not an inherently bad product. From 1982 to 2012, when we had some of the greatest increase in CO2—I guess the greatest increase in CO2 in the history of the planet, unless there was some volcano or some event—we have seen actually a decrease in droughts. Small, but a decrease nonetheless.

Last July, the Budget Committee, which I was the ranking member of, had a hearing on the cost of climate change to the economy and the Democrats called that hearing. The Republican witnesses were Dr. Bjorn Lomborg and David Montgomery. Professor Lomborg, from the Copenhagen Institute in Denmark, said this:

While some warming may have occurred, it will not mean the end of the world. The total, discounted cost of inaction— not doing anything on global climate change— over the next five centuries is about 1.2 percent of discounted GDP. The cumulative cost of inaction towards the end of the century is about 1.8 percent of GDP. While this is not trivial, it by no means supports the often apocalyptic conversation on global climate change.

It goes on: The cost of inaction by the end of the century is equivalent to losing one year’s GDP growth.

Last year we had, what, 2 percent GDP, using an average of 2.5 percent, 2 percent, 1 year’s worth; not 100 years’ worth, 1 year’s worth, the equivalent, he said, of a moderate 1-year recession. The cost of inaction of the next 80 years of the century is equivalent to an annual loss of GDP growth on the order of .02 percent, or two-hundredths of 1 percent—not 2 percent; two-hundredths of 1 percent.

Professor Lomborg, who believes that human activity has contributed to some global warming—he said that—also pointed out that climate control policy, based on current data, will cost far more than the “benefits” it delivers.

Isn’t that the question we have to ask ourselves? When we impose a cost on the American people, shouldn’t that cost produce more benefit than the cost in currency? He continues: A slightly warmer Earth means net benefits through the first half of this century, until 2065. So until 2065 it will benefit America, warmer temperatures. After that, these models and other projections—he is taking them from the IPCC’s own data—find that costs do begin to occur.

He continues: However, an aggressive government response to warming now can wipe out the benefits we can expect to gain.

Plus we will have higher taxes; more spending; more regulations will cut jobs, reduce incomes, hurt savings, and, thus, set us back more as a nation. Dr. David Montgomery, who testified at the hearing, said: It is far from clear that recent weather events are anything other than the natural variability in storm frequency and intensity and the nature, timing and extent of damage from climate change remains highly uncertain. This does not imply that no action is justified, but it does imply that costs and avoided risks must be balanced carefully.

I think that is what we need to do, balance the cost and the risk.
In sum, these experts before the Budget Committee highlighted that the climate change could be happening and it could be a part of human action, but its costs in the near term certainly are not great. This compares to the cost of trying to stop climate change by reducing human activity as very large indeed.

Congress considered legislation in 2009 and 2010 to put a price on carbon through a cap-and-trade system that President Obama supported. The cost was deemed too high. Congress said no.

The bill that passed the House would cost $161 billion—it was in Democratic hands at the time—would cost $161 billion in the first year, and it increased in additional years. How much is $161 billion? Well, we are desperately trying to find $10 billion, $12 billion a year for the next 6 years to fund the highway bill. That is $10 billion a year. This is $160 billion a year. The amount we spend on education in America is about $100 billion a year. This would be $161 billion a year. Over a decade, we are talking $2 trillion hammered onto the American economy.

This is a serious matter and, fortunately, Congress did not yield. Congress considered this legislation, and the President decided to pursue the same results, not through the elected representatives but through the regulatory process. In 2007, the Supreme Court sided with the State of Massachusetts, thus granting the Environmental Protection Agency—if it chose—to regulate greenhouse gases, based on the Clean Air Act of the 1970s, when global warming was never dreamed of and nobody ever considered CO2 to be a pollutant. This was an activist Supreme Court decision, in my opinion. Congress would never pass this law. There has never been one time in the last 30 years, or certainly before that, that Congress would pass a law recommending huge regulatory powers to the EPA over CO2.

So the Court did not require EPA to regulate gases, but the Court allowed that under the Clean Air Act. So now the EPA is developing a rulemaking called a Clean Power Plan. This regulation will cost between $41 billion and $73 billion annually, more than the road bill and almost as much as the educational bill according to analysts.

On top of this, consumers will have to spend billions of dollars on conserving electricity. Electricity rates are going to increase by double-digit percentages throughout most of the country. These are the costs of only one of the regulations EPA is pursuing. In total, the Heritage Action expects the President’s Climate Action Plan will cost $1.47 trillion in lost GDP by 2030. The costs of action far outweigh the cost of inaction, it seems to me. That is the basis of my concern about many of the extreme actions we are taking, is crisscrossed with pipelines. They are all over it.

In my home State of Alabama, we are not having complaints about that. This idea that we shouldn’t have a pipeline to bring oil from our ally and friend Canada to drive down further, hopefully, the cost of energy in the United States is an erroneous idea. It is all driven at the bottom by this global climate change issue. I am not a climate expert, and I know that the President is, and what history will teach. I have assumed over the years scientists are on to something when they claim that CO2 will be a blanket effect in our atmosphere and temperature might increase. I do know that fossil fuels, when burn plants, it creates CO2. I know that. It increases it in the atmosphere. The models which are predicted increasing temperatures from this steady rise in CO2 that has been occurring for over 100 years as the planet’s population increases have been wrong.

Let me show this chart. It is prepared by Dr. John Christy, who worked at NASA and the University of Alabama at Huntsville. The red line represents the projection of the average of all the models—and there are many of them; I think about 30 people doing modeling of the temperatures and the average shows this rise. This is an alarming rise. It was based on those predictions from 1975 to 2025, that people have demanded we change what we do with energy in America and we reduce fossil fuels and we pay more for energy to avoid this trend.

We are getting not too far from 2025. That is the red line at the reality though. These are the numbers, satellite data, and balloon data around the world. We basically had very little increase from 1980 to 2015. For 18 years or so it is basically totally flat. So what does that mean? I am not sure. Maybe it will start surging next year. Maybe we will see more. But at this point, as reasonable Congressmen and Senators, I don’t believe we can conclude that we should abandon our pipeline in any way. That is, as it is—high unemployment, December wages dropped 5 cents an hour. The President kept talking about how great things are. Wages dropped 5 cents an hour in 1 month alone—December. We have the lowest percentage of Americans in the working ages actually working in America today since the 1970s. Things aren’t going so well. We don’t need to be driving up costs for our businesses, making them less competitive in the world marketplace, making gasoline more expensive for working moms, making electricity more expensive for our elderly who are at home and cold. We just don’t.

So who cares the most? I say we need to care about the people we represent. We need to care about their welfare. Mr. Steyer, with his tens of millions of dollars in contributions, demands we don’t pass Keystone Pipeline, to carry out his theory—this billionaire that he is—and he doesn’t care apparently about what is happening to jobs in America, competitiveness in America, and the welfare of the citizens of this country.

Congress represents the interests of 320 million people. We need to defend their interests, not ideological activists. It is almost a religion to them. We have to be objective and realistic as we evaluate. So there can be no doubt that this agenda will increase energy prices, it will not shrink the middle class; it will eliminate jobs, it will increase costs across the board, it will reduce wages, and it will throw millions of Americans out of work. It just will if we carry out this agenda.

We are not close to doing that today. It would never pass this Congress, either House or Senate. There is zero chance it would pass if it was actually voted on.

So long as Congress has decided not to act, how can EPA act? It is acting against the wishes of the American people and the interests of the country. It takes the consensus of the American people to move large and costly legislation such as this, hundreds of billions, trillion of dollars. That consensus is not formed. It is not there.

On Keystone and other key issues, the consensus is against government excess, not for the government to do more. Talk to the American people. Look at the polling data. Someday maybe things will change, it is true, I will acknowledge. Temperatures could start to rise significantly and storms...
could begin to worsen. But as long as the measured data fails to match the alarmists’ climate models, I believe Congress should approve this pipeline and reject the agenda of the climate alarmists and conduct a policy that is beneficial to the people of our Nation. I thank the Chair and yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Ayotte). The Senator from Vermont.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I know the ranking member had intended to offer an amendment on behalf of himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The amendment is as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. 2. Rebates for Purchase and Installation of Photovoltaic Systems. (a) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Photovoltaic system.—The term ‘‘photovoltaic system’’ includes—

(A) solar panels;

(B) roof support structures;

(C) inverters;

(D) energy storage system, if the energy storage system is integrated with the photovoltaic system; and

(E) any other hardware necessary for the installation of the photovoltaic system.

(2) Secretary.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) Rebates for Purchase and Installation of Photovoltaic Systems. (1) In general.—The Secretary shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall provide rebates to eligible individuals or entities for the purchase and installation of photovoltaic systems for residential and commercial properties in order to install, over the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems in the United States (as compared to the number of photovoltaic systems installed in the United States as of the date of enactment of this Act) with a cumulative capacity of not less than 13,000 megawatts.

(2) Eligibility. (A) In general.—To be eligible for a rebate under this subsection—

(i) the recipient of the rebate shall be a homeowner, or State or local government that purchased and installed a photovoltaic system for a property located in the United States; and

(ii) the recipient of the rebate shall meet such other eligibility criteria as are determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(B) Other entities.—After public review and comment, the Secretary may identify other individuals or entities located in the United States that qualify for a rebate under this subsection.

(3) Amount. —Subject to paragraph (4)(B) and the availability of appropriations under subsection (c), the amount of rebate provided to an eligible individual or entity for the purchase and installation of a photovoltaic system for a property under this subsection shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 15 percent of the initial capital costs for purchasing and installing the photovoltaic system, including costs for hardware, permitting and other ‘‘soft costs’’, and installation; or

(B) $10,000.

(4) Intermediate Report.—As soon as practicable after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, and publish on the website of the Department of Energy, a report that describes—

(A) the number of photovoltaic systems for residential and commercial properties purchased and installed with rebates provided under this subsection; and

(B) any steps the Secretary will take to ensure that the goal of the installation of an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems in the United States is achieved by 2025.

(5) Relationship to other law.—The authority provided under this subsection shall be in addition to any other authority under which credits or other types of financial assistance are provided for installation of a photovoltaic system for a property.

(c) Authorization of Appropriations. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, it goes without saying I disagree with my good friend from Alabama in terms of his assessment of the climate situation. To my mind, the scientific community, the overwhelming majority of scientists have made it clear that climate change is real, caused by human activity, is already causing devastating problems in this country and around the world, that we have a limited opportunity to try to transform our energy system so that a bad situation does not become much worse. One of the ways we transform our energy system is by moving to such sustainable energies as wind, solar, geothermal, and others.

What this amendment does is propose to create over the next 10 years 10 million solar rooftops in this country—a massive effort to expand solar energy in this country by giving a rebate on new solar systems. As we all know, the solar industry is booming. We are seeing significant increases in the number of people who are using solar. Today there are more than 13,000 megawatts of operating solar capacity, nearly half a million photovoltaic systems.

We have made real progress in recent years. But we have a long way to go, and that is what this legislation would do. I want to say a word about—There is an article that appeared in many of the papers today which I think is pretty scary stuff.

It talks about the Koch brothers being prepared to spend almost $1 billion in 2016 in order to move forward with their very rightwing agenda. When we hear these numbers about one family—the second wealthiest family in America, extreme rightwing family—prepared to spend almost $1 billion in the coming elections, I think the American people have to ask whether the foundations of American democracy have been uprooted and whether in fact we are moving to an oligarchic form of society. As many people know, what oligarchy is about is when you have very wealthy and powerful people controlling what goes on.

What the history of America presumably has been about is ordinary people determining what happens in our country. Ordinary people elect Members of the House and Members of the Senate. Now what we have is one family worth some $85 billion prepared to spend in the next election almost as much as Obama spent and almost as much as Romney spent in the last Presidential election.

My guess is in the coming years what we are going to see is the major and most effective and most powerful political party in America is not the Republican Party. It is not the Democratic Party. It is the Koch brothers party. They already have assembled, as I understand it, a political database which has more information than the Republican Party database. We have to take a very hard look at what is going on and determine whether this is what we believe our democracy should be—a billionaire family with more power than either the Democratic or Republican Parties.

In the last election, a Republican candidate for President, Mitt Romney, spent about $464 million from his campaign committee—about half of what the Koch network plans to spend next year. President Obama spent $715 million in 2012 from his campaign committee. The difference is that Obama and Romney raised significant sums of money from people all over the country, people who may have contributed 50 bucks or 100 bucks, and now we have one family preparing to spend almost as much money as either Obama or Romney spent, and that is a frightening situation. It tells me loudly and clearly that we must overturn this disastrous Supreme Court decision called Citizens United.

REBUILD AMERICA ACT

Madam President, today I have introduced legislation that calls for a $1 trillion investment to rebuild our collapsing infrastructure; that is, our
roads, bridges, wastewater plants, water systems, dams, levees, rail, airports.

Everybody in the Senate and I hope everybody in America understands that our infrastructure is collapsing. We can’t turn our backs on this issue. We can’t turn our backs on this issue. I am a former mayor, and what I can say is that infrastructure does not get better when we ignore it. It gets worse, and it becomes more expensive to fix.

For our history the United States proudly led the world in building innovative infrastructure, from inland canals to the transcontinental railroad. We implemented huge flood-control projects and embarked on an ambitious rural electrification program. We built modern airports and the Interstate Highway System. In terms of infrastructure, we were the envy of the world. Sadly, that is no longer the case.

Today the United States spends just 2.4 percent of GDP on infrastructure—less than at any point in the past 20 years. Europe spends twice that amount, and China spends close to four times our rate. We are falling further and further behind, and that is not where the United States of America should be.

Today we are 12th in the world in terms of the quality of our infrastructure when we used to be No. 1. One out of every nine bridges in our country is structurally deficient and nearly one-quarter are functionally obsolete. Almost one-third of our roads are in poor or mediocre condition, and more than 42 percent of urban highways are congested. Urban and suburban transit systems are struggling to address deferred maintenance even as ridership steadily increases.

No one argues about the need to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. When we do that, we get an additional bonus because we save $1 trillion over a 5-year period, we can create 13 million decent-paying jobs, and that is exactly what we should be doing. Real unemployment today is not 5.6 percent, it is 11 percent. Youth unemployment is 18 percent. African-American youth unemployment is 30 percent. We need to create millions of decent-paying jobs, and the best way we can do that is by rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, in President Obama’s State of the Union Address last week, he outlined an agenda focused on what he called middle-class economics, which he described as providing Americans with the “tools they needed to go as far as their effort and their dreams will take them.”

Our country thrives when hard-working Americans prosper. The President was right to praise policies, such as the GI bill and Social Security, that have helped millions, but he is also right why I am perplexed at the President’s proposal to tax the earnings of 529 college savings plan accounts. Rather than help American families meet the enormous cost of a college education, this proposal undermines the very benefits of a law that is helping millions of parents plan for their children’s futures. The President’s proposal undermines the very values we should be promoting—families making sacrifices today in order to better provide for their children tomorrow. The President’s plan would also lead to more student loan debt for many young people at a time when concern over the level of debt is rising.

I would also note that the President has proposed eliminating the tax deduction on interest on student loan payments.

One of the first questions new parents ask themselves is how they will be able to pay for their children’s education. And the 529 accounts have been an important part of the answer. They have allowed parents to save for their children’s education in tax-advantaged accounts. Regular, affordable contributions made with after-tax dollars from their paychecks grow over time. When college years start, those savings and the earnings from their investments can be withdrawn tax free for educational expenses. These small sacrifices made from paycheck to paycheck can have an enormous impact, making real the dream of higher education.

Parents know that receiving a college degree greatly improves their child’s future earnings potential. In fact, according to data compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau in the year 2011, individuals with college degrees earn approximately $1 million more over the course of their careers than do workers with high school diplomas. Census data also showed that people with higher levels of education are more likely to be employed full time year-round. College graduates also tend to have access to more specialized jobs that, in turn, yield higher wages.

Critics of the 529 plans assert that they disproportionately benefit very high-income families who could afford to pay for college without the tax-free growth in these dedicated savings accounts. Data from the College Savings Foundation, however, counters this assertion. According to the foundation, the average value in one of these 529 accounts is $19,774. Additionally, the average contribution to accounts that receive regular electronic contributions, such as those coming from paychecks, grows to $975 a month. That is clearly more in line with hard-working families trying to make ends meet than with affluent families who enjoy significant disposable income.

My home State provides a great example of the benefits of the 529 law. After this law was passed in 2001, thousands of Maine families established college savings accounts, knowing that every power extra incentive. In 2008 the Harold Alfond Foundation, which was established by one of Maine’s greatest philanthropists, created the Harold Alfond College Challenge. This program now provides a one-time payment of $500 to college savings accounts of every baby born in Maine. To date, some 23,000 Maine families have used this generous gift to begin planning for the future education of their children. As their parents’ own contributions are added to the account, the future becomes even brighter for these children and for our State. As the children grow and make their own contributions from after-school and summer jobs, so too grows their appreciation of financial responsibility and savings.

The President says his proposal is driven in part by the need to simplify the Tax Code. Our Tax Code certainly needs simplification, and I hope that becomes a major accomplishment of this Congress. But we must be asked—how does creating a difference between the 529 contributions already made, which would remain untaxed, and new contributions, which would be taxed, simplify anything? And more to the point, in addition to simplification, our Tax Code needs predictability.

Before I joined the Senate, I was employed at Husson University in Bangor, ME—an outstanding institution that provided educational assistance, and a tax deduction for student loan payments. My experience at Husson is the chief example of the benefits of the 529 law.

The President’s proposal to tax the earnings of 529 college savings plan accounts, which would remain untaxed, would harm all hardworking families, not just high-income families. These accounts provide a $500 contribution to the college savings account of every baby born in Maine. To date, some 23,000 Maine families have used this generous gift to begin planning for the future education of their children. As their parents’ own contributions are added to the account, the future becomes even brighter for these children and for our State. As the children grow and make their own contributions from after-school and summer jobs, so too grows their appreciation of financial responsibility and savings.

The President says his proposal is driven in part by the need to simplify the Tax Code. Our Tax Code certainly needs simplification, and I hope that becomes a major accomplishment of this Congress. But we must be asked—how does creating a difference between the 529 contributions already made, which would remain untaxed, and new contributions, which would be taxed, simplify anything? And more to the point, in addition to simplification, our Tax Code needs predictability.

Before I joined the Senate, I was employed at Husson University in Bangor, ME—an outstanding institution that provided educational assistance, and a tax deduction for student loan payments. Many provisions of that bill are now law but would also be harmed by the President’s proposal.

The 529 college savings plan program channels the determination that I saw while working at Husson University and that exists throughout our great country into a tangible benefit built upon the virtues of saving and planning for the future. Changing the tax rules for the 529 accounts would break a promise to families across this country who are working hard to save for their children’s educations to help them attain a brighter future.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to make college more accessible and more affordable and to save the 529 college savings plan program.
I thank the sponsors and managers of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I rise today not just to contribute to the engaged discussion we have been having on this important issue. I would like her to know that I join with her in a concern that has been raised with the President and this proposal.

As the mom of two young men who are just finishing their years in college—I have one who graduated last year and one who will graduate in May.

Very early on we participated in the 529 plan that was offered in the State of Alaska.

In fact, in my early years as a State legislator, it was my legislation in the Statehouse that set up the University of Alaska 529 College Savings Plan, and our boys were direct beneficiaries of that, if you will, because it allowed us, as parents, to begin our savings in a way we knew, when it came time for them to go to schools, we would be as prepared as we could be at that point in time.

I don’t think any family is ever really prepared, particularly for the extraordinary costs of higher education. We were fortunate in that our sons chose to attend schools that were not some of the most expensive schools in the country—they attended State universities—but we paid as a family for their college education, and having two boys in college at the same time puts a stress on families that is very real. So the suggestion that somehow these 529s benefit a very limited group of families across the Nation, I think, belies the obvious.

I think we all try to do the best we can by our kids, and saving for their future when they are very young is important.

So when we have these programs that will allow and encourage families to do this, knowing there will be a tax benefit, it is important. It is important for the families, it is important for the young people looking to their opportunities in college and, hopefully, when they complete their college education, they are not bearing these incredibly crushing financial burdens.

Again, I applaud the efforts of my colleague and I look forward to working with her on this very important issue.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Merkley amendment No. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 174 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in communities in the United States while also helping to fund climate change adaptation in developing countries)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING OF CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed $3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund, with the objective of helping developing countries deal with the impacts of climate change and advancing mitigation efforts;

(2) many communities in the United States, including many rural and indigenous communities, face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries and are also being impacted by climate change;

(3) these communities include indigenous and traditional communities in the Arctic region of the United States;

(4) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural and other vulnerable communities in the United States; and

(5) the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in vulnerable communities in the United States, including rural and indigenous communities, while also helping vulnerable communities and developing countries adapt and mitigate in developing countries.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, in very brief format, this amendment is about recognizing that global warming is having an impact on some of the poorest countries around the world, and that the United States should work with these nations in terms of helping them address some of those consequences. But the amendment also notes that we have communities in the United States that are poor and struggling with the impacts of climate change and that we should give much attention to helping those communities address the impacts as well and that these two issues—helping poor countries around the world and helping communities within the United States—are not in conflict with each other in that we should be doing both of these things.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

(Purpose: To eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and provide infrastructure funding.)

I wish to call up a second amendment, so I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Merkley amendment No. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 125 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in the Record of January 22, 2015, under “Text of Amendment.”)

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, this amendment recognizes that construction jobs can play a key role in strengthening our economy, and not just strengthening our economy with current jobs but rebuilding infrastructure or building new infrastructure that will facilitate a very successful economy in the future.

This particular amendment proposes that we not create 4,000 construction jobs in the pipeline but that we create 400,000 jobs rebuilding key infrastructure in a variety of ways across our Nation.

I think as we wrestle with both the current economy and the strength of the future economy, this is an idea well worth considering.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], for herself and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 131 to amendment No. 2.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that if the Keystone XL Pipeline is built, it will be built safely and in compliance with United States environmental laws)

In section 2(a), strike the period at the end and insert the following:

subject to—

(1) all applicable laws (including regulations); and

(2) all mitigation measures that are required in permits issued by permitting agencies; and

(3) all project-specific special conditions listed in Appendix Z of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, as my colleague said, we are going back and forth on offering amendments to this bill and I hope this process will lead us toward getting this bill passed up. I know many of my colleagues have been talking about various aspects of this legislation, and this particular amendment focuses on making sure that if this project goes forward that we meet certain environmental standards.

I can’t say how important that is because the first serious delay in the approval process came because a bad route was selected. The pipeline was
originally proposed to go through an aquifer that is critically important to a large percentage of agriculture in the area. So this is very important to me, and that was a very glaring example that we need to get this right.

What was wrong then is that Congress and I basically say the State Department was wrong and just go ahead and approve this pipeline. So I feel we are about at that same point again in saying just forget the administrative process and let us go ahead. That is not from this approved. If Congress, rather than the administration, approves this pipeline, the American people will lose all the protections and conditions attached as part of the national interest determination.

Just so people understand, according to Executive Order 13337, the State Department can require permits to contain “such terms and conditions as the national interest may . . . require.” So the President can decide a pipeline is in the national interest if it is constructed to meet those specific standards.

In this case, the State Department’s environmental impact statement outlined hundreds of conditions that should be sure the pipeline is built to the highest safety standard. To quote the environmental impact statement:

If the proposed Project is determined to serve the national interest . . . the applicant would be required to abide by certain conditions listed in this Supplemental EIS and the Presidential Permit.

So these conditions, or mitigation measures, as the report refers to them, are compiled in one section of the report and it highlights the measures TransCanada needs to take to deal with and reduce the impacts when they are operating this pipeline. These are higher standards for environmental and public safety that the company would be obligated to meet.

The problem is the bill before us would authorize the pipeline without those mechanisms and without those conditions. If TransCanada declined to meet these conditions, there would be no legal recourse for the injured parties to take TransCanada to court.

I wish to talk about those conditions that are included in the environmental impact statement so that my colleagues understand what we are talking about when they say they would vote to bypass this process. I will give three examples of the conditions included in the environmental impact statement.

First, along the proposed pipeline there are areas where the terrain is fragile. There has been a lot of discussion of the Sand Hills region of Nebraska and how difficult it would be to site a pipeline on those very fragile sandy soils. The Sand Hills are so fragile that the current route goes around them. So I can tell you, in southern South Dakota and northern Nebraska, there are areas that, according to the environmental impact statement, “exhibit conditions similar to the Sand Hills Region and are very susceptible to wind erosion.”

Let me read from the appendix about how TransCanada would be required to operate the pipeline in those areas.

This document proves site-specific reclamation during construction, erosion control, and revegetation procedures for those fragile areas . . . To reduce the potential impacts related to severe wind and snow and sand and the following summary . . . of best management practices would be implemented during construction, reclamation and post-construction.

This document then goes on to list 16 specific building requirements that TransCanada must meet. These conditions for the Sand Hills-like area along the route include: avoiding wetlands, avoiding erosion-prone areas such as ridgetops, working with landowners to build fences to prevent livestock from the construction, providing compensation to landowners who need to let pastures rest until vegetation can be reestablished.

Most people would agree TransCanada should do these things. I think the American public would follow the rules and do the things that are required. It makes sense to do these things for the protection of our environment and vulnerable areas and for the landowners whose livelihoods depend on the land around the pipeline. But if S. 1 became law, the State Department would not have the authority to ensure the things I just mentioned—namely, that they build the fences, they compensate the ranchers as outlined, and the conditions be required that the State Department has laid out.

So the State Department, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and TransCanada are working on a plan to ensure the protection of endangered species along the pipeline route and these important things are part of what we want to see addressed. Implementation of an agreement that is designed to avoid harm to these species is what we are trying to make sure of if the President has the authority to issue a permit.

In contrast, the bill we are considering, S. 1, exempts the pipeline from further review under the Endangered Species Act. According to the State Department, the process that is now underway to establish these implementing agreements to protect these vulnerable species would stop—would be overruled if this bill became law.

Finally, the conditions would require TransCanada to improve its safety standards. And my colleagues may not know that TransCanada received a “warning letter” from the Federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration for violating pipeline safety regulations over a year and a half ago. As outlined in a September 26, 2013, letter from the administration:

TransCanada experienced a high rejection rate for welding and failed to use properly qualified welders. So in 1 week alone, 72 percent of TransCanada’s welds had to be reworked. After TransCanada’s shoddy work came to light, the State Department added 2 new safety conditions to the 57 conditions that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration had already required.

One of those conditions required TransCanada to hire a third-party contractor to monitor pipeline construction and report back to the U.S. Government whether that construction is sound.

So the new condition was that TransCanada adopt a quality management program to ensure “this pipeline is—from the beginning—built to the highest standards by both the Keystone personnel and its many contractors.” But if this legislation is approved, this pipeline and all the conditions I just mentioned fall away. That is why I do believe that, with this legislation, we are acting prematurely. So I am offering this amendment.

Last week we had a very big reminder that pipeline spills do happen when 30,000 gallons of oil spilled into the Yellowstone River in Montana—not the first spill into that river, unfortunately.

So I ask my colleagues, why would we continue on a process without making sure that TransCanada follows the established safety issues on pipelines and we make sure that they comply with these environmental laws?

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this amendment. I hope my colleagues will stand with 61 percent of the American people who believe that due process is more important than special interest.

Madam President, I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we have a number of amendments pending on both sides of the aisle and there are other Senators who are working with us to offer them tonight. We will be working to set votes on many of these pending amendments tomorrow, with nongermane amendments set at a 60-vote threshold.

So if there are other Senators on either side who have amendments they intend to offer, they should be coming down to the floor to talk with the bill managers and get those amendments pending. We do intend to try to get to the third reading of the bill before the end of the week.

With that, I recognize the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 102.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. TILLIS], for himself and Mr. BUIR, proposes an amendment numbered 102 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. TILLIS. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for leasing on the outer Continental Shelf and the distribution of certain qualified revenues from such leasing)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLES 01 AND 02—ATLANTIC OCS ACCESS AND REVENUE SHARE ACT OF 2015

TITLE 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Atlantic OCS Access and Revenue Share Act of 2015”.

TITLE 02. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term “Mid-Atlantic Producing State” means each of the States of—

(A) Delaware;

(B) Maryland;

(C) North Carolina; and

(D) Virginia.

(2) MID-ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term “Mid-Atlantic Planning Area” means the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled “Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012-17” and dated June 2012.

(3) QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues” means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues” does not include—

(i) revenues from the forfeiture of a bond or other surety securing obligations other than royalties, civil penalties, or royalties taken by the Secretary in-kind and not sold; or

(ii) revenues generated from leases subject to section 107 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) SOUTH ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term “South Atlantic Producing State” means each of the States of—

(A) Georgia;

(B) South Carolina; and

(C) North Carolina.

(6) SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term “South Atlantic Planning Area” means the South Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled “Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012-17” and dated June 2012.

SEC. 03. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING IN MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) not later than July 15, 2016, publish and submit to Congress a new proposed oil and gas leasing program prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1341) for the 5-year period beginning on July 15, 2017 and ending July 15, 2022; and

(2) not later than July 15, 2017, approve a final oil and gas leasing program under that section for that period.

(b) INCLUSION OF MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.—The Secretary shall include in the program described in subsection (a) annual lease sales in both the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area and the South Atlantic Planning Area.

(c) PROHIBITION ON LEASING CERTAIN AREAS.—

(1) PETITION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the leasing of areas within the administrative boundaries of a Mid-Atlantic Producing State or South Atlantic Producing State or less than 30 miles off the coast of the State shall be prohibited.

SEC. 04. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM MID-ATLANTIC LEASING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the South Atlantic Planning Area in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200305 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each Mid-Atlantic producing State that are 30 miles or less off the administrative boundaries of a Mid-Atlantic Producing State that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each Mid-Atlantic Producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(2) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a South Atlantic Producing State each fiscal year under paragraph (1) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under paragraph subsection (a)(2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall be available for further appropriation, in accordance with this section; remain available until expended; and

(e) DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES SHALL BE NET OF RECEIPTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year’s qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the South Atlantic Planning Area.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, earlier this week—and actually, yesterday and today—the Department of the Interior announced a plan that will allow for permitting in 2017 for offshore oil and gas drilling off the Outer Continental Shelf of our beautiful east coast.

The concern we have with this measure is not unlike the concern my friends may have in Alaska, with steps taken by the administration to actually limit the true potential of these regions. Like Alaska, we have a number of opportunities for offshore oil and...
natural gas drilling that have not been exploited in the past, and I am afraid that under the current course and speed of the administration’s action, they will not be fully exploited to the benefit of North Carolinians and many east coast states.

That is why Senator BURR and I have sponsored an amendment that directs the administration to take more decisive and more comprehensive action so we can seize the opportunity for North Carolina and many of our neighbor States.

The main reason we are doing this is because I think North Carolina and the east coast can do their part to make our Nation an energy super power. We can also have enormously positive impact on our economy as we move forward. This slide depicts some of the initial estimates for the economic impact that we could have by simply directing the Department of the Interior to issue leases and to allow exploration and ultimately extraction off the coast.

This graphic gives us an idea, from Delaware down to Florida, of the potential jobs creation. We can see that in North Carolina that is 55,000 jobs. It is 55,000 of the hard hit areas of North Carolina, where people are out of work, and the unemployment rate is well above the State average. It is a jobs creation opportunity that we are just waiting to be able to provide to the States with the permission of the authority to decide whether they are going to move forward.

In terms of the economic impact, it is over $190 billion in capital investment and nearly $51 billion in revenue to the Federal Government and to State governments between 2017 and 2035.

This opportunity is something that I hope doesn’t go without the full efforts of the State to actually determine how we can do it in an environmentally responsible way.

I was speaker of the house before I came into this great body, and we took the steps to put into place a regulatory framework to allow potential natural gas drilling within the State of North Carolina. We did it in a very responsible way, and we did it in a way that made sure stakeholders had the opportunity—environmentalists, business people, travel and tourism—so we made sure it was done right. I believe we have laid the groundwork with the State. Now we want to do the same thing for the opportunity that we have near the Outer Continental Shelf.

The process will involve the input of several stakeholders. It will involve the input of environmentalists and key stakeholders across the State to make sure we get this right. Ultimately, it gives the States the right to determine whether they want to pursue this—from Florida to Delaware.

The amendment that I do is addresses a number of concerns I heard when I was a legislator and since I was speaker. It has to do with one of the greatest assets we have in North Carolina; that is North Carolina’s beautiful coast. This is a picture of a North Carolina beach today. It is beautiful. It is why we have millions of people come visit our coast every year. Based on our amendment, the idea of how that same beach will look after we authorize drilling and we are actually creating those jobs. It is that same beautiful beach because we have taken the steps to make sure that any drilling would be near the high line of our beautiful beaches. I believe, as a result, we will have travel and tourism on our side because those jobs create additional opportunity to expand opportunities for travel and tourism.

Then, finally, I want to talk about what good the revenue to the State can do for this very same area. We desperately need increased infrastructure in the eastern part of our State. We desperately need funds to renovate our beaches and we desperately need funds to clear our inlet and outfit our ports so that North Carolina can play a part in the new shipping patterns that will occur post-Panama Canal upgrade.

So in terms of economics, it is fairly simple. We are looking for about 50 percent of a revenue share, with 37 percent of that going to the States and for the effective regions for items such as inlet clearing and beach renovation.

We are also looking for 12.5 percent of the revenues dedicated to the Land and Water Conservation Fund so we can continue the good work of setting aside irreplaceable lands and increase our emissions over the years.

I believe this is an opportunity for North Carolina to do its part to make America the energy super power that we need it to be, to improve our economy in North Carolina, and to contribute to improving the economy of this great Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and call up Markley amendment No. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKLEY) proposes an amendment numbered 178 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To delay the effective date until the President determines that the pipeline will not have certain negative impacts)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions resulting from production of oil sands, oil derived from tar sands, and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, as described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to an increase in more extreme weather events.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, the subject matter of these two amendments is, No. 1, the Canadian oil company that wants to build a pipeline through our country right now is exempt from having to pay taxes into the oilspill liability trust fund. In other words, if there is an accident in the United States, if the oil pipe breaks or something happens, the Canadians will not have paid into the oilspill liability trust fund the way every American pipeline company has to do.

So my first amendment would just say that they cannot be exempt from that, and the hundreds of millions of dollars which they are responsible for would have to be put into the trust fund.

The second amendment is an extreme weather amendment. That amendment would call for a requirement and analysis of the impact that global warming would have from the tar sands pollution and would require that we have that scientific analysis just so that we can understand it and its impact on extreme weather in the United States and across the planet.

We would need both of those amendments to be debated in order to make
sure we fully understand the implications of what is being debated here.

Finally, I wish to say that I note Senator Cruz from Texas has an amendment which would almost automatically approve any natural gas exports going to any WTO country in the world. I think that is a very bad stance for the Senate to take.

We have to debate what the impact of the exportation of natural gas on a mass basis is going to be on the price of natural gas here in the United States—the price that utilities are going to have to pay for natural gas to generate electricity, the speed with which we will be able to transform our automotive sector from oil over to natural gas, the impact on the petrochemical industry and other industries that are now increasingly using low-priced natural gas in our country. We also have to deal with the fact that the Energy Information Agency says that the already-approved export of natural gas will lead to a more than 50-percent increase in domestic natural gas prices for Americans at home.

I understand why the natural gas industry wants to do it, but I think we have to have a big debate here in Congress over the fact that the natural gas imports are going to have, especially if they are approved automatically if they are heading to any WTO country in the world.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2
Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and I be allowed to call up my amendment, Whitehouse amendment No. 148.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be reported.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE], for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. S HAEFFEN, Mr. B ALDWIN, Mr. M URPHY, and Mr. H EINRICH, proposes an amendment numbered 148 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the wording of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require campaign finance disclosure by entities profiting from tar sands development)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 10. CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY ENTITIES PROFITING FROM TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT.

Section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) DISCLOSURE BY TAR SANDS BENEFICIARIES.—

"(1) INITIAL DISCLOSURE.—Every covered entity which has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during the period beginning on December 1, 2012, and ending on the date that is 165 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

"(B) SUBSEQUENT DISCLOSURES.—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements or covered transfers is required to file a statement under subparagraph (A) and received covered transfers (other than a covered transfer reported under subparagraph (A)) in an aggregate amount of $10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

"(2) CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

"(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of the place of business or establishment or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

"(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

"(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than $200 during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

"(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain, and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

"(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20))) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more to that account during

"(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

"(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed as a prohibition on the use of funds in such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

"(F) If the disbursements or transfers were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during

"(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

"(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

"(3) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered entity' means—

"(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

"(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

"(B) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person—

"(i) holds one or more tar sands leases, or

"(ii) has received revenues or stands to receive revenues of $1,000,000 or greater from tar sands production, including revenues received in connection with

"(I) exploration of tar sands;

"(II) extraction of tar sands;

"(III) processing of tar sands;

"(IV) building, maintaining, and upgrading the Keystone XL pipeline and other related pipelines used in connection with tar sands;" (V) expanding refinery capacity or building, maintaining, and retrofitting import and export terminals in connection with tar sands;

"(VI) transportation by pipeline, rail, and barge of tar sands;

"(VII) refinement of crude derived from tar sands; and

"(VIII) use of byproducts from tar sands, such as petroleum coke for energy generation.

"(C) TAR SANDS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'tar sands' means bitumen from the West Canadian Sedimentary Basin.

"(4) COVERED DISBURSEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered disbursement' means a disbursement for any of the following:

"(A) An independent expenditure.

"(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

"(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

"(ii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of such general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

"(ii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preferential election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President and ending on the date of the general election; and

"(III) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, is targeted to the relevant electorate (within the meaning of subsection (f)(3)(C)).

"(C) A transfer to another person for the purposes of making a disbursement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

"(D) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered transfer' means any amount received by a covered entity for purposes of making a covered disbursement.

"(E) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'disclosure date' means—
Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I just wish to speak briefly to this amendment, which I hope might help answer the mystery as to why the first order of business of the new majority in the Senate is S. 1, a bill that allows a foreign corporation to run a pipeline across our country, seizing American farms and ranches along the way. That would not ordinarily seem to be our country’s first and highest order of business given all of the issues that we face.

We have seen news reports just today that the legendary Koch brothers are gearing up to spend $900 million in the coming election. We have seen news reports that compare their political operation to the Republican National Committee’s political operation—favorably to the Koch brothers as having a bigger political operation.

We know that since Citizens United there has been a torrent of corporate money poured into our elections, and a great deal of it has come from the fossil fuel industry. We know also that beside that torrent of disclosed money has been another torrent of dark money that has poured into our elections. We don’t know quite where that has come from, but there are plenty of reasons to suspect and to suggest that money has also come from the fossil fuel industry.

So we have a situation right now where I think reasonable people could look at the facts and draw a sensible inference that the Republican Party has been acquired by the fossil fuel industry as its political subsidiary. If that were the case, then that might be an explanation of why S. 1 does that extraordinary service to a foreign corporation at peril to all of the American farms and ranches and families whose land would be taken from them in order to give this foreign corporation this great boon.

This amendment would require that companies that will make more than $1 million off of the Keystone Pipeline should meet the disclosure obligations that we have voted on before in the Senate. These are disclosure obligations that Republican Senators have often supported in the past.

Indeed, until 2010 and until the Citizens United decision actually showed where the money was coming from and to whom, one of the most ardent and eloquent advocates for disclosure was none other than the distinguished Senator from Kentucky who is now our majority leader. So it would not seem to be out of place to ask for a little bit of disclosure, a little bit of transparency, about where the political contributions that are going to make so much money from this, whether it is more than $1 million off the pipeline or whether it is opening up the tar sands and having tar sands leases.

So I hope we will have a chance to vote on this, and if we are in favor of transparency and voters understanding what is going on around here, this ought to be an amendment we ought to be able to support.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. BOOKER. First of all, I want to say how good it is to see the President, and also recognize that he is a member of the nascent Cory caucus, and I respect that quite a lot.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 155.

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

The clerk will report.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To allow permitting agencies to consider new circumstances and new information)

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in subsection (b) shall apply for purposes of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.''

NEPA regulations require agencies to supplement already-issued environmental impact statements when significant new circumstances or information is found to exist relating to the environmental impact of a project. The pending Keystone bill, however—and the final environmental impact statement issued last January to fully satisfy this NEPA requirement going ahead. This would remove the obligation from permitting agencies to supplement any environmental impact statement—significant new circumstances or information is discovered.

This amendment I am putting forward, No. 155, would change that and would preserve a commonsense obligation of agencies to supplement the environmental impact statement for significant new circumstances or information. In other words, if very pertinent information comes forward, it would require there be a need to supplement the environmental impact statement.

For example, if the proposed route of the pipeline were changed, it could mean that drinking water supplies or critical resources would have a higher risk of contamination from a spill. This amendment would simply require consideration of significant changes so we don’t go blindly and put natural resources at greater risk without understanding the impact.

This bill is for me common sense. It says, basically, if circumstances change, we should make sure a new environmental impact study is considered.

I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment as not providing special treatment to a foreign company that American companies don’t get that could result in harm to fellow Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 92
Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to pledge my overwhelming support to Senator TILLIS on the Outer Continental Shelf amendment that has been placed on the Keystone bill, and I think it is apparent with the direction the administration is going that they finally realize this is the right thing, but I think codifying that into this bill is important.

AMENDMENT NO. 102
I also come today because many of my colleagues in this body support the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Just to remind some who might not have been here as long, the Land and Water Conservation Fund was created and funded by royalties off of this exploration explosion we have had over decades in this country.

I might say a disappointment to me is that over the life of this trust fund we created, it never received the appropriated that it accrued in a balance. It accrues a certain amount off of royalties and it was directed in statute that money goes to fund the Land and...
Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund;)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “During the period ending September 30, 2015, there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “through September 30, 2015”.

(b) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Not less than 1.5 percent of amounts made available for expenditures in any fiscal year under section 200302 shall be used for projects that secure recreational public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational public access to existing Federal land, that secure recreational public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational public access to existing Federal land, and that provide benefits to the national wildlife refuge systems.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I have spoken very briefly on this reauthorization because it is a very simple measure. I urge my colleagues, because it is now pending, when we have an opportunity to vote, and I think that will be sooner rather than later on a whole host of amendments, that you take the opportunity to permanently reauthorize a program that is clearly one that benefits this country and our National Parks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the amendment now pending, which is the Burr-Bennett-Ayotte amendment. It is to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I am sure the President is aware that the program expires the end of September, and we can wait, but I don’t think we should wait to reauthorize what I believe is, dollar for dollar, the most effective government program we have. We can save any kind of funding-level cuts later on. The simple truth is this program is a trust fund that is codified in law. So we are not debating whether this exists or doesn’t exist. It does exist and every year $900 million in royalties are paid by energy companies that drill for gas or oil in the Outer Continental Shelf and are put into this fund, but for some reason, that group, that conservation effort, only finds what the appropriators are willing to pass on to it.

Our amendment would reauthorize the program itself on a permanent basis, and I am going to ask all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up amendment No. 92.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Coons] proposes an amendment numbered 115 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Coons] proposes an amendment numbered 92 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Coons] proposes an amendment numbered 115 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, this amendment recognizes that climate change is not a hoax, that climate change is a reality, and that we need to do some things together to begin to plan for and prepare for the inevitable consequences and impacts on our infrastructure.

As someone who was in local government for a long time before coming to this body—I was a county executive—I have a sense of what it means for our States, our municipalities, and our county governments to have to plan for and deal with the inevitable consequences of the impacts on our infrastructure of the coming changes through climate change.

I happen to represent the lowest mean elevation State in America, and our Governor Jack Markell and his able folks in the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control have led a grassroots statewide effort to begin planning for the future impacts of climate change. Because of the combination of subsidence and sea level rise, Delaware will see earlier than many States impacts on vital local infrastructure. So whether it is our sewer systems, our roads, our water systems or other infrastructure, we need to begin to plan now to make resiliency into the future of our communities.

Given the unique and important role that the Federal Government plays in financing infrastructure and in responding to disasters such as Superstorm Sandy that destroyed a lot of the infrastructure in the nearby States of New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut, we need to be mindful of what these costs could be.
The U.S. Department of Defense is already preparing plans to understand how climate change will impact its infrastructure. My thinking is that the entire Federal Government should make responsible, timely, and thoughtful plans to prepare for prudent mitigation of the future impacts of climate change on our infrastructure. So I am hopeful that this will be among the many amendments that will be taken up, debated, discussed, and passed in the coming hours and days.

I am grateful that we continue to have an open amendment process and the opportunity to discuss and debate the issues in front of us, and I very much look forward to passage of Coons amendment No. 119.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, two Senators from Delaware, back to back—a double shot.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. CARPER], for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. HERRMANN, proposes an amendment numbered 120 to amendment No. 2.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credits for new qualified fuel cell vehicles and alternative fuel vehicle refueling property)

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR NEW QUALIFIED FUEL CELL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) In General.—Paragraph (1) of section 30B(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made on or after the date which is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity.

My colleague from Delaware, Senator Coons, knows that Delaware, until 4 years ago, developed and built more cars, trucks, and vans per capita than any other State in America. We lost this industry, a GM plant that employed thousands of employees and a Chrysler plant that employed thousands of people. Those companies went into bankruptcy.

For a number of years before that and since then, I have gone every year in January to the North American auto show in Detroit. I remember being there half a dozen or so years ago and walking through the demonstrations—they call them the stands—where the auto companies, whether they happen to be domestic, Ford, Chrysler, GM, or companies from Europe or Asia, had on display their vehicles, in some cases the vehicles they were introducing that year for the next buying year, and in some cases concept cars that may never be built but are just interesting, exciting new technologies that are represented in those vehicles.

I have never forgotten about a half dozen years ago walking through this enormous cavernous auto show and coming across a stand where a number of the Honda vehicles were being displayed. One of them was in a makeshift garage. I thought that was interesting. You don’t see makeshift garages in the Detroit auto show.

I asked the Honda people, what is this about? They said, imagine a vehicle that is in a garage alongside a house. The technology in this vehicle will actually provide for the propulsion of that vehicle, propel the vehicle, and the fuel this vehicle uses will also cool the house in the summer and warm and heat this house in the winter. I said, you are kidding. I said, what kind of technology is this? He said, this is fuel cells. I said, no kidding. Are you really serious about this? He said, yes, we are.

As it turns out, a few years after that, I was back in Delaware at Dover Downs. A lot of people think of Dover Downs now because we have musical festivals. Firefly was there, and we had 80,000 people, and we had 80,000 people show up for a couple of Sundays every year for the auto show.

A couple of years ago, I was at Dover Downs, and I had a chance to drive around the Monster Mile when no other cars were on the track but a GM minivan. The thing that was unique about the GM minivan was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan. The thing that was unique about it was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it cost.

GM, Chrysler, and Ford have put a lot of money into fuel cell vehicles. One of the people who helped to run GM for a number of years, a fellow named Tom Davis, a longtime friend, when he stepped down from GM several years ago ran the part of the company that dealt with light trucks and SUV’s. Almost half of their revenue was generated from those sources.

Earlier this month he and I talked about the future of the auto industry and GM in particular. I said, what do you think the future is for providing propulsion for cars? Is it like the hybrid electric? He said, no, it is not. I said, is it like the diesel electric? He said, no, it is not. I said, is it pure electric? He said, no, it is not. I have said for years that the future is fuel cells. I said, no kidding. That is just like I saw at the auto show years ago and just like the fuel-cell powered minivan I drove at Dover Downs a couple of years after that. He said, that is the future.

It turns out in Japan they have a word that actually means future that they use to describe this technology, and it is called “mirai.” Honda and Toyota are betting a little bit of their own money on fuel cells. I don’t think it’s a mistake. I don’t think it is a mistake that some of our domestic auto companies are betting some money of their own.

The great thing about this technology is that it reduces the consumption of oil. We are still the leading consumer of oil in the world. A lot of our oil is from foreign sources, and some of it is unstable. I think some of the countries use our money to harm us. This technology has the ability to reduce our dependence on that foreign oil from unstable countries. It has the ability to further clean our air and to improve our competitiveness. I personally experienced it myself all those many years ago in Dover Downs on the Monster Mile.

What I want do today is call up an amendment that will help us to seize the day and to take this technology, which is ready now, to be made commercially and to be introduced on both coasts and across the country in order to provide fuel cell vehicles and to help give it a little push, if you will, through the Tax Code to encourage them to be purchased by our consumers.

There are actually two parts to my amendment. One of those is to provide a $4,000-a-year tax credit for alternative fuel vehicles. In this case I am talking about fuel cells, but it could be electric, and it could be others as well.

The second half of the amendment is to provide the infrastructure. We have had a few years of development. Well, these would be infrastructures that would include fueling stations for fuel-cell-powered vehicles.
It is a two-fold amendment. It reduces our dependence on foreign oil, especially from unstable sources. It provides for new investment and for creation of jobs for that new investment. It is something that would help consumers, it would help our domestic auto industry, and it would enable us to compete with the rest of the world.

There are two parts to this amendment—a tax credit of about $4,000 for each vehicle for 5 years, and then an investment tax credit of 30 percent to enable us to put in the fueling stations. We have gas and diesel stations all across the country. We need alternative fueling stations, if you will, for these alternative vehicles if they are to realize their potential and we are to realize ours.

Later in the week, I will ask to have the opportunity to offer this amendment, and I ask that my colleagues keep these arguments in mind, and if they see fit, to support this amendment when it comes to the floor.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2
Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Ms. HEITKAMP], for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS, proposes an amendment numbered 133 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended to extend the credit with respect to facilities producing energy from certain renewable resources)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 153. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING 5-YEAR EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the United States is based on an all-of-the-above approach to production sources;

(2) an all-of-the-above approach reduces dependence on foreign oil, increases national security and creates jobs;

(3) smart investments in renewable resources are critical to increase the energy independence of the United States, reduce emissions, and create jobs;

(4) wind energy is a critical component of an all-of-the-above energy policy and has a proven record of creating jobs, reducing emissions, and provides an alternative and compatible energy resource to the existing generation infrastructure of the United States;

(5) the wind energy industry and utilities require long-term certainty regarding the Production Tax Credit for project planning in order to continue build out of this valuable natural resource; and

(6) the stop-start unpredictability of short-term Production Tax Credit extensions should be avoided, as short-term extensions have disrupted the wind industry, lowering the ability of the wind industry to cut costs, as compared to other industry occurrences with a long-term, predictable policy in place.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended by striking “January 1, 2015” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2020” in—

(A) paragraph (2)(A);

(B) paragraph (2)(A);

(C) paragraph (3)(A);

(D) paragraph (4)(B);

(E) paragraph (6);

(2) paragraph (7);

(G) paragraph (9); and

(H) paragraph (11)(B);

(2) clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) should be amended by striking “January 1, 2015” and inserting “January 1, 2020”; and

(3) the amendments that would be made by paragraphs (2) and (2) should take effect on January 1, 2015.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Keystone has been described two ways down here, an energy bill and a jobs bill—economic development offering economic opportunities. There could be an amendment that is offered that would fit both slots of the description of the Keystone bill than the amendment that I am proposing, amendment No. 133.

This is a bipartisan proposal that has always been supported by both sides of the aisle, and quite honestly, it has tremendous support across the country from the American people. Quite simply what the amendment does is to provide that it is the sense of the Senate that we should extend the production tax credits for the next 5 years to give certainty to alternative energy companies, particularly to wind energy companies. It would basically lay down the glidepath out, and everyone under-
North Dakota is the Saudi Arabia of wind because I think he is thinking that Colorado might be the Saudi Arabia of wind. I know that the Presiding Officer is a great supporter of wind energy as well.

But when we do these stops and starts, when we don’t give a constant and predictable policy, we are living hand to mouth. Maybe we are making some decisions to deploy resources in a way that meets with the congressional schedule and doesn’t meet with the business community or orderly introduction and continuing development of this industry.

If you are looking for a germane amendment that addresses both jobs and energy, this is a perfect amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I may be able to offer my amendment, amendment No. 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] proposes an amendment numbered 121 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect at the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1. NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this Act may not change, suspend, supercede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian tribe, Indian tribe organization, or Indian tribal organization, including the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, without consultation with, and the informed and express consent of, the applicable Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67289 (November 6, 2000)).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, my amendment states that S. 1 must declare that the conditions under which the United States pledged to protect Indian Tribes, guarantee the right to Self-Government and obligated itself to underwrite the cost of the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868.

We further assert that construction of any pipeline that violates the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, which impact the greater homelands that still possess substantial treaty obligations, cultural and natural resources, that are important to our way of life and for our future generations will potentially be destroyed or compromised by the pipeline.

We have also observed that the lands have not been surveyed by outsiders less they be looted or plundered but are held in trust by the people considered to be safe keepers of this knowledge. The Programmatic agreement entered into for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act acknowledges that construction of the pipeline would cause destruction to many sacred and cultural sites.

With regards to our tribal federally reserved water rights in the Great Plains Basin, the pollution risk via benzene and other carcinogens from the tar sands sludge pipeline would be catastrophic if it would enter into the Missouri River or leaching into the Ogallala Aquifer, should a pipeline break occur, is too great. The Missouri River is the source of drinking water for many communities along the Missouri River main-stem. The Ogallala Aquifer supplies drinking water for the Great Plains. All of this development further impacts reserved rights of our Oceti Sakowin which were unceded by treaties, including the right to live a safe manner of life. We as a people through the processes of human, cultural and natural resources as outlined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Consultation occurred in a manner that recognizes free, prior and informed consent for the construction of this
pipeline. We believe it is our Human Right to live safely on our homelands with clean water and lands. Very importantly, the XL Pipeline and the continued development of the Alberta tar sands will increase the carbon footprint in our sacred lands for the enrichment of foreign and corporate entities. We know, climate change will impact and affect all of us including the generations to come unless we do something to stop it now. The Oceiti Sakowin Power Project (OSPP) that recognizes fossil fuels are relics that contribute to climate change. OSPP leaders met with the White House representatives in our effort to turn the tide against global warming through solar and wind developments on our lands. We do not have to be held prisoners of fossil fuels but can create stories of redemption for Mother Earth through exciting renewals development, not in the future but now.

Because of the dire concerns outlined above, we request an emergency meeting with Department of Interior Secretary Sally Jewell and Tribal Leaders for the Great Plains Region which comprises the common interests of the Sovereign Tribes and Nations of the Great Plains Region which comprises the common interests of the Sovereign Tribes and Nations of the Great Plains Region and their members; and

Whereas, opposition to the Exxon-Imperial ‘‘Heavy Haul’’ proposal to transport ‘‘tar sands’’ and ‘‘oil sands’’ development and expansion until a ‘‘cumulative effects management system’’ is in place, and are also in opposition to the pipeline and the construction of the pipeline; and

Whereas, in treaties, the United States pledged to protect Indian Tribes, guaranteed the right of Tribal self-government, and has undertaken a trust responsibility to promote the viability of reservations; and lands as permanent homelands for tribes; and

Whereas, on September 28, 2011, the Tribal Chairman’s Association represents Tribal Nations that are members of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association, have been meeting at the request of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Environmenal Protection Agency of a ‘‘Finding of No Significant Impact’’ from the proposed pipeline; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of State did not properly consult with the Tribes along the route of the Keystone XL Pipeline and, as a result of the mechanisms used for what consultation was provided, the affected Tribal Nations were not provided the opportunity for ‘‘free and informed consent’’ regarding the construction of the pipeline; and

Whereas, the GPTCA hereby urges all its member Tribal Nations to submit comments to the U.S. Department of State regarding the Keystone XL project as not in the tribal nor the national interest; and

Resolved, that the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association stands in solidarity with the First Nations of Canada and with Tribal Nations in the United States in opposing the Keystone XL pipeline and the Exxon-Imperial Heavy Haul proposal and their negative impacts on cultural sites and the environment in those portions of Indian country over and through which it is proposed to be constructed, and

Resolved, that the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association approves the Mother Earth Accord among the First Nations of Canada and the Tribal Nations within the United States; and

Resolved, that the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association requests a meeting with the Tribal Leaders and Hilary Clinton, Secretary of State, and the Administration to present an Accord and voice the concerns of the US Tribal Nations and the First Nations of Canada opposing the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and the Heavy Haul proposal in the national interest. Now, therefore be it

GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN’S ASSOCIATION (GPTCA)

Opposition to Keystone XL (‘‘Keystone II’’) Pipeline now being considered for authorization by the U.S. Department of State, on the basis that construction of such pipeline is not in the national interests of the United States.

Whereas, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association (GPTCA) is composed of the elected Chairs and Presidents of the 16 Sovereign Indian Tribes and Nations recognized by Treaties with the United States that are within the Great Plains Region of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association was formed to promote the common interests of the Sovereign Tribes and Nations and their members of the Great Plains Region which comprises the states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska; and

Whereas, the United States has obligated itself both through Treaties entered into with the sovereign Tribes and Nations of the Great Plains Region and through its own federal statutes, the Snyder Act of 1921 as amended, the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1976 as amended, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 1976 as amended; and

Whereas, Indian Tribes are governments that pre-date the United States, and through the Indian Commerce, Treaty and Apportionment Clauses and the 14th Amendment, the United States has crossed the status of Tribes as sovereigns and the status of American Indians as tribal citizens;
Resolved that this resolution shall be the policy of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association until otherwise amended or rescinded or until the goal of this Resolution has been accomplished.

CERTIFICATION

This resolution was enacted at a duly called meeting of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association held at Rapid City, SD on September 13, 2011 at which a quorum was present, with 10 members voting in favor, 0 members opposed, 0 members abstaining, and 6 members not present.

Dated this 20th day of September, 2011.

Mr. CARDIN. With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. 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. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about President Obama’s State of the Union Address last week. It was a speech that I believe laid out a positive and forceful agenda for strengthening our middle class and for accelerating our Nation’s economic recovery.

Over the past year, our Nation’s economic progress has become unmistakable and undeniable. In our home State of Delaware, more people are working. People spend much less time looking for work, and job growth has been the strongest it has been since the 1990s.

Nationally, we are amidst the longest period of sustained private-sector job growth on record. Of particular interest to me is that our manufacturing sector has come back and come back strongly as manufacturers have created nearly 800,000 jobs in the last 4 years—jobs that make up the foundation of our 21st century middle class and our economy.

Our unemployment rate has dropped to its lowest level since before the great recession. Our growing private sector is not just creating jobs now. They are also laying the foundation for the future. As test scores continue to improve, high school graduation rates reach record highs, and, as our President said, “More Americans finish college than ever before,” we are laying a path that ensures that future generations of Americans can thrive as well.

But our work remains unfinished. Although we are right to turn the page on the crisis here at home, crises do remain real in the lives of far too many American families. I listen to who are struggling to get into and stay in our middle class. For many in the middle class, wages have remained stubbornly stagnant as incomes for the wealthy have continued to grow. At the same time, too many Americans just stopped looking for work altogether during the recession and haven’t begun that job search again. So we have a lot of work to do together to ensure that the middle class experiences the benefits of this recovery.

On that note, I appreciated President Obama’s call for an agenda that would do a lot to strengthen our middle class. Although this isn’t what we will hear about on the news, many of these ideas should enjoy bipartisan support. I wish to spend a few minutes on some of the areas that I think are ripe for bipartisan cooperation and that would go a long way toward actually helping middle-class families and our Nation as a whole.

First, it is no secret to anyone that our country’s infrastructure is badly outdated and in need of repair. From our ports and roads, to our bridges and railways, we have steadily racked up a national debt that we will need to pay for. The only question is when and how we do it. Historically, infrastructure—fixing roads and bridges and ports and railways—has not been a partisan issue. It is something that has always been at the heart of the American dream. We can move forward together, and it is my sincere hope that we will rise to that occasion, that we will seize this opportunity and do the critical work of building and sustaining our vital middle class.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up on behalf of Senator Gillibrand amendment No. 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

(Without objection, the amendment was agreed to).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up on behalf of Senator Gillibrand amendment No. 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

(Without objection, the amendment was agreed to).

At the appropriate place, insert the following:
SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF UNDERGROUND INJECTION.

Section 1421(d)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h(d)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) includes the underground injection of natural gas for purposes of storage.

Mr. President, this amendment amends the Safe Drinking Water Act to protect clean drinking water sources from hydraulic fracturing, commonly known as fracking, and from underground storage of natural gas.

The Safe Drinking Water Act currently exempts underground injection of fracking fluids and underground storage of natural gas from regulation under the act. The Gillibrand amendment repeals those exemptions and makes underground injection of fracking fluids and underground storage of natural gas subject to those regulations.

I know my colleague from New York has been on the floor many times—actually, I think—always during this debate trying to offer this amendment. I am offering it on her behalf tonight. I am sure she will be looking for time to come and discuss it further.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 55 on behalf of Senator Peters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington, [Ms. CANTWELL], for Mr. Peters, for himself and Ms. Stabenow, proposes an amendment numbered 55 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a study of the potential environmental impact of by-products of the Keystone XL pipeline)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. STUDY OF BY-PRODUCT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.

(a) In General. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall complete and make publicly available on the Internet a study assessing the potential environmental impact of by-products generated from the refining of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in section (2)(a), including petroleum coke.

(b) Report. On completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, including a summary of best practices for the transportation, storage, and handling of petroleum coke.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Peters amendment No. 55 would require the EPA to complete a study on the environmental impacts of petcoke. My colleague has been here on the floor speaking on the tar sands issue in general because Kalamazoo had one of the worst tar sands oilspills in the Nation’s history. On the floor talking about the things we need to do to protect people not just in the State of Michigan but throughout the United States.

One of the aftereffects of this issue is also petcoke, which my colleague from Illinois has been speaking to on the floor. This is a very big issue for midwest Senators who have an amount of petcoke in their communities and want to see the proper environmental treatment of it.

I am sure Senator Peters will be back to the floor to speak in more detail on amendment No. 55, but I offer it on his behalf.

I ask the Senator from New Jersey, and I think he is here to speak on another matter, but I will yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the energy committee for yielding me some time this evening. I am not here for the purposes of legislation we have been debating; I am here to take time on the Senate floor on an occasion that I think is incredibly important to recollect, to commemorate, and to talk about. Seventy years ago today a Soviet soldier, Ivan Martynyushkin, arrived with his unit at the death camp at Auschwitz, and he said in an interview that he was instantly struck by the silence, the smell of ashes, and the emptiness. But as they entered the gates, Ivan and his unit were unaware of the atrocities, the war crimes that were to come to light over time.

Today is in memory of the 1.1 million persons who perished there, 90 percent of them Jews. I rise in recognition of 1.1 million lost dreams, lost hopes, the lost wisdom of 1.1 million percent of them Jews. I rise in recognition of 1.1 million lost dreams, lost hopes, the lost wisdom of 1.1 million lost dreams, lost hopes, the lost wisdom of 1.1 million lost dreams.

Ivan Martynyushkin and his unit entered the camp thinking there would be a Nazi ambush, and then they noticed people—tall and barefoot wire. It was hard to watch them,” he said. “I remember their faces, especially their eyes, which betrayed their ordeal.” Ivan didn’t know that the Nazis had evacuated another 58,000 prisoners 10 days earlier or the 6 million who were killed in camps across Europe.

He stood witness that day to the ultimate manifestation of man’s inhumanity to his fellow man—7,000 prisoners left behind, dead corpses born of history. He has been on the floor talking about the things we need to do to protect people not just in the State of Michigan but throughout the United States.

As we remember the 6 million killed in camps like Auschwitz, we must also remember the 600 corpses born of hatred, intolerance, prejudice, bigotry, and a seething anti-Semitism that is again rearing its ugly head in Europe, the Middle East, and around the world.

There has been an alarming increase in anti-Semitic attacks and incidents in Europe that remain a challenge not only to stability and to security but to our shared morality, to our mutually ethical core as human beings. Just two weeks ago, on January 9, 2015, four members of France’s Jewish community were murdered during a hostage crisis at Hyper Cacher—a kosher supermarket—following the deadly terrorist attack on the Paris offices of the newspaper Charlie Hebdo.

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights issued a 2013 report on anti-Semitism in France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Belgium, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, where 50 percent of Europe’s Jews reside, in which three-quarters of respondents said that anti-Semitism had worsened over the past 5 years where they lived.

In France, home to Europe’s largest Jewish population, it has been reported that the number of French Jews immigrating to Israel in 2014 had doubled compared to 2013. And for the first time ever, more Jews moved to Israel from France than any other country in the world.

Anti-Semitic acts in European countries in 2014 included violent attacks, death threats, and the desecration of Jewish homes, commercial property, cemeteries, and places of worship. On May 29, 2014, a gunman opened fire at the Jewish Museum of Belgium in Brussels, Belgium, and killed four people. On July 29, Molotov cocktails were thrown at the synagogue in Wuppertal, Germany, which was founded to the ground by the Nazis during the 1938 Kristallnacht and had only been rebuilt in 2002.

We have all been shocked by the recent, disturbingly stereotypical anti-Semitic utterances of President Erdogan of Turkey and those around him. He said in February of 2013, “Today the image of the Jews is no different from that of the Nazis.” Speaking at a campaign rally in the Black Sea province of Ordu, he said the “terrorist State Israel has attacked Gaza once again, hitting innocent children who were playing on a beach,” and the crowd chanted “Down the Israel.” Erdogan said, “The world’s media is under the influence of Israel.” He said, “Wherever Jews settle, they make money.” He claimed during the 2013 Gezi Park protests that the Europeans and what he stereotypically referred to as the “anti-Israel lobby” were backing the antigovernment campaign, with the ultimate goal of dividing Turkey from within.

A Turkish writer aligned with President Erdogan called for Turkish Jews to be taxed to pay for Gaza reconstruction. He said:

The reconstruction of Gaza will be paid for by Jewish businessmen.

He went on to say:

The penalty for failing to pay the tax should be revocation of the Jewish business license and the seizure of his property.

This is the kind of anti-Semitism we hear in Turkey today.
Around the world, the numbers are shocking. Based on the global survey, the ADL concluded that 1.09 billion people harbor anti-Semitic attitudes. Thirty-five percent never heard of the Holocaust.

If the world does not stand together in never forgetting and if our schools, teachers, parents, and communities do not join together in the fundamental principle of never forgetting, how can we prevent this from ever happening again? How can we work together to confront the anti-Semitism that enables hatred, violence, murder, and genocide around the world?

We can only ask what tomorrow might bring. We cannot know what the future will hold, but we have learned from the past. What we remember today—70 years after the liberation of Auschwitz—is that the United States and the American people will always stand shoulder to shoulder with the Israeli people and Jewish communities across the globe in ensuring never again. This means confronting modern-day anti-Semitism, whether from the world’s leaders, from ivory tower academics, or from economic belligerence pushing the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement. We must back against any and all efforts to delegitimize the Israeli State, the Jewish people, and the Jewish religion.

As I have said many times, on many occasions, the Holocaust was the most sinister of all possible reminders that the Jewish population in exile has lived under constant threat. It is the definitive reminder that anti-Semitism can appear anywhere, and its horrors galvanized international support for the State of Israel.

But let’s be very clear. While the Shoah has a central role in Israel’s identity, it is not and never has been the reason behind Israel’s founding, and it is not the main justification for its existence. In fact, extreme characterizations of this mistaken view is that Western powers established Israel in 1948 based on their own guilt, at the expense of the peoples who already lived there, and therefore the current state is illegitimate and, according to religious clerics such as Supreme Leader Khamenei, who retains his own aspirations for regional hegemony, should be wiped off the face of the map.

This flawed argument is not only in defiance of human dignity but in plain defiance of history, in defiance of what we remember today. It is in defiance of ancient history, as told in biblical texts and through archeological evidence. It ignores the history of the last several centuries, and it stands in stark contrast to what we remember today. Several thousand years of history lead to an undeniable conclusion: The reestablishment of the State of Israel in modern times is a political reality with roots going back to the time of Abraham and Sarah.

At the end of the day, the argument for Israel’s legitimacy does not depend on what we say in speeches and what we say on an occasion like this. It has been made by the hard reality of history. It has been made by the men and women who made the desert green, by Nobel Prizes earned, by groundbreaking innovations and enviable institutions, by lives saved, democracy defended, peace made, and battles won.

There can be no denying the Jewish people’s legitimate right to live in peace and security in a homeland to which they have had a connection for thousands of years. And there can be no denying the suffering, the senseless slaughter of a generation, and all that the world realized we had lost when Ivan Martynushkin and his unit walked through those gates and liber- ated Auschwitz-Birkenau, a reminder for all times of the racism and hatred from the most devastating genocide in human history.

As we commemorate the victims of the Holocaust, let us never forget. But let us be very clear as we look around the world today that the struggle is not over. Combating anti-Semitism is not only a Jewish issue of the past, it is a matter of basic civil and human rights today and in the present.

Like those Russian soldiers 70 years ago, I have personally stood at the gates of Auschwitz-Birkenau. I felt the impact, the horror, the silence, the emptiness, and I felt the lives lost. It is a moving experience that should compel all of us to collectively reflect on how we must transform the lessons we should have learned into concrete acts to prevent history from repeating itself.

Now is the time to renew the vow “never again” with even greater resolve.

I yield the floor, and 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. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we Americans are so fortunate to enjoy the blessings of liberty. We protect our rights as individuals, and we have a legal system that demands that government officials respect those rights and respect the law.

Historically some nations have lost their freedoms in revolutions. In others a leader gradually undermined the rule of law. Once the rule of law is dismantled, the road to dictatorship is easily traveled.

In a country under the rule of law, government officials are bound by that law.

When the Framers wrote our Constitution, they feared that the Federal Government might grow too strong. They divided and limited the powers among three branches. They made sure to preserve State power to serve as a check on the Federal power, and they also limited the Federal Government had the authority to make uniform laws, contrary State laws gave way.

To make sure everyone would be subject to the law, they entrusted the President with the duty to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.”

President Obama has repeatedly failed to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. He has repeatedly violated the Constitution. His administration has not confirmed its conduct to law.

His administration therefore has undermined the rule of law. Often patterns repeat. The President proposes legislation that the American people need. The Congress naturally refuses to enact it.

The President then decides that he will take Executive action as if Congress had enacted that law. Another pattern is he claims the authority to issue an opinion from the Department of Justice that coherently supports his authority. That creates a terrible lack of accountability.

We have also seen the President pick and choose which legal opinion he will enforce, claiming that the ability to make individual enforcement decisions extends to failing to enforce the laws in millions of instances, and the President has simply failed to take notice when the Supreme Court has ruled he has exceeded his powers.

I know my colleagues think these are serious charges, and they are.

I wish to outline a number of instances where the President or his administration, acting at his discretion, has failed to follow the Constitution or the laws. Regrettably I will only be able to touch on some of the examples.

The President has attempted to unconstitutionally limit the powers of States through ObamaCare. He threatened the States that did not expand Medicaid would lose their existing Medicaid funds. The Supreme Court ruled 7 to 2 for the first time that a condition on Federal spending was so discrete as to deprive the States as to be unconstitutional.

Another President might have been careful after such a rebuke by the highest Court in the land to be mindful of State power—after all, it included one of the Justices that the President himself appointed to the Supreme Court—but not this President taking notice of what the Court said.

President Obama’s EPA then turned around and has not followed the rule of law. It wrongly recognizes no limit to Federal power over its own trade.

Despite the fact that Congress rejected his cap-and-trade proposal, his EPA issued greenhouse gas regulations...
that would require States to develop plans that meet EPA-established emission standards. Once EPA approved them, EPA would then order the States to enforce the standards.

Supporters of EPA argued that the threat from pollutants under the Clean Air Act, a category in which they erroneously include carbon dioxide, justified EPA’s action, but the “end justifies the means” is an argument that is totally at odds with the concept of rule of law.

EPA’s approach is unconstitutional. Just as a State cannot be coerced by Federal spending programs, it cannot be commandeered to enact Federal dictates. This is a well-established rule of the 10th Amendment, otherwise the States would lose their sovereignty.

Responsibility and therefore accountability would be blurred as voters could not tell which level of government to blame for unpopular policies. Among those who recognize that EPA has acted unconstitutionally is the President’s own liberal constitutional law professor, Laurence Tribe of Harvard.

He wrote, “any judge who tells you that the EPA is ‘nurturing executive power far beyond its lawful authority.”

He also wrote, “Frustration with congressional inaction cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard.”

President Obama also acted unconstitutionally when he made what he said were valid recess appointments, even though the Senate was not in recess. Although Presidents had been making recess appointments for more than 200 years, the Senate’s use of the power was once again unprecedented.

He was armed with a Justice Department opinion that laughably argued that the President could ignore when the Senate said it was in session to make such appointments.

The Supreme Court rejected the President’s so-called recess appointments unanimously. That meant of course that both of the Justices President George W. Bush appointed rejected his claim that he could determine when the Senate was in recess, even though the Constitution makes it very clear, and it also rejected the Justice Department’s arguments that supposedly allowed the President to make that recess appointment in violation of the Constitution.

But the President, similar to the old French Kings, learns nothing and forgets nothing when it comes to respecting the Constitution.

Despite the lodging of the power in the Constitution to Congress alone to enact uniform laws of naturalization, the President decided to enable millions of people who entered the country without proper documentation to remain without congressional approval.

In fact, at a recent Judiciary Committee hearing we heard testimony that the administration’s misuse of power authority under this directive would allow many individuals who are here illegally to obtain green cards without Congress changing a word of the immigration laws.

This follows the President’s earlier decision when Congress would not pass the DREAM Act to give benefits to undocumented aliens, as if that bill had been enacted into law.

In both of these instances, the supposed justification for noncompliance with the law is that the need is so great. This is a siren song that supports of the rule of law must reject.

Texas and a number of other States have already filed suit challenging the immigration director’s constitutionality, as well as its violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In an unrelated case, Federal district court has already found parts of the order to be unlawful. The President also has claimed enforcement discretion in failing to enforce other Federal criminal laws.

The Controlled Substances Act prohibits marijuana possession nationwide. Under the supremacy clause of the Constitution, States laws to the contrary are invalid.

Normally the Federal Government sues States that enact such laws. But when Colorado and other States legalized marijuana, the Obama administration directed Federal law enforcement to refrain from resources to enforce Federal law in those States. It did not make individualized prosecutorial decisions but a very blanket refusal to enforce Federal law, contrary to the oath.

Nebraska and Oklahoma, rather than the Federal Government, have sued Colorado, as those neighboring States argue they face a significant increase in marijuana and other drug-related harms as a result of the Colorado law. To make matters worse, Attorney General Holder is expanding his refusal to apply Federal marijuana laws to Indian reservations. Those reservations depend upon Federal law enforcement.

He plans to allow tribes to petition unselected local prosecutors to decide whether the same nonenforcement of marijuana laws’ policy will apply to those reservations. Apart from the rule of law question, it must be kept in mind that these reservations are in States that still want to see marijuana illegal. As a matter of policy, rates of illegal drug use are higher on Indian reservations, with all of the associated health and crime consequences.

Again, this goes to the heart of the rule of law.

Does anyone believe if a State decided dealers could sell guns without conducting the federally required background checks, that the Obama administration would ignore those States? Anyone who approves what President Obama has done under the guise of enforcement discretion will have no cause to complain about a future President’s decision to allocate scarce resources.

For instance, he could decide that the ObamaCare individual mandate, which is constitutional according to the Supreme Court—only because it is a tax—will not be enforced against anyone who does not buy government-approved health insurance.

President Obama has also violated the law when he released five Taliban fighters who were detained at Guantánamo in exchange for an American service member. The Government Accountability Office concluded, the failure to notify Congress 30 days before such transfer, and to provide a justification, was a violation of law.

I have asked the Justice Department for the justification for this executive order for this move by the President. To this day, the President refuses to produce the Justice Department’s opinion that purports to legally justify this action, contrary to the law passed by Congress.

The American people can draw their own conclusions as to whether that means a well-reasoned legal argument exists that the President could legally act as he did.

Any rule of law ensures that government officials and agencies obey the law. Under the Constitution, Federal agencies can only exercise the power that Congress gives them. They cannot do whatever they want. Now that is obviously true for any high school government class. But in the Obama administration, where too many agencies do not believe in limited government, agencies are lawlessly exceeding their powers. This lawlessness is a major reason why polls show that Americans believe the Federal Government is overregulated.

Let’s take a look at the EPA again. Not only has the EPA violated the Constitution and exceeded its powers on the Clean Air Act, that agency has violated a core Federal statute—the Administrative Procedures Act. The Administrative Procedures Act sets forth the process by which agencies can issue regulations and conduct other administrative business.

For instance, under the EPA, an agency can issue a regulation that is binding on citizens with penalties for noncompliance only if that agency pursues notice-and-comment rulemaking.

This process, consistent with notions of due process and fairness, requires any agency to issue a proposed rule, seek public comment, respond to public comment, and modify the proposed rule to reflect those comments when it issues a final rule. The process is this way to assure accountability, to ensure transparency and input from regulated entities. Courts can strike down the regulation if the agency fails to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act.

They can also strike down the regulation where the agency exceeds its statutory powers or where the agency’s justification of law that is said to justify the regulation does not reflect a legitimate reading of the statute. Courts give greater deference to an agency’s interpretations of statutes that are taken after proceeding through the notice-and-comment process.

The EPA recently violated the Administrative Procedures Act in my own
State of Iowa. The EPA wrote letters to Iowa municipalities setting forth specific requirements that they said must be followed to meet their obligations under the Clean Water Act. The cities challenged the EPA because the two agencies effectively imposed new regulatory requirements. They argued the EPA could not impose regulatory obligations simply by letter but needed to proceed by notice-and-comment rulemaking—the Administrative Procedures Act requirements.

They argued that so-called informal guidance imposes subtle pressures on regulated entities to comply even if the EPA does not call its actions a regulation.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit agreed and struck down the requirements EPA imposed on those cities just by issuing letters. However, the EPA has since publicly stated, as a lot of government agencies do, that the EPA would only comply with the Eighth Circuit decision. So here we have a situation where there is a national law, the actions of the EPA are struck down in the Eighth Circuit, and now that law is going to be applied one way in the Eighth Circuit and in another way in the rest of the States. In other words, the EPA has proclaimed it intends to continue to impose these illegal requirements on municipalities in those States outside the Eighth Circuit, in clear violation of the APA.

The EPA is not alone in failing to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act. The Department of Education issued what it termed informal guidance concerning campus sexual assault last year without public input.

I hope we can see a pattern here, whether it is by letter by the EPA to Iowa municipalities or whether it is something called informal guidance by the Department of Education. These are all terms trying to get around the legal requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act to get things done faster by these agencies, because following the rule of law is kind of an inconvenience they do not want to go through.

In regard to what the Department of Education did, at a HELP Committee hearing the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights Catherine Lhamon stated that she expected colleges and universities to comply with that guidance that was not a regulation under the Administrative Procedures Act. Of course, that meant what the Department was calling informal guidance was really a regulation that could only be issued after engaging in notice-and-comment rulemaking.

When Senator Alexander, who is chairman of the committee now, asked her who gave her the authority to issue the guidance, she responded, incredibly—and I emphasize incredibly—"Well, with great pride, you did, when I was confirmed." So you get confirmed by 100 Members of the Senate and you can do whatever you want to regardless of law? No. This is the United States, where we operate under the rule of law and the constitution. It is not France in the age of Louis XIV where government officials say, L’Etat c’est moi. I am the State, in other words.

Senate confirmation means only that a person has been legally installed in a job. But once confirmed, the agency official can only act in accordance with the laws governing their agency. I support the Government’s overall goal of holding accountable those who commit campus sexual assault, but it has to be done lawfully. By issuing so-called guidance that, by her own admission, she expected colleges and universities to follow, the Department exceeded its lawful powers.

Separate from excluding the public from having any say in the rules that have governed their conduct, bureaucrats have many incentives—too many incentives—to ignore the Administrative Procedures Act.

Imagine: Formal rulemaking takes time. A formal notice of proposed rulemaking is followed by the public’s comment period, then the agency responds to comments and modifies their proposed rule. The process is very slow.

The Office of Management and Budget reviews the regulation and can block or modify it. The Office of Management and Budget makes agencies justify the costs and benefits of their rules, reduce burdens through the Paperwork Reduction Act, and also prepare a federalism impact statement for those proposed rules.

Agencies that want to regulate without oversight can subvert the whole process of issuing binding rules under the cover of "informal guidance." It is so much faster for bureaucrats to issue dictates to whomever they want for whatever reason they want.

By avoiding the Administrative Procedures Act, agencies act legislatively in violation of the laws governing their agency. They act legislatively in violation of the limited authority Congress provides them to act. Then they are free to issue even more rules, restricting the freedom of American people and increasing the role of unelected bureaucrats in telling other people what to do. Reductions in freedom are ultimately manifestations of a failure to follow the rule of law.

We are all becoming complacent in that direction. The Supreme Court has before it a case now from the Labor Department, where one of the issues discussed at oral argument was whether that agency was required to proceed by notice-and-comment rulemaking rather than through interpretive rules.

We shall see, then, whether the Court addresses that issue or focuses instead on what level of deference a court gives when agencies change their position without proceeding through Administrative Procedures Act rulemaking.

But even if the issue of the necessity of engaging in notice-and-comment rulemaking is not addressed in that case, the Court, before long, will reach that question. When it does, I believe it will find that what the Obama administration has been doing is clearly illegal.

President Obama’s claims of Executive power are unprecedented. He is creating a general precedent of a Presidency unrestrained by law.

When Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated in the darkest days of the Great Depression, he called on Congress to act to respond to the emergency as well as giving him powers to address it. He did issue Executive orders, such as declaring a bank holiday, but he did not say that he had a phone and a pen and that he would do whatever he felt was necessary regardless of whether Congress acted. Rather, he said that if the powers Congress gave him to address the emergency were inadequate, he would ask Congress to amend with the APA.

We have a very good example from the dark days of Watergate. The Nixon administration exceeded its powers too. When that happened, there were administration officials who pushed back against their own President who appointed them. The appropriate Justice Department official told President Nixon he would haul him into Federal Court if there were evidence of his criminality. Attorney General Elliott Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelhaus resigned rather than fire the Watergate special prosecutor, as the President had ordered. People of conscience do sometimes resign or threaten to do so, and that increases public pressure on the President to obey the law.

Who in the Obama administration has ever stood up against his lawlessness? No one. As far as I know, no one has resigned from the Justice Department as it has become a rubber stamp for wild claims of Presidential power that exceed the Constitution and violate the laws.

Who in the EPA or any other Department has stopped her agency from acting unconstitutionally by exceeding the powers that Congress has specifically delegated under various statutes? What lawyer has stopped an agency from violating the Administrative Procedures Act by issuing binding rules on the public without public comment?
I regret to say that the Congress up to now has too often been complicit with Presidential assaults on the rule of law. When President Obama eviscerated the core Senate prerogative of advice and consent by making unconstitutional appointments, not one single Democrat in this body objected. This is where the real harm of excessive partisanship manifests itself.

Time and again, the previous majority in this body refused to take action against any Presidential action that violated the law if they agreed with the policy being pursued by the President. This sort of nonactivity is not why the Constitution created the Congress. Whatever its flaws, an active Congress that defends its legislative prerogatives and conducts effective oversight of Executive illegality is vital to preserving liberty.

In one historical example, the process of transformation from democracy to dictatorship was completed when the Parliament voted itself out of existence.

The Framers did not intend a Congress to sit idly by as the President violates the Constitution and the laws. In Federalist 51, James Madison wrote that the separation of powers was vital to the preservation of liberty. He noted that checks and balances would be effective in keeping each branch within its prescribed constitutional role because each had, in his words: . . . the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others . . . Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.

Recently, the Senate has failed to counteract unlimited Executive ambition. That must change and, as a result of the last election, should change. Will it change? I sure hope so.

I trust that under our new leadership, the Senate will take action for the government to control itself, and to restore the system of government that has been so badly damaged in recent years, because if we take the spirit of the Declaration of Independence—and remember, prior to that Declaration, the colonies decided they did not want one person, George III, making decisions affecting millions of people on this side of the ocean. So they were very careful, when they declared independence and they wrote a Constitution a few years later, to make sure they carried out the spirit of the Declaration of Independence that: . . . they are endow by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Not by our government, but by nature or by our Creator,

So they put into this Constitution assurances so there could never be a George III again, and separated all the powers so one person didn’t have all the power.

Now we see one person trying to exercise the power of several branches of government, as George III tried to do. So we are over that hurdle. All we have to do is make sure that the checks and balances the government worked—the same checks and balances that every high school kid learns in government class, to make sure that one person doesn’t do it, and that our liberties are protected by a government that operates under the rule of law. And that Constitution is our rule of law.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 245 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up amendment No. 245 on behalf of Senator Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Nothing in this Act may change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian nation without consultation and implementation, as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 246 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REAL- TORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

It is the sense of Congress—

(1) the Land and Water Conservation Fund plays an important role in improving wildlife habitat and increasing outdoor recreation opportunities on Federal and State land; and

(2) reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority for Congress and should include improvements to the structure of the program to more effectively manage existing Federal land.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, as a fifth-generation Montanan and lifelong sportsman, I have a deep appreciation for public lands hunting, fishing, and hiking on our public lands are important parts of many Montanans’ way of life. These are traditions I have enjoyed in my life and traditions I have also enjoyed with my kids.

It is important our State’s outdoor heritage is protected for future generations. That is why protecting and increasing access to public lands is so important. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been instrumental in increasing access to our public lands, growing opportunities for outdoor recreation and protecting wildlife. There is great potential for the program to be used to improve the management of our existing Federal lands.

In fact, there is much improvement to be made to make Federal land management more effective. My amendment will express the sense of the Congress that the Land and Water Conservation Fund plays an important role in improving wildlife habitat and increasing outdoor recreation opportunities on Federal as well as State land. It will also convey that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority for Congress and should include improvements in the structure of the program to more effectively manage existing Federal land.

Montana’s outdoor heritage is of great importance to our State’s economy and thousands of Montanans’ way of life. We must work to improve programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund so it will work better for Montanans and all Americans.

Supporting and improving the Land and Water Conservation Fund will help us ensure this legacy is continued for future generations.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
January 27, 2015

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to voice in relation to the matters to be considered, the amendments in the order listed: Cardin No. 75, Peters No. 70, Sanders No. 23, Cruz No. 15, Merkley No. 125, Moran No. 73, Whitehouse No. 148, Daines No. 132, Coons No. 115, Collins No. 35, Carper No. 120, Murkowski No. 166, Heitkamp No. 133, Gillibrand No. 48, Barrasso No. 245, Cardin No. 124, Daines No. 246, and Burr No. 92, as modified with the changes at the desk; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and that no second-degrees be in order in the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote, and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

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

The amendment (No. 92), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: SEC. 1. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) In general.—Section 200002 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “During the period ending September 30, 2015, there and inserting “There”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “through September 30, 2015”.

(b) Public access.—Section 200006 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Public access.—Not less than 1.5 percent of amounts made available for expenditure under section 200005 or $10,000,000, whichever is greater, shall be available each fiscal year for projects that secure recreation and public access to existing Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes.”.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

MARY LEAHY’S CAREER AS AN EDUCATOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have the privilege of being a lifelong Vermonter, as were my parents and my brother and sister. All Vermonters realize that in a small State like ours, it takes the dedication and hard work of very special and talented people to make the State great.

I will take a moment as a proud brother to mention one such person, my younger sister, Mary Leahy. Mary’s work with adult basic education and teaching and her ability to give adults who have not had the capability to read a newfound ability is profound. It is impossible to calculate the number of lives she has dramatically improved in our State through her work. I still carry the memory of watching a grandchild play with a child who could not read and seeing the delight on his face as he read a simple child’s book to his grandchild. He then told me that he had never been able to read to his child, the grandchild’s parent, but at least in his later years he could read to the grandchild. I then told him that he was not alone as he is one of many as I read an article printed in a number of our media in Vermont, written by Nancy Graff, about this part of Mary’s career. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From VTDigger.org, Dec. 28, 2014]

IN THIS STATE: FOR MARY LEAHY, LITERACY GAVE ME THE MESSAGE TO GO ON. (By Nancy Graff)

Several miles up a dirt road in Marshfield, Mary Leahy’s driveway swings up a modest rise on the right. In the wake of a recent snowstorm, ice, clumps of snow, and rutted snow, she is more than happy to step smooth as glass after decades of use. Beside them is a well-used brass can that contained solvent to clean the type.

Monday, however, she began to see that being able to identify a letter, being able to associate that letter with a sound, stringing letters into words, and understanding the meaning of the words were not enough. She recalls men at a local electric company who were afraid to requisition a part to fix a machine they could run with their eyes closed because they were unable to form needed to get the part. They learned the fundamentals of reading for their jobs, but until they could engage with ideas they remained outliers in the world’s literacy community.

“They needed to be included,” Leahy says.

And that meant being able to help their children with schoolwork, being able to articulate their ideas and opinions, being able to teach themselves to learn.

Bringing the newly literate into the life of their families and home communities, into the community of ideas that explore our humanity and world, became Leahy’s goal.

These days CVABE serves approximately 600 students, down from a high of 800 a few years ago. Leahy is quick to praise the people with whom she has worked over the years and other organizations that have made literacy work possible, especially the Vermont Council on the Humanities, with its emphasis on teaching reading not just as a vital skill but as a revelation of the human condition.

Each student presents unique challenges. Some are well-educated immigrants who need to learn English to work in their field. Some are learning how to write but aren’t being addressed. Others have lived in such chaotic situations that school wasn’t a priority. Still others have come from such poverty that illiteracy was a legacy passed from generations.

When she began working for CVABE, the organization struggled one-on-one in-home tutoring. ABE itself was a feature of the war on poverty that was an extension of the Department of Education. Leahy’s job was to develop tutoring programs by recruiting students and volunteers. To find students, she went door to door asking if anyone needed literacy assistance.

Being illiterate is not something people want to admit, she says. “There’s a chronic fear of being found out that you can’t do what everyone else can. You think you’re alone in not being able to do this.”

And so she met them wherever they felt comfortable. She tutored in homes, in restaurants, in libraries, sometimes in her car. Eventually, the Department of Education pushed the ABE program to move toward a more center-based structure. So Leahy oversaw that change, as well as many others, including gaining inclusion as a board member, fundraising, starting an alternative high school program for teens, and very important, from her perspective, hosting reading and discussion groups.

In 1996, she helped organize the first statewide conference for Vermont’s newly literate, ABE
students who had once believed their opinions did not matter.

Leaky learned early in life what it means to be part of a community. Her father, a printer in the Statehouse, and like her brothers (one of whom is Vermont’s U.S. Sen. Patrick Leahy), she regularly delivered printing jobs to the capitol. In the process, she learned about government and politics and the obligations of citizenship. She learned about history and immigrant communities through their Irish and Italian ancestors, including one grandmother who was illiterate. These interests have carried over into her current volunteer work for the Friends of the Vermont State House, the Vermont Historical Society, and the Marshfield Historical Society. She wants everyone to have full access to communities like those that will enrich their lives.

According to Leahy, her students were a joy to teach because they were so motivated. With her eyes tearing up she tells the story of a man who wrote a letter to his grandchild. “Things are going to be different than they were for me and your mother,” he wrote. “Your mother would bring papers home and I don’t keep my distance because I didn’t want her to know. But things will be different with you and me.”

That change in one family’s quality of life, says Leahy, matters. “I feel that special about those who had once believed their opinions did not matter. [a] Confidential testimony.—No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Committee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Member of the Committee by a majority vote of the Committee.

[c] Confidential testimony.—No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Committee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Member of the Committee by a majority vote of the Committee.
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Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise
today to speak on the Jones Act, an
important law for our Nation’s mar-
time industry and for our national se-
curity. Senator McCain has filed an
amendment to repeal the Jones Act, and
I urge its defeat.

In Louisiana, we know how impor-
tant the maritime industry and Jones
Act-related jobs are to our State and
our economy. According to the Amer-
ican Maritime Partnership, Louisiana
leads the Nation in maritime jobs by a
number of measurements of the domes-
tic maritime economy. For domestic
maritime employment, Louisiana
has more jobs than any other State—$5,000
jobs, as of the latest count. Louisiana
also leads the Nation in per

On January 27, 2015, the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs held a hearing on S. 539, the "Defending the Jones Act". The hearing was held to discuss the importance of the Jones Act for the Louisiana maritime industry, particularly for the State's economic growth. The Jones Act, named after Senator James Jones, is a law that requires U.S. ships to be built, owned, and operated by U.S. citizens. The committee heard testimony from various witnesses, including representatives from maritime businesses and maritime unions, who highlighted the economic benefits of the Jones Act for the Louisiana maritime industry. The hearing concluded with a vote on a resolution expressing the committee's support for the Jones Act.
TRIBUTE TO HOWARD GEORGE HITCHENS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I wish to honor Howard George Hitchens and highlight his service to the Slaughter Beach community and the State of Delaware.

Howard George Hitchens is a charter member of the Memorial Volunteer Fire Company of Slaughter Beach, DE, which he and several others established in 1954. Howard previously served as fire chief, assistant chief engineer, and director of the fire company. He also started its Santa Claus show for children, which still occurs each year during the holiday season. Howard has served the fire company for more than 60 years and is the only living charter member.

On February 14, 2015, the Memorial Volunteer Fire Company will honor Howard for his service. Howard is a true Delawarean and a model community leader. I would like to honor Howard for the dedication of his service to his family, friends, community, and the State of Delaware.

TRIBUTE TO TOM GRADY

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Assemblyman Tom Grady, of Yerington, on his retirement. After serving 12 years in the Nevada Legislature, Assemblyman Grady is retiring from public service. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate him not only as a colleague but also as a friend on his retirement after more than 36 years of hard work and dedication to the Silver State.

A devoted husband and proud father of three, Assemblyman Grady stands as a shining example of someone who has dedicated his life to serving his community. Upon graduating from the University of Nevada, Reno, Assemblyman Grady went on to attend the Washington State Bankers School. After moving back to Nevada, he served as the secretary-treasurer of the Truckee Thawson Community District before advancing to vice president of Pioneer Citizens Bank of Nevada. After leaving the bank, Assemblyman Grady reentered public service after winning a seat on the Yerington City Council. After 3 years of service on the Yerington City Council, Assemblyman Grady was elected mayor, a position he held for 12 years.

Assemblyman Grady’s experience as a local government leader qualified him for a seat in the Nevada Assembly, where he dutifully served his constituents for 12 years. During his time in the legislature, Assemblyman Grady served on the Taxation, Ways and Means, and Government Affairs Committees. Although I was a few years in the assembly, I am proud to have served with Assemblyman Grady in Nevada State government as secretary of state.

His service to his community goes far beyond the many positions he has held in the Silver State over the years. Assemblyman Grady also served his country in the U.S. Army Reserve. I extend my deepest gratitude to him for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication to his family and community earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve America but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home.

I am grateful for his dedication and commitment to the people of Yerington. He personifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Assemblyman Grady on his retirement, and I offer my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada an even better place. I offer my best wishes to Assemblyman Grady, his wife, Patricia, and their three children and seven grandchildren for many successful and fulfilling years to come.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages...
from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees. (The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
At 11:11 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Norwood, in whose hands the message was pending, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 357. An act to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

H.R. 468. An act to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

H.R. 514. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):
S. 256. A bill to amend the definition of “homeless person” under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

S. 257. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services, to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. Tester, Mr. Coats, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Moran, Mr. Barasso, Mr. Thune, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Daines, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Hoeven, Ms. Murkowski, Ms. Hekten, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Merkley, and Ms. Klobuchar):
S. 258. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. Klobuchar):
S. 259. A bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself, Mr. Portman, and Mr. Toomey):
S. 260. A bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to recommend temporary duty suspensions and rejections to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 261. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway Jr. United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. Collins, Ms. Ayotte, and Mr. Booker):
S. 262. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. Risch):
S. 263. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Barasso, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Heller, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Lee, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Moran, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Portman, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Scott, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Vittek, Mr. Perdue, Mrs. Capito, and Ms. Hirono):
S. 264. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Corzine, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Rucho, Mr. Flake, and Mr. Hatch):
S. 265. A bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. Nelson):
S. 266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY:
S. 267. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain items under the control of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. Mikulski):
S. 268. A bill to improve the infrastructure of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. Menendez, Mr. McCauley, Mr. Ayotte, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Coats, Mr. Pitts, Mr. Rucho, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Graham, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Casey, Mr. Burr, and Mr. Blumenthal):
S. 269. A bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Brown, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Markey, Mr. Coons, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Franken, and Mr. Pitts):
S. 270. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the definition of spouse for purposes of veterans benefits in recognition of new State definitions of spouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. Wyden):
S. 271. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service; to permit the receipt of Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. Mikulski):
S. 272. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; read the first time.
**SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS**

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SHELBY:
S. Res. 42. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

---

**ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS**

S. 11  
At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 30  
At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 33  
At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 33, a bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 38  
At the request of Mr. TRUPE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 38, a bill to ensure that long-term unemployed individuals are not taken into account for purposes of the employer health coverage mandate.

S. 42  
At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 42, a bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes.

S. 143  
At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from incentivizing, or making financial support conditioned upon a State, local educational agency, or school's adoption of specific instructional content, academic standards, or curriculum, or on the administration of assessments or tests, and for other purposes.

S. 155  
At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 155, a bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States.

S. 167  
At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 170  
At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 197  
At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HENRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes.

S. 201  
At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 201, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 203  
At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 210  
At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

---

**AMENDMENT NO. 15**

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 15 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

**AMENDMENT NO. 92**

At the request of Mr. BURB, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 92 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

**AMENDMENT NO. 156**

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 234, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites.

**AMENDMENT NO. 234**

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 247, a bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes.

---

**AMENDMENT NO. 35**

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cruz) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 35, a resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.
New York (Mrs. Gillibrand), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Manchin), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Ayotte), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin), the Senator from Maine (Mr. King), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy), the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 156 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. Feinstein (for herself and Mr. Portman):

S. 256. A bill to amend the definition of ‘homeless person’ under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. Feinstein. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce bipartisan legislation with my colleague Senator Portman that would expand the definition of ‘homeless’ used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, to ensure all homeless children and families are considered eligible for existing Federal homeless assistance programs. This change in the definition would be in alignment with what is already currently used by the U.S. Department of Education.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, approximately 1.2 million children were homeless during the 2012–2013 school year, which accounts for 6 percent increase from the 1,166,436 homeless students enrolled in the 2011–2012 school year.

In California, 259,656 children experienced homelessness last year. This increase is nearly four times the 65,000 homeless children that were reported in California in 2003.

Unfortunately, the numbers reported by the HUD ‘Point-in-Time Count’ fail to accurately reflect the upward trend in homeless families.

According to the 2013 HUD ‘Point-in-Time Count’, there were only 222,197 people counted as homeless in households that included children, a fraction of the number reported by the Department of Education.

This issue is important because only those children and their families counted by HUD are eligible for vital homeless assistance programs. The rest of these children and families are simply out of luck and are turned away by providers that do not want to be reimbursed for not following HUD regulations.

The Homeless Children and Youth Act of 2015 would expand the homeless definition to allow HUD funded homeless assistance programs to serve extremely vulnerable children and families, specifically those staying in self-occupied motels or in doubled up situations because they have nowhere else to go.

These families are especially susceptible to physical and sexual abuse, trafficking, and neglect because they are often not in a parent’s care, and thus remain hidden from potential social service providers.

As a result of the current narrow HUD definition, communities that receive federal funding through the discretionary grant process are unable to prioritize or direct resources to help these children and families.

This bill would provide communities with the flexibility to use federal funds to meet local priorities.

I would also like to note that this legislation comes at no additional cost to taxpayers and does not impose any new mandates on service providers.

Finally, this legislation improves data collection transparency by requiring HUD to report data on homeless individuals and families currently recorded under the existing Homeless Management Information System survery.

I am pleased that Senator Rob Portman (R-OH) has joined me as an original cosponsor on this bill.

Homelessness continues to plague our Nation. If we fail to address the needs of these children and families today, they will remain invisible and stuck in a cycle of poverty and chronic homelessness.

It is our responsibility to ensure that we do not erect more barriers for these children and their families to access services when they are experiencing extreme hardship. I believe this bill is a commonsense solution that will ensure that homeless families and children can receive the help they need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, in the year two thousand fifteen:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Homeless Children and Youth Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

(a) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “are sharing” and all that follows through “charitable organizations,”;

(ii) by striking “14 days” each place that term appears and inserting “30 days”;

(iii) in clause (1), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi);

(ii) by striking “are sharing” and all that follows through “charitable organizations,”;

(iii) by redesignating clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi);

(C) in paragraph (1) by striking “Federal statutes other than this subtitle” and inserting “other Federal statute”;

(D) by inserting “of” before “this Act”;

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (33) as paragraphs (15) through (34), respectively;

(F) by inserting after paragraph (15) the following:

(14) OTHER FEDERAL STATUTE.—The term ‘other Federal statute’ includes—

(A) the Right to迅速 and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.);

(B) the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

(C) the Violent Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13034 et seq.);

(D) section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254(h));

(E) section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1766);

(F) the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

(G) subtitle B of title VII of this Act.

(3) by inserting after section 408 the following:

SEC. 409. AVAILABILITY OF HMIS REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The information provided to the Secretary under section 402(i)(3) shall be made publically available on the Internet website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in aggregate, non-personally identifying reports.

(b) REQUIRED DATA.—Each report made publicly available under subsection (a) shall be updated on at least an annual basis and shall include—

(1) a cumulative count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness;

(2) a cumulative assessment of the patterns of assistance provided under subtitles B and C for the each geographic area involved; and

(3) a count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness that are documented through the HMIS by each collaborative applicant.

(c) DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary, in making awards under this Act, may consider or prioritize the specific homeless

“(A) are certified as homeless by the director or designee of a director of a program funded under any other Federal statute; or

(B) have been certified by a director or designee of a director of a program funded under this Act or a director or designee of a director of a public housing agency as lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, which is—

(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or

(ii) living in a motel or hotel.”. 
Judge Holloway was the longest serving judge on the Tenth Circuit, and he served for over 45 years. During his remarkable tenure on the court, Judge Holloway adhered to precedent when deciding cases. He did not proclaim any type of philosophy. As new 10th Circuit Judge Robert Bacharach described Judge Holloway, `He simply decided cases by asking “What does the statute say? What does the Constitution say? What are the facts of this case?” We know that is a high standard, and a standard lost sometimes in our judiciary.

When he passed away last year, 10th Circuit Judge Jerome Holmes said of Judge Holloway, “The nation has lost a thoughtful, dedicated, and compassionate jurist, and, as a former law clerk of Judge Holloway, I have lost a mentor, dear friend, and colleague. I know that Judge Holloway was very honored to serve his nation as a judge on the Tenth Circuit, and he served with great distinction.”

On behalf of Judge Holloway and his family, I introduce this bill in his honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud today to introduce the Leahy-Collins Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

This legislation has the support of the judges on the Western District, retired Judge Ralph Thompson who served on the bench in the Western District for from 1975 to 2007, and many in the legal community in the Western District of Oklahoma.

Judge Holloway was born in Hugo, OK, and his father was the eighth governor of the State of Oklahoma. He served in the U.S. Army during the height of World War II, received his law degree from Harvard University in 1950, and worked in private practice with a 2-year stint for the Department of Justice. President Lyndon Johnson nominated Judge Holloway to the 10th Circuit in August 1968, and the Senate confirmed him on September 13, 1968, where he served as chief judge from 1984 to 1991. Judge Holloway assumed senior status in May 1992 and passed away April 25, 2014, in Oklahoma City.

Judge Holloway was the longest serving judge on the 10th Circuit, and during his lifetime, he authored over 900 opinions. He was well regarded by all who worked with him, appeared before him, and knew him. I have not found a person knowledgeable of Judge Holloway or his service who could not unreservedly tell you that Judge Holloway adhered to precedent when deciding cases. He did not proclaim any type of philosophy. As new 10th Circuit Judge Robert Bacharach described Judge Holloway, “He simply decided cases by asking ‘What does the statute say? What does the Constitution say? What are the facts of this case?’”

We know that is a high standard, and a standard lost sometimes in our judiciary.

When he passed away last year, 10th Circuit Judge Jerome Holmes said of Judge Holloway, “The nation has lost a thoughtful, dedicated, and compassionate jurist, and, as a former law clerk of Judge Holloway, I have lost a mentor, dear friend, and colleague. I know that Judge Holloway was very honored to serve his nation as a judge on the Tenth Circuit, and he served with great distinction.”

On behalf of Judge Holloway and his family, I introduce this bill in his honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 262. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud today to introduce the Leahy-Collins Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. It is deplorable that the wealthiest country in the world, 1.6 million teenagers live on the streets because they have no home. We know that those who do not have a safe place to sleep at night are particularly vulnerable to being exploited and trafficked. Human Study found that nearly one in four homeless young people have been victims of trafficking or sexual exploitation. We often talk about human trafficking as an international problem, but the sad truth is that it is a major problem right here at home. It is time we provide the resources to help protect our children from this very real threat.

The Runaway Youth Act, first signed into law in 1974, has proven essential to providing for the basic needs and resources that runaway and homeless youth need, and our continued support is vital. Thirty-nine percent of the homeless population is under the age of 18, and the average age at which a teen becomes homeless is 14.7 years old. Think about that. The average teen living on the streets is not even old enough to drive. These young people represent our country’s future and its optimism, and as a father and a grandfather, I believe that we must do more to provide a safe haven for the 1.6 million homeless youth in our country.

Teens run away and become homeless for myriad reasons. A U.S. Department
of Health and Human Services study found that 46 percent of homeless youth had run away because of physical abuse and 17 percent because of sexual abuse. Nearly 40 percent of homeless youth identify as LGBT and report being left on the street and vulnerable because of a lack of acceptance. By including a new provision that prohibits grantees from denying services based on the sexual orientation or gender identity of the homeless youth, this bill takes important steps to make sure that we are meeting the needs of this growing and particularly vulnerable population. No young person should be turned away from these essential services.

We have made great strides in recent years in our efforts to combat human trafficking. Most recently, we reauthorized the comprehensive Trafficking Victims Protection Act, a bipartisan bill I introduced and was proud to see enacted in part of the Ledyard-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. And last year, we saw historic levels of funding for victims of trafficking, an urgently needed increase that I hope will sustain the progress we are making.

By including in this legislation and for joining me as original cosponsors. We have the chance to make a real difference by passing the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. Every day we wait is another night too many children are sleeping on the streets.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. WYDEN)

S. 271. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of our Nation’s veterans to once again discuss the unjust and outdated policy of failing to give our veterans the full military retirement and veterans disability compensation benefits that they have earned in service to the Nation. Full payment of retirement and disability benefits, together known as “concurrent receipt,” is an issue that I have strongly advocated for more than a decade.

In the past, veterans were prevented from receiving the full pay and benefits they earned in dedicated service to our country. The law required that military retirement pay be reduced dollar-for-dollar by any disability compensation a veteran received. I am pleased to say that many Senators have joined me in fighting this policy, and we have made some progress on behalf of our Nation’s veterans.

In 2003, Congress passed legislation that allowed disabled retired veterans with at least a 50 percent disability rating to become eligible for full concurrent receipt. In 2004, the 10-year phase-in period was eliminated for veterans with 100 percent service-related disability. With the phase-in period now complete, I am deeply gratified that all those veterans with over 50 percent disability ratings are now receiving the full benefits they earned from their service. These are significant victories that put hundreds of thousands of veterans on track to receive both their retirement and disability benefits.

I hope that we can finally enact this meaningful bill in 2015.

In addition to the dangers of human trafficking, homeless youth are at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. They are less likely to finish school, more likely to enter our juvenile justice system, and are often ill-equipped to find a job. The services authorized by this bill are designed to intervene early and prevent the exploitation in the first place. We owe it to these children to focus on ending demand and arrest our way out of this problem; we must eliminate the conditions that make these children so vulnerable. That means investing in stable housing and support services for more kids in need, doing enough.

I hope that we can finally enact this meaningful bill in 2015.

This is not a partisan issue. Our Nation has been at war for over a decade, through both Republican and Democratic administrations, and our service members have performed with unmatched valor around the world. Our uniformed duty as lawmakers should be to ensure that the brave men and women who served in the United States Armed Forces receive the benefits they have earned.

So once again, I rise on behalf of our Nation’s veterans. Today, I introduce legislation that will eliminate all limitations to concurrent receipt. We must take action now to support our veterans who have never faltered in their unwavering service to this grateful Nation. This is the right thing to do.

I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 271

The Concurrent Receipt of Both Retirement and Disability Compensation for Certain Military Retirees with Compensable Service-Connected Disabilities. This Act may be cited as the “Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2015”.

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) Extension of Concurrent Receipt Authority to Retirees With Service-Connected Disabilities Rated Less Than 50 Percent.—

(1) Repeal of 50 percent requirement.—Section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(2) Computation.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) For a month for which the retiree receives veterans’ disability compensation for a disability rated as 40 percent or less or has a service-connected disability rated as zero percent, 30 percent, or 50 percent.”

(b) Clerical Amendments.—

(1) The heading of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows: “1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans’ disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation”.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows: “1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans’ disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.”

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2016, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 3. Coordination of Service Eligibility for Combat-Related Special Compensation and Concurrent Receipt.

(a) Amendments To Standardize Similar Provisions.

(1) Qualified Retirees.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 2(a), is amended—
(A) by striking “a member or” and all that follows through “retiree)” and inserting “a qualified retiree”; and
(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) QUALIFIED RETIREES.—For purposes of this section, a qualified retiree, with respect to any month, is a member or former member of the services who—

(A) is entitled to retired pay (other than by reason of section 1273b of this title); and

(B) is also entitled for that month to veterans' nonduty compensation.”

(2) DISABILITY RETIREES.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(2) EXPENSES.—Vouchers not required. —Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate; as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(B) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(1) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(2) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery; and

(3) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.”

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 shall be $5,347,119, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $3,119,153 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act);

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2016.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016 shall be $2,227,966, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $1,348 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 shall be $5,347,119, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $3,119,153 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—In exercising its functions under this section, the committee shall be reimbursed and paid the expenses of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from appropriations provided for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations of the Senate” such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 243. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 73 proposed by Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEU, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 244. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEU, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

...
amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 202. NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Nothing in this Act may change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian nation without consultation with the applicable Indian nation, or in any manner whereby Indian lands would be conveyed to the Federal Government or conveyed to any person for the use or benefit of any Government of this country.

SA 246. Mr. DAINES proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 203. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Land and Water Conservation Fund plays an important role in improving wildlife habitat and increasing outdoor recreation opportunities on Federal and State lands; and

(2) reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund would be a priority for Congress and should include improvements to the structure of the program to more effectively manage existing Federal land.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Fixing No Child Left Behind: Supporting Teachers and School Leaders.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Fixing No Child Left Behind: Supporting Teachers and School Leaders.”

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mary Future and Carter Burwell, detailees from the Department of Justice, be given the privileges of the floor during the 114th Congress.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 272

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I understand that S. 272, introduced earlier today by Senator SHAHEEN, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 272) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I now ask for its second reading, and I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2015

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. Wednesday, January 28, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the Senate then be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1 under the previous order.

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

The Senator from Washington.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS

Ms. CANTWELL. If I could, I want to say to our colleagues who may have been following this process that we encourage people who have not spoken or who plan on speaking to come down to the floor and do so.

I appreciate the Senator from Alaska working with us on this amendment process today.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it has been a long day and we are at the end, but as Members can see, we have a path forward tomorrow, and I think that is good.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:10 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Richard T. Julia, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board for a term expiring September 30, 2019. Vice Raymond T. Wagner, Jr. term expired.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Albert Stanley Meiburg, of Georgia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Vice Robert Periasepe, retired.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be Associate Attorney General. Vice Derek Anton West, resigned.
Earlier this month in Rowan County, North Carolina, nearly 200 supporters gathered to hear testimonies from human trafficking survivors as well as discuss ways to increase awareness and assist victims in the local community at the Triad Ladder of Hope's First Annual Human Trafficking Awareness Gala. And today I’m wearing a bracelet made from recycled soda tabs that was designed by Monarch, a Christian ministry that creates accessories as a unique way to engage in the fight against human trafficking.

As the charm on this bracelet reminds us, there is hope that lives discarded can be reclaimed.

COMBATTING HUMAN TRAFFICKING IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is considering 12 bills designed to fight trafficking crimes and boost resources for law enforcement.

According to the FBI, sex trafficking is the fastest-growing business of organized crime and the third-largest criminal enterprise in the world. More than 300,000 American children are at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking annually in what is estimated to be a $9.8 billion industry.

Human trafficking is modern day slavery that preys on vulnerable individuals, and this epidemic is not isolated to far-off places. It is happening every day in the places we call home.

As we take steps at the federal level to end this despicable and horrifying practice, there are many organizations dedicated to helping victims and preventing even more people from being mistreated.

More than 300,000 American children and the third-largest criminal enterprise in the world. It is a big, booming business—trafficking a child for sex can be more lucrative than drug trafficking. This is why I am glad to join my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bipartisan legislation so that we may protect our most vulnerable children, including those in the foster care system, who have been victimized through no fault of their own.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

HON. MIKE COFFMAN
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08. Today, it is $18,086,335,602,055.12. We’ve added $7,459,458,553,142.04 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could
CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MR. CUB, ERNIE BANKS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAOKWSKY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. SCHAOKWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life and accomplishments of Ernie Banks—known by Chicagoans as “Mr. Cub.”

Chicago lost a true hero and friend when Ernie Banks passed away on Friday, January 23. His baseball accomplishments are legendary. During his playing days, he always erup at Wrigley Field when Banks would make a clutch hit or a spectacular diving catch. His greatness was well acknowledged—Banks was voted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame in 1977—the very first year he was eligible.

While Banks excelled on the field, he also blazed a trail off of it. As the first African-American player for the Chicago Cubs, he was a pioneer in our community and across the country. Banks treated people well, got along with most everyone and stood for justice even as he faced discrimination. During road trips, hotels and restaurants opened to his white teammates were often closed to him and other African-Americans. I am happy to see how far we have come as a country throughout the course of his career and his lifetime.

Banks founded the Ernie Banks Live Above and Beyond Foundation, which helps promote social welfare and assist youth and seniors who may need assistance. I know he was very proud of the young players on Chicago’s own Jackie Robinson West team who won the Little League championship last year.

According to Fox Chicago, Jackie Robinson West player Lawrence Noble said, “I met [Ernie Banks] during the summer and he was such an inspirational person to me, it was just very sad hearing that he passed away.’

This problem is personal for me because according to the U.S. Department of Justice, my home city of Houston, Texas is the epicenter of human trafficking in the United States with over 1,000 cases in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year’s massive effort “Operation Cross Country” led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

Between 1998 and 2003 more than 500 people from 18 countries were ensnared in 57 forced labor operations in almost a dozen cities throughout the State of Texas.

The Justice Department’s Internet Crimes against Children Task Force (which coordinates with 61 federal, state and local law enforcement task forces) reports that the number of child victims of prostitution increased by more than 900% between 2004 and 2008.

Currently, our state child welfare systems do not properly identify and help the children that have been taken by this horrible industry.

Even more disturbing is that the protections provided by our child welfare systems often do not extend to young victims of trafficking.

Hard as it is to believe, in some states trafficked youths are not even regarded or classified as victims.

Rather, they are treated as youthful offenders and consigned to the criminal justice system.

These kids are not criminals. They are victims, robbed of their innocence by adult criminals.

They are boys and girls who have been taken advantage of and are unable to escape an ugly system.

I support H.R. 246 because it is focused on using technology to minimize the sex trafficking of vulnerable children and empowers people by giving the opportunity and means to report suspicious activity.

Under current law, the Health and Human Services Department (HHS) provides an annual grant to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children for a range of activities, including running a tip line that allows online users and Internet service providers to report Internet-related child sexual exploitation.

This tip line includes reports on child pornography, online enticement of children for sexual acts, child prostitution, sex tourism involving children, extra familial child sexual molestation, unsolicited obscene material sent to a child, misleading domain names and misleading words or digital images on the Internet.

I strongly support H.R. 246 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage which will help bring an end to the evil practice that is child sex trafficking.

MISSING CHILDREN’S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

SPREE OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 246, a bill “To Improve The Response To Victims Of Child Sex Trafficking,” which broadens the issues to be reported on the federal tip line on Internet-related child sexual exploitation run by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to explicitly include child sex trafficking—specifically, by replacing the term “child prostitution” with the term “child sex trafficking,” including child prostitution.

Trafficking in humans is a major problem across the globe and in our own country. As lawmakers, we have a moral responsibility to combat this scourge and protect our children, especially those without parents to care for them, from being exploited and falling through the cracks.

As the Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus, I understand how important it is to be there for those who are too young to defend themselves.

This problem is not the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Justice, it is the responsibility of the community and the Federal Government to work together to find solutions.

We will miss you, Ernie.
The importance of eliminating shutdown threats to the District was definitely shown recently. The three leading bond rating agencies favorably cited the fiscal year 2014 D.C. Appropriations bill provision exempting D.C. from a shutdown in fiscal year 2015. In upgrading their ratings on the D.C. government, Standard & Poor’s and Moody’s Investors Service favorably cited the provision while maintaining D.C.’s rating.

Several years ago, we negotiated an agreement with a Republican-led appropriations committee that ensures that the city’s local budget is approved in the first continuing resolution (CR) if the D.C. Appropriations bill has not been approved by the start of the fiscal year, another important step that responded to practical realities. This approach ended the annual nightmares of lengthy delays of approval of the local budget of a big city until a national appropriations bill was passed, often months after the start of the fiscal year. As a result, under CRs, the city has been able to spend its local funds at the next year’s funding level, even though federal agencies must spend at the prior year’s funding level. We are deeply appreciative that this process, which eliminated serious problems for the functioning of the D.C. government, has continued.

We fought for budget autonomy for the District in the last days of the lame-duck session in the 111th Congress, when Democrats were in control. We got the House authorizers to include budget autonomy in the fiscal year 2011 D.C. Appropriations bill, which was passed by the subcommittee. Unfortunately, the Democratic Senate did not include budget autonomy in its appropriations bill, and Congress passed a CR instead of regular appropriations bills in the lame duck.

Most important, we gained critical support for D.C. budget autonomy in the 112th and 113th Congresses. In an Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing in May 2011, Chairman Darrell Issa (R–CA) endorsed budget autonomy. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R–VA) and Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell (R) during that year both indicated their support for budget autonomy. Last Congress, Majority Leader Cantor and Chairman Issa both continued in their support for budget autonomy. The President’s fiscal year 2015 budget, for the second time, will have granted D.C. budget autonomy. The Senate’s fiscal year 2015 D.C. Appropriations bill granted the District budget autonomy, which was the first ever appropriations bill to do so. We also got budget autonomy introduced as a stand-alone bill in the Senate. The autonomy referendum from being overturned in Congress. However, a federal district court struck it down and an appeal is pending before a federal appeals court.

Even if the District of Columbia Budget Autonomy Act of 2015 were enacted, Congress would still retain jurisdiction over the District of Columbia under article I, section 8, clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution until statehood is achieved. This authority allows Congress to make changes to the District’s budget at any time, as we saw last week when the House voted to cut spending on the District’s budget and delay its local budget funding for low-income women. Therefore, it is unnecessary to require the District to incur the costs and delays of transmitting its local budget for congressional approval. The time is overdue to permit the city to enact its local budget, the single most immediate step Congress could take to help the District better manage itself. Members of Congress were sent to Washington to do the business of the nation, not local jurisdiction. Members have no reason to be interested in or to become knowledgeable about the local budget of a single city or jurisdiction far from their own. In the past, the House and Senate have more often than not passed the District’s budget as is. Our budget autonomy bill tells the Congress in the direction it is already moving.

INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAID PARENTAL LEAVE ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in his State of Union President Obama spoke about restoring the link between hard work and growing opportunity for every American. That link is at the very core of what made America great. And he spoke about the need to ensure that working families have a fair shot and a level playing field.

One of the places that the United States continues to lag behind the entire rest of the world is in parental leave. Right here in the United States, we are the only industrialized nation with no paid parental leave. It is only us and Papua New Guinea in the whole world that have no statutory maternity leave. This is embarrassing and it hurts hardworking American families. It is way past time to drag at least our federal workplace policies into the 21st century. That is why I am introducing the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act to provide six weeks of paid parental leave to federal employees for the birth, adoption, or foster placement of a child.

The federal government is our nation’s largest employer and it should be setting an example—and leading the march into the modern era. Paid parental leave would be a big boost for the almost two million people who work for the federal government. And this won’t just affect our nation’s capital—86 percent of federal workers live and work outside the metro Washington, DC area. In fact, the metro region of my home city of New York City has the second highest number of federal employees of any region in the country.

For these working families in New York and elsewhere around the country, paid leave is an economic lifeline. The growing costs of caring for a new child—the expensive diapers, bottles, baby carriers—they all add up very quickly. The U.S. Department of Agriculture found that in the first two years a new child can cost families an average of nearly $13,000. Who can forego weeks of pay on top of those new expenses. It is both crippling and cruel to ask families to choose between a paycheck and caring for a new child when costs continue to mount.

Providing paid leave helps pay for itself with the broad benefits it produces. It gives parents the time to bond with their child in those critical first weeks of life and research shows the critical nature of the first few months of life on the health and intellectual development over the lifetime of the child.

To those who would push back on this legislation, I refer you to the Congressional Budget Office findings that this legislation is budget neutral. Congress has nothing more to lose than every thing. It requires no new money but would immeasurably enrich the lives of federal employees by allowing them to maintain their salary during the course of FMLA-permitted parental leave.

I urge my Republican colleagues to support the bill. It passed the House twice before—with great bipartisan support. Now is the moment to bring this legislation forward and in so doing, bring America forward.

WINTER STORM JUNO

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the state and local leaders and emergency responders in Rhode Island who, as I speak, are working tirelessly to manage the impact of Winter Storm Juno that struck Rhode Island last night.

This storm is still hitting Rhode Island with heavy snow, high winds and coastal flooding. As a former Mayor, I understand the devastating impact this type of snowfall can have on individuals and families, and the painstaking efforts it will take to restore services to Rhode Island’s communities.

Yesterday our entire delegation sent a letter to President Obama, Senator Jack Reed, Senator Sheldon Whitehouse, Congressman Jim Langevin, and I, urging the President to make federal assistance available to Rhode Island to support emergency operations and recovery due to the blizzard conditions.

I stand ready to assist my home state in any way I can, and applaud the tremendous efforts of our Governor Gina Raimondo, Mayor Jorge Elorza and all the dedicated local leaders and emergency responders who are working around the clock to ensure Rhode Island makes a speedy recovery.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I voted against the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill for the remainder of Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (H.R. 240), due to House Republicans’ irresponsible attempt to hijack this much-needed legislation.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is at the forefront of protecting our nation from terrorist threats. The women and men on the frontline of securing America’s borders deserve a clean appropriations bill that provides them with the funding and resources they need to keep our families, communities, and our nation safe. Instead of bringing a bipartisan bill to the Floor, House Republicans opted to pick a political fight with the
President, jeopardizing our country’s security needs.

Republicans voted to add five poison pill amendments targeting the President’s executive actions on immigration to this critical funding bill. One of the most offensive and dangerous of these amendments is the DeSantis/Roby amendment. The National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women strongly opposes this and other amendments, which they describe as “overly broad, sweep large numbers of victims into their scope and ignore the best interests of victims and their children.” In addition, the Task Force urges Congress “to prioritize the needs of immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence, and reject these amendments.”

Other amendments proposed by House Republicans would further derail the Administration’s progress on immigration reform. The Aderholt amendment would block the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) program and expansions to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. In addition, the amendment would block measures to strengthen border security, facilitate legal immigration, promote citizenship and immigrant integration, and spur innovation and entrepreneurship. The Blackburn amendment would terminate the existing DACA program and prevent hundreds of thousands of young people (DREAMers) who already have come forward, passed background checks, obtained protection, and followed the rules from renewing DACA. The Salmon amendment is based on the false premise that the president’s recent executive actions create an incentive under the Affordable Care Act for employers to hire deferred action recipients. Finally, the Schack amendment also is premised on the false notion that deferred action applications unfairly delay the adjudication of all applications.

Jeopardizing this must-pass legislation, critical to our national security, is unacceptable. I urge my Republican colleagues to bring a clean bill for the remainder of FY2015 for DHS, without further delay and without the distraction of partisan politics.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp.

It is fitting today to remember those who experienced the depth of human cruelty in that camp and all other Nazi concentration camps. It is estimated that over one million prisoners perished at the Auschwitz concentration camp over the five years that it was operational.

I grieve for those lost souls, but I give thanks to the 7,500 prisoners who were liberated 70 years ago today.

The stories of those survivors ensure that we remain vigilant and dedicated to combating hatred and oppression in all its forms.

For that reason, I would also like to bring attention to the ongoing massacres and human rights violations being carried out by the militant terrorist organization Boko Haram in Nigeria.

Just like the actions of the Nazis during World War II, the actions of Boko Haram today are an affront to human life and dignity.

From their first violent uprising in 2009, to the massacre in Baga less than one month ago, Boko Haram has been waging a war that has cost an estimated 10,000 lives, and displaced more than one million people.

I thank Secretary Kerry for his active role in supporting the Nigerians in their efforts to combat Boko Haram.

I also thank the United States military, for providing the Nigerian military with trainers and specialists to aid them.

But there needs to be more.

These atrocities must not be permitted to continue, and we must do everything within our power to stop the kidnapping and killing of innocent men, women, and children across Nigeria.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 357, the “Human Trafficking Prevention Act.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to expanding the training and capability of federal government personnel in detecting and combating human trafficking and assisting its victims.

Throughout my tenure in Congress and a founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus, I have advocated on behalf of victims of human trafficking, especially children, who are the most vulnerable and innocent victims.

I am also committed to ensuring that law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in people.

H.R. 357 strengthens the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 by amending it to require training related to trafficking in persons for all State Department personnel. Specifically, the bill requires the following:

1. A distance learning course on trafficking in persons issues and the Department of State’s obligations under the Act to be completed by embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus’ trafficking in persons coordinators, and their supervisors;

2. Specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before they depart for their posts; and

3. Annual reminders to all such personnel and other federal personnel at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of key human trafficking problems, threats, methods, and warning signs.

This legislation does for the State Department what the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 4660, “Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Act for 2015,” approved by the House in the last Congress does for the Justice Department.

This amendment, adopted in May 2014 by the House, provides another tool in law enforcement’s arsenal to tip the balance in favor of victims by ensuring funding for the Attorney
General to provide training for State and local law enforcement agencies on immigration law that may be useful for the investigation and prosecution of crimes related to trafficking in persons.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in humans, and especially child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society and those who engage in this illicit trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

To effectively combat human trafficking, we need to provide resources and training to government personnel to assist victims and apprehend criminals.

By providing the necessary training and support, we will catch more human trafficking criminals and save lives, and prevent many other persons, including children, from becoming human trafficking victims. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 357, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act.

HONORING MS. ABHA PANDYA

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Abha Pandya, who is retiring at the end of this month from the position of Chief Executive Officer of Asian Human Services, Inc. (AHS) after 20 years in leadership at the organization. AHS is Chicago’s largest social service agency serving the needs of the pan-Asian and other immigrant and underserved communities residing in metropolitan Chicago. Ms. Pandya joined AHS in June 1994 as the Executive Director, and in 2004 she became the Chief Executive Officer. In 1994, AHS had a staff of six employees and a budget of $294,000. Under Ms. Pandya’s leadership, AHS has grown nearly 40-fold—having a budget of approximately $15 million in fiscal year 2015, and a staff of 115 full-time employees.

Ms. Pandya is a truly remarkable leader. She always completed what she set out to do, including big projects that are important to the community, such as opening several Federally Qualified Health Care Clinics, providing dental services to the community, and opening education and job training centers. I attended many wonderful ribbon cuttings of AHS projects under Ms. Pandya’s leadership.

AHS is a multilingual, functionally diverse, not-for-profit social service agency that provides direct services to over 27,000 clients a year. Its excellent staff speaks 24 languages and includes people of different ages, genders, ethnicities and races.

Under Ms. Pandya’s leadership, AHS opened “Illinois’ first federally-funded primary care and dental clinic to provide linguistically and culturally appropriate services to Asian immigrants and others; a comprehensive mental health program, the only state-funded program for the Asian community in Illinois; a large community health education and prevention program; an extensive family literacy program; and a job training and placement program.” AHS received $2.8 million in capital funds from the state and federal governments to start an expanded primary care and dental clinic, and the new clinic became fully operational on September 3, 2013. In 2014 AHS received federal funding to establish an additional primary care clinic in my district, in Skokie, Illinois.

AHS will be naming one of their clinics the “Abha Pandya’s Family Health Center” to honor her contributions. It is an extremely well-deserved honor.

Ms. Pandya has advocated extensively at the federal, state and city levels on behalf of Asian and other immigrant and refugee communities in Chicago for a more equitable distribution of resources, greater access, and linguistically and culturally appropriate services. She has served on the Governor’s Multicultural Services Committee, and on the Board of Directors of the Chicago Council on Urban Affairs, the Coalition of Limited English Speaking Elderly, the metropolitan Board of the United Way of Chicago and the Chicago Council of the United Way.

Ms. Pandya received a B.A. with honors from Elphinstone College, University of Bombay, and a master’s degree with distinction from the University of Delhi, and an M.S. in Journalism from Northwestern University. She will be spending time with her family, including her grandchildren, in California. I thank Ms. Pandya for her leadership and service. I will miss working with her in her leadership role at AHS, but I know she will continue to look for ways to serve our community.

HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE OF WILLIAM ‘BILL’ MAYS

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a beloved member of the Indianapolis community, Bill Mays. Sadly he unexpectedly passed away on December 4, 2014, his 69th birthday. Bill was a businessman, a family man, a leader of the community, and a philanthropist. He built an economic empire and used his fortune to help others. His dedication to the Hoosier community will forever be remembered.

A lifelong Hoosier, Bill was born in Evansville on December 4, 1945. He graduated as the number one male academically from Evansville Central High School, where he was also a member of the football team. He later received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Chemistry and a Master of Business Administration from Indiana University in Bloomington. He later went on to receive four Honorary Doctorates from universities and colleges in Indiana. In 1980, Bill launched Mays Chemical Company, Inc. and grew it into one of the largest chemical distribution companies in North America. During the first year of business he doubled his $1 million sales objective. From there his business grew exponentially and it is now ranked the 20th largest chemical distributor in the United States. He was regarded as one of the most successful businessmen in Indiana, not just because of Mays Chemical, but also because of other ventures he undertook. In addition to starting Mays Chemical, he also owned The Indianapolis Recorder. In 1990 Mays purchased The Recorder, saving the newspaper. His niece, and a dear friend of mine, Carolene Mays, became general manager of The Recorder in 1998. Under Bill and Carolene’s leadership The Recorder grew in readership, prominence, and credibility. The Recorder is still in circulation today. Mays also was the former majority owner of the Hoosier Radio and Television Properties, which include WAV-TV53, HOT 96.3 FM, WGRF 106.7 FM and WIRE.

His business savvy was impressive, but his dedication to the community set him apart. He served on a wide variety of for-profit and non-profit boards and held many chairmanships. His list of community service honors and awards is lengthy. Just to name a few, he received the National Society of Black Engineers Golden Torch Award (2003), Indiana University’s Herman B. Wells Visionaries Award (2000); Wheeler Boys & Girls Club Man and Youth Award (1998); Madame C.J. Walker Lifetime Achievement Award (1998); was inducted into the Junior Achievement Central Indiana Business Hall of Fame (1998); and had the honor of carrying the Olympic flame during its trip through Indianapolis in 1996.

Mays is survived by his wife, Dr. Rose Mays, retired Associate Dean of Community Affairs at Indiana University’s School of Nursing, daughters Kristin Mays-Corbitt, President of Mays Chemical, and Heather Mays-Woods, and educator. Bill was a mentor and a leader of the business community, but most importantly he was a husband and father. On many occasions Mays had said that his true passion was his family. Please join me in thanking Bill’s family and friends for sharing such a wonderful man with the Hoosier community.

ENHANCING SERVICES FOR RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS VICTIMS OF YOUTH TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 468, “Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2015.”

I support this bipartisan legislation which amends the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 by inserting the phrase “sever forms of trafficking in persons” and including “youth who are victims of trafficking,” in the definitions for the law.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in persons is an inconceivable, callous and inhumane crime that disproportionately devastates the nation’s most vulnerable children. It is particularly difficult to see the victimization of the very young who are sold or tricked into becoming victims of Human Trafficking.

I urge my colleagues is working to strengthen laws against human trafficking, and supporting the allocation of resources to further the efforts of law enforcement and aid agencies in identification of youth victims and provide vital support to preventing further victimization and to reclaim the lives of the most vulnerable among us—our children from traffickers.

It is estimated 2.8 million children living on the streets of this nation are at risk for trafficking into the sex industry. Children who are
abused or victims of molestation are most vulnerable.

If they are lured into human trafficking they are isolated from the rest of the world and start living lives controlled by pimps, escort and massage services, private dancing clubs, pornographic carnival and much worse.

The work of the authors of this bill contribute to raising public awareness must be at the forefront of our hearts and minds and these unlawful, immoral traffickers, beyond a doubt must unavoidably be brought to justice. We must seek them out and press them from our society by standing up together with a collective voice saying, “Human trafficking stops today, right now, with us.”

Mr. Speaker, I along with my Colleagues on the Committee on Homeland Security held a field hearing in Houston Texas last year on the issue of Human Trafficking.

The day before that hearing local law enforcement with support from federal law enforcement agencies raided a house where suspected victims of human trafficking were being held.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas is one of the nation’s largest hubs for human trafficking, with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

In 2006, the Department of Justice National Conference on Human Trafficking identified the I–10 corridor as one of the main routes for traffickers. Interstate I–10 links the major towns in between.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to raise public awareness and force the activity of traffickers and their victims out of the shadows into the light.

Raising the visibility and status of the governmental entities charged with the responsibility of documenting the problems, successes, and remaining challenges confronting the United States and the international community in eradicating the scourge of human trafficking is a positive step forward in achieving this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 468.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGETTE BROWN
HON. GREG WALDEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to John Brown, a dedicated public servant and a very good friend of mine who passed away earlier this month. For 25 years, Georgette served the people of Josephine County, Oregon, as the longest serving County Clerk in county history.

Along the way, she implemented local vote-by-mail and published the first local voters’ pamphlet. Today, I honor her commitment and lifetime of community service.

Georgette understood the importance of participating in our democracy. Whether at a town hall, rotary speech or business roundtable, Georgette was always present, actively listening, asking pertinent questions and showing genuine support. She believed the best way to make her voice heard in Washington, DC was by being present and engaged.

For Georgette, the core duty of a citizen was voting. She worked hard to make sure every vote counted. When Oregon moved to a vote-by-mail system, Georgette appeared before the Oregon Legislature to advocate for ballot deadline announcements in the media. In her own county, she took it upon herself as Clerk to make sure as many people as possible voted, telling anyone who would listen that they better vote!

Georgette Brown’s belief and dedication paid off. Voter turnout in Josephine County peaked at nearly 90 percent in the 1996 general election and averaged nearly 70 percent during much of Georgette’s tenure. She served as president of the Oregon Association of County Clerks. I am sure more than a few of the fellow clerks with whom Georgette served are grateful for having so many helpful things from her along the way.

Georgette had the distinction of being Josephine County’s first clerk to perform marriages, and she performed hundreds of them during and after her tenure. She even once traveled on her own time to New Zealand to perform a wedding for a Grants Pass resident, quickly making new friends along the way.

If someone had a question, Georgette usually had an answer. Often, she would rattle off the appropriate Oregon statute from memory. Georgette believed it was important to be fiscally responsible in running her office. She ran it like a business, looking for ways to save money. Sometimes, when times were tight, she’d pay her own expenses when traveling to a conference, sharing a room when necessary.

Georgette had great respect for the office of Clerk, and those who worked there. After her retirement in 2008, she would stop by the county courthouse to say hello. Her last visit was in May when she hand delivered her ballot to make sure the county clerk knew her signature had changed—and likely to see how the turnout was looking to see how many people she still needed to remind.

TRIBUTE TO ELISE JONES MARTIN
HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful woman and South Carolinian who is turning 100 years old on January 27, 1915.

Ms. Martin was born in Hartsville, South Carolina and arrived in Columbia in the 1930s following cosmetology training in New Jersey. She later attended South Carolina State College in Orangeburg, SC where she received her teaching certification. She taught for many years at Booker T. Washington High School and was very active in her trade’s professional organizations.

Ms. Martin became the first African American woman to own a business on Main Street in Columbia when she opened a wig shop called Accent Elise. She became a dedicated and trustworthy member of the community. She worked with the Columbia Housing Authority’s Hope VI program and served as a poll worker for over three decades. In 2008 she served as the poll manager to her polling location at the youthful age of 94. She has also served as a member of the Columbia Zoning board and a member of the America Beautiful Committee of the Midlands.

She believes that citizens must take part in the change they seek and has been a tireless worker through the City of Columbia. Ms. Martin has been extremely dedicated to Bethel A.M.E. Church, where she’s been a member for more than 70 years and has held many leadership positions. Her deep and lasting commitment to her church and her community have made her a valuable asset. She has always been very approachable. Her wisdom, friendship and compassion are often sought and highly valued by her family and fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in congratulating Ms. Elise Jones Martin on this tremendous milestone. It is very fitting that this contribution and this celebration of 100 years of life are being recognized by her family and friends for all she has done to give back to those with whom she has shared a century of blessed experiences.

EXTRAORDINARY ACT OF VALOR
HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Deputy John McCord of the Fort Bend County Precinct 3 Constable’s Office for being selected by the Houston 100 Club for the Officer of the Year Award. This award recognizes his extraordinary act of valor to protect the lives of residents of Fort Bend County.

On June 27, 2014, Deputy McCord responded to a call reporting a child drowning in the Weston Lakes subdivision in Fulshear, Texas. Deputy McCord rescued the unconscious boy from the bottom of the lake and performed lifesaving CPR before a medical helicopter arrived to bring the child to the hospital. Thanks to officers like Deputy McCord, residents of Fort Bend County can rest assured that our police officers are dedicated to serving our community and keeping us safe.

I thank Deputy John McCord for his courage and readiness to act in the line of duty. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, thank you and congratulations again to John for being selected to receive the Houston 100 Club’s Officer of the Year Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. MAXINE WATERS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit my vote preference for Speaker of the House. I was unavoidably detained at the time of voting. However, had I been present in person, I would have cast my vote in support of Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI for Speaker of the House.
In addition to her official duties, Georgette was generous, giving to parks and 4-H programs. She was very community-minded, working on Rotary projects and serving as Rotary president. She was a member of St. Anne’s parish for more than 40 years, serving as a reader at Saturday evening mass. One of her favorite retirement roles was leading with students at Allen Dale Elementary School. Always fun to be around, Georgette brightened every activity she was involved in and she never spoke ill of others.

Born in Hoboken, New Jersey, Georgette attended school at St. Mary’s in New York. She and Larry moved to Grants Pass in 1972. When Larry died of cancer in 2002, Georgette missed him terribly. Georgette was deeply loved and will be dearly missed by her daughters, Marble and Monique, her 7-year-old grandson, Taylor, her many friends and the countless people whose lives she positively touched through her service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in honoring Georgette Brown for her many years of exemplary service in Josephine County and caring leadership of her community.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF JADE STAWASZ

HON. JOHN R. CARTER OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Jade Stawasz. On January 27, 2015, she closed out 47 years of incredible service to the U.S. Army and begins the next exciting chapter of her life.

Jade is a valued member of the Army’s Civilian Service. More than 330,000 strong, Army civilian serves as an integral part of the Army team. This global family is devoted to ensuring our warriors are prepared to shoulder any challenge that comes their way.

Widecly admired and respected for her leadership and work ethic, Jade excelled at numerous responsibilities over the years. From her work as Director of Executive Services for III Corps and Fort Hood to her efforts on behalf of Army leadership ranging from Kansas to Hawaii, she’s long been someone both her supervisors and colleagues could rely upon.

Jade’s great work has not gone unnoticed. For her efforts she was awarded a Superior Civilian Service Award, Commander’s Award for Civilian Service, and a Commander’s Award for Public Service. The United States Army Honor Society honored her with the Citation of St. Joan D’Arc Medallion for her contributions to the morale, welfare, and spirit of armor and cavalry families during their spouse’s absence. Her commitment to service doesn’t end when she leaves the office. As a member of the Harker Heights and Killeen Chambers of Commerce she works tirelessly to strengthen bonds between Fort Hood and the surrounding communities.

I commend Jade Stawasz’s selfless service to the United States Army. Her patriotism, citizenship, and commitment to excellence reflect the very best values of Central Texas. I join Jade’s friends, family, and colleagues in wishing her all the best in her much-deserved retirement.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TFARAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support H.R. 469, the “Strengthening Our Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015, Combatting Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Pub. L. 93–247) by requiring that state plans for federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment programs include elements focused on human trafficking.

Trafficking in humans is a major problem across the globe and in our own country. As lawmakers, we have a moral responsibility to combat this scourge and protect our children, especially those without parents to care for them, from being exploited and falling through the cracks.

As the Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus, I understand how important it is to defend those who are too young to defend themselves.

This problem is personal for me because according to the U.S. Department of Justice, my home city of Houston, Texas is the epicenter of human trafficking in the United States with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year’s massive effort “Operation Cross Country” led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

In general The Center shall carry out the following activities:

1. Receive information on travel by child-sex offenders.
2. Establish a system to maintain and archive all relevant information, including the response of destination countries to notifications under subsection where available, and decisions not to transmit notification abroad.
3. Establish an annual review process to ensure that the Center is consistent in procedures to provide notification to destination countries or not to provide notification to destination countries, as appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to raise public awareness of the continuing prevalence of modern day slavery and human trafficking.

This identification requires cooperative efforts between the United States and foreign governments. In exchange for providing notice of child-sex offenders traveling to the United States, foreign authorities will expect United States authorities to provide reciprocal notice of child-sex offenders traveling to their countries.

Raising the visibility and status of the governmental entity charged with the responsibility of documenting the problems, successes, and remaining challenges confronting the United States and the international community in eradicating the scourge of human trafficking is a positive step forward in achieving this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 469.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS SLAVERY

HON. TED POE OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my other life, I was a prosecutor and Judge. I saw the worst of the worst criminals in my courtroom, but it wasn’t until I visited the Ukraine, when I first came to Congress, that I learned about the scourge of human trafficking. It is slavery. Soon I became aware that this crime wasn’t just happening in far off places but right here in the United States, in our own backyards.

Unfortunately, my hometown of Houston is one of the hubs for human trafficking because of its proximity to the border, major interstates, airports, and ports.

As co-founder and co-chair of the Congressional Victims’ Rights Caucus with my friend Jim COSTA from California, I have made fighting human trafficking a priority.
Human trafficking is a hidden crime. These victims are not willing participants in prostitution. These women, men, girls, and boys are being held against their will, caught in a life of drug addiction, physical abuse, and sexual assault. Children cannot be prostitutes. Children cannot consent to sex. They get forced into human trafficking, they are victims not criminals.

It is estimated that at least 100,000 children are at risk for human trafficking every year in the U.S. The real number of trafficking victims is unknown.

Even if they are identified, they are constantly moved around by their traffickers, whether that's across our borders and/or around the country. Many are runaways, throwaways, or stowaways. Imagine a child being considered a throwaway or a child that no one is looking for. This is reality for many in our country. We must be the ones to give them hope.

Victims may be afraid to come forward. They may be arrested and jailed because they are mistaken for criminal. Forgiven immigrants kidnapped and brought to the US are told their family will be killed if they seek help.

Many victims may be suffering from Stockholm Syndrome and actually believe they are in a loving relationship with their trafficker.

Education and awareness for law enforcement and the public will help prevent trafficking and identify the victim.

Rescuing and Restoring victims must be a top priority. Trafficking victims have unique needs, different than the needs of other crime victims. They must receive specialized, trauma-informed care from those that understand this crime.

Trafficking victims are not easy victims to help. They've been through extremely terrible situations. Many have come from a life of hardship, from abusive families, and moved around from family to family in foster care. Anyone they've trusted in the past has used them and betrayed them. So, many times after they've been rescued, they run because that's what they know.

We cannot give up on these girls. They deserve to know love and trust. As a society, we must embrace them.

I've introduced the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act with Congresswoman Mалоумна, to ensure funding for the rescue and restoration of trafficking victims. It will ensure specialized training and care, and training for law enforcement. These services will be paid for by fines on the perpetrators. The bad guys literally pay for the crimes they have committed. What a concept!

Our bill also addresses the cause of this dastardly deed: the demand. Gone are the days of boys being boys. Those that buy sex from children are child abusers, not Johns. John is in the Bible. He's a good guy. These criminals must be punished like the child abusers that they are. They are child rapists.

During January, National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, we recognize that we have a long road ahead of us in order to eradicate our country and our world of modern day slavery. If we have the help and work of local, state, and federal governments, wonderful anti-trafficking organizations, and just people with good hearts, I think we can put a stop to this despicable crime.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING GEORGE STEVENS, JR. AS THE FOUNDER OF THE KENNEDY CENTER HONORS AND FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN FILM MAKING

HON. STEVE COHEN
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize George Stevens, Jr., an American writer, director, producer, playwright, author and founder of the American Film Institute and the Kennedy Center Honors. With an impressive, creative and innovative career spanning nearly 65 years, he has contributed greatly to American filmmaking and diplomacy, and has elevated artistic standards and appreciation to new heights. It is therefore with profound gratitude for his dedication to the arts and yet sadness that December 2014 marked the passing of the esteemed Kennedy Center Honors that I am speaking today.

In 1978, Stevens founded the Kennedy Center Honors, which is an annual TV special that recognizes the extraordinary contribution of artists who have contributed to American culture through dance, the theater, music, film and television. The Kennedy Center Honors, however, is more than just a TV special. It is the brainchild of George Stevens and it was influenced by his hero and friend, President John F. Kennedy, who said, “I look forward to an America that will honor achievement in the arts the way we honor achievement in business and statecraft.” Through personal dedication and a labor of love, Stevens committed much of his adult life to the honors which is a significant part of his legacy and contribution to the arts.

For thirty-six years, Stevens produced the Honors and made it the premier show of American arts appreciation. In 2008, his son Michael joined him as a producer of the show and it remains one of the most highly anticipated events of the year, showcasing some of the best talents America has to offer. Last year’s Honors recipients included Tom Hanks, Sting, Lin-Manuel Miranda and singer-songwriter Al Green from my home of Memphis, Tennessee. The show was an amazing celebration of these artists and a testament to Stevens’ love for the arts. I was glad to be among the attendees at the historic 2014 Honors.

In 1962, former CBS Newsman and head of the United States Information Agency (USIA) under the Kennedy Administration Edward R. Murrow reached out to Stevens to join the Agency to help inform the world about the U.S. through film. It was during this time that he formed a lasting relationship with President John F. Kennedy and his family, and began laying the foundation that transformed how American films and the arts are recognized and appreciated today. After completing nearly 300 short films for the USIA and following the President’s assassination, Stevens produced the heartfelt and well-received documentary about the life of President Kennedy entitled Years of Lightning, Day of Drums. At the time, the National Board of Review named the documentary “Documentary of the Year” and in 2013, Stevens worked with Warner Bros to restore the film and release it on DVD.

George Stevens, Jr. was born no stranger to Hollywood and American filmmaking. His grandparents and grandfather were all actors, having starred alongside Charlie Chaplin and in silent films. His father, George Stevens, Sr., was a legendary Hollywood director who made more than 50 films and earned an Oscar for directing the 1951 motion picture The Search for Place in the Sun. At age 17, the younger Stevens began working with his father reading scripts and stories for potential films, including the 1953 Western classic Shane, which received five Academy Award nominations, and the 1959 film version of the Pulitzer Prize-winning play, The Diary of Anne Frank. Between 1959 and 1961, Stevens directed episodes for the television series Peter Gunn and Alfred Hitchcock Presents. In 1967, he, along with Sidney Poitier and Gregory Peck, founded the American Film Institute, which serves to preserve original prints of American films.

Stevens continues to produce some of the most important works in American culture. In 2013, he produced American editorial cartoonist Herbert Block’s documentary entitled Herblock: The Black & the White, and in 2011, he adapted Thurgood, his 2006 one-man stage play about the first African-American Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, into a feature film. In 2009, he was the executive producer of the TV special We Are One: The Obama Inaugural Celebration at the Lincoln Memorial.

Stevens is an American icon whose dedication to the arts is unwavering. He has won 13 Emmys, two Peabody Awards for Meritorious Service to Broadcasting, eight Writers Guild of America awards, the Christopher Award and Writers Guild of America’s Paul Selvin Award for his writings on civil rights and liberties. In 2011, President Barack Obama appointed him Co-chairman of the President’s Committee on the Arts and Humanities.

George Stevens continues to serve and represent the arts community well. Because of his steadfast efforts to celebrate and promote American art, the Kennedy Center Honors is always at the top of TV ratings. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on more than 65 years of dedication to the arts and the 36 years of producing the Kennedy Center Honors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J. RANDY FORBES
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, last week I was unable to cast my vote for two important pieces of legislation. Had I been in the chamber, I would have voted YES on H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act and YES on H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act and the Affordable Health Insurance Full Disclosure Act. I voted to pass H.R. 7 in the 113th Congress. This crucial bill will establish a government-wide, permanent prohibition on the funding of abortion, ensuring that no program or agency is exempt from this safeguard. I believe that life—even in its earliest stages—deserves respect and protection. I am and always have been pro-life, and throughout my tenure in Congress will continue to be a strong advocate for the unborn.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

JAMES KRAMER TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. James Kramer. Mr. Kramer is the Pueblo County Coroner and will be retiring this month after a remarkable 37-year career, making him one of the longest serving public officials in Colorado history.

Mr. Kramer was elected as Pueblo County coroner on November 1, 1977 and has investigated around 21,000 cases during his career. He has been a tireless servant to the people of Pueblo County and has remained on-call 24 hours a day, seven days a week for the better-half of four decades. He has compassionately delivered tragic news on thousands of occasions and has served with his team nationally both at ground zero after the September 11th attacks and in Louisiana after the devastation of Hurricane Katrina.

Prior to Mr. Kramer’s service to the county of Pueblo, he served this nation in the U.S. Air Force from 1968–1977, and worked as a physician’s assistant at Touchstone Family Practice.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kramer’s dogged work ethic and dedication to serving both his country and community is truly admirable. I stand with the residents of Pueblo County and the citizens of the United States in thanking Mr. Kramer and congratulating him on a lifetime of service.

Further, the Secretary State is asked whether they intend to designate one of the Assistant Secretary of State positions as the Assistant Secretary of State to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and the reasons for that decision.

I have a concern regarding the bill’s amendment of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to prohibit subsequent inclusion for more than one consecutive year on the special watch list of countries whose compliance with minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking is full, partial, or insignificant if the country:

was included on the list for four consecutive years after enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, and

was subsequently included on the exclusive Tier 3 list of countries not making significant efforts to bring themselves into compliance with the law.

It is important that the mechanisms for reaching determinations regarding compliance with anti-human trafficking measures are consistent and reliable over time.

There should be care taken that places around the globe with long histories of human trafficking do not find ways limit access to information that would better measure their progress in eradicating the practice and bring to justice those involved.

According to the Report, the most common form of human trafficking (79%) is sexual exploitation. The victims of sexual exploitation are predominantly women and girls. Surprisingly, in 30% of the countries which provided information on the gender of traffickers, women make up the largest proportion of traffickers. In some parts of the world, women trafficking women is the norm.

The second most common form of human trafficking is forced labor (18%), although this may be a misrepresentation because forced labor is less frequently detected and reported than trafficking for sexual exploitation.

Globally about 20% of all trafficking victims are children. Unfortunately in parts of Africa children are the majority, these numbers rise to 100% in some parts of West Africa.

Many of those who are victims of human trafficking are exploited in locations near their home.

According to the 2009 United National Report on “Human Trafficking Exposes Modern Form of Slavery” research reveals that internal regional and domestic trafficking are a source of the problems.

The United Nations Protocol against Trafficking in Persons reports that in the past few years the number of Member States seriously implementing the Protocol has doubled going from 54 to 125 out of the 155 nations.

In 2009, there were many countries that lacked the necessary legal framework or political will to take on the issue of human trafficking.

I join my colleagues in working to strengthen laws nationally and internationally against human trafficking, and supporting the allocation of resources toward that end.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 514.
Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. This bill undermines vital consumer protections and regulations afforded by Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203). On January 7, 2015, the House voted on this new bill under suspension of the rules where it failed. I did not support this recrafted bill and I do not support it now.

While many of the provisions within H.R. 37 have passed the House in a bi-partisan fashion during prior Congresses, this year House Republicans have added a new, political provision to weaken consumer protections that I cannot support. Undermining the Volcker Rule by delaying its implementation until 2019 will again put middle-class and working families at financial risk just as our economy has recovered. The Volcker Rule prohibits financial institutions from conducting speculative investment activities that do not benefit their customers. This federal regulation is necessary to safeguard the American people from the financial instability and damaged caused by risky trading by Wall Street that contributed to the Great Recession.

This bill is unnecessarily being rushed to the House floor. Neither the Financial Services Committee nor the Agricultural Committee has had an opportunity to review this bill in this new Congress and assess the impacts it would have on our banks and our farmers. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act and instead bring a bill to the House floor that protects all Americans not just Wall Street.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORING OUR WWII MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 2015

HON. JANICE HAHN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, millions of Americans in uniform fought bravely to secure freedom and peace throughout the world. We honored their sacrifices by ensuring we took care of them at home, through initiatives such as the G.I. Bill and other services meant to support our veterans.

During the war, U.S. Merchant Mariners were responsible for transporting troops and delivering supplies for the military. Hundreds of ships and thousands of men were lost to enemy submarines and aircraft, including dangerous missions ferrying supplies to Western Europe and even Russia. It was one of the most critical roles played during the early part of the war.

Unfortunately, those who served this nation so valiantly during that time, were not eligible for the G.I. Bill that helped millions of veterans go to college, secure a home and transition seamlessly into civilian life. The fact that we did not provide similar benefits to those who risked their lives for this country is simply unfathomable.

That's why I am proud to join with my colleague Rep. JOHN DUNCAN in introducing the bipartisan “Honoring Our WWII Merchant Marine Act of 2015.” This bill would provide a one-time benefit of $25,000 to the surviving 5,000 World War II Mariners. In just two years since I last introduced this act, the number of surviving Merchant Mariners has been cut in half, and if we fail to act now none will see the promise fulfilled. By providing this most needed benefit, we will finally be giving our brave merchant mariners the recognition they rightfully deserve.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MS. LAURA L. HAMPTON
HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Ms. Laura L. Hampton on the celebration of her 80th Birthday.

Being publicly provided involves one and has provided me with the opportunity to meet and interact with some of the most wonderful and most delightful people. One such person has been, and continues to be Mrs. Laura L. Hampton, whom I met during the 1980s while serving as Alderman of the 29th ward, which was more than twenty years ago. Mrs. Hampton was a community leader and her family lived in the West Garfield Park community on West Wilcox Street. She has played every role, that one can play in a community; a wife, a mother, a grandmother, an organizer, a leader, a treasurer, a President and whatever it takes to make a community function.

Mrs. Hampton has been and continues to be what is called a “Community Activist”, that is, one who is actively involved in the affairs of community life, block, neighborhood, church, school, electoral process, and all that takes place in a community.

I congratulate Mrs. Hampton on the occasion of her 80th birthday. Wish her well and thank her for all that she has done for the community including helping to elect me to Congress and President Barack Obama as President of the United States of America.

INTERNATIONAL MEGAN’S LAW TO PREVENT DEMAND FOR CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 515 International Megan’s Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking.

This legislation protects children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

Child sex tourism, where an individual travels to a foreign country and engages in sexual activity with a child in that country, is a form of child exploitation and, where commercial, child sex trafficking.

Human trafficking is a problem for the United States because the U.S. State Department estimates that approximately 17,500 foreign nationals are trafficked into the United States each year, the largest number of people trafficked into the United States come from Asia and the Pacific and the next highest numbers coming from Latin America and Europe.

Law enforcement officials indicate that known child-sex offenders are traveling internationally, and that the criminal background of such individuals may not be known to local law enforcement prior to their arrival.

The commercial sexual exploitation of minors in child sex trafficking and pornography is a global phenomenon.

The International Labor Organization has estimated that 1.8 million children worldwide are victims of child sex trafficking and pornography each year.

It is estimated 2.8 million children living on the streets of this nation are at risk for trafficking into the sex industry.

Children who are abused or victims of molestation are most vulnerable.

If they are lured into human trafficking they are isolated from the rest of the world and start living lives controlled by pimps, escort and massage services, private dancing clubs, pornographic clubs and much worse.

The State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons produces the annual Trafficking in Persons Report (“TIP Report”), which is Congress’ primary resource for human trafficking reporting, analysis and recommendations for the United States and 186 countries around the world.

These kids are not criminals. They are victims, robbed of their innocence by adult criminals.

They are boys and girls who have been taken advantage of and are unable to escape an ugly system.

I support H.R. 515 because it is focused on helping at-risk and vulnerable children rather than treating them as criminals.

Specifically, the bill requires that state plans for federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment:

1. provide procedures to identify and assess all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking;

2. provide training for child protection service workers to appropriately respond to reports of child sex trafficking; and

3. develop and implement policies and procedures to connect child victims to public or private specialized services.

Additionally, the bill requires States to report annually the numbers of children identified as victims of sex trafficking within the already existing National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System.

H.R. 515 also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress outlining the prevalence and type of child trafficking nationwide as well as the current barriers to serving child victims comprehensively.

I strongly support H.R. 515 and urge my colleague to join me in voting for its passage which will help bring an end to the evil practice that is child sex trafficking.
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Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S495–S547

Measures Introduced: Seventeen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 256–272, and S. Res. 42. Pages S541–42

Measures Reported:
S. Res. 42, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. Page S541

Measures Considered:

Keystone XL Pipeline—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

PENDING:
Murkowski Amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute. Page S497

Vitter/Cassidy Modified Amendment No. 80 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf. Page S497

Murkowski (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 67 (to Amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel. Pages S497, S509–12

Cardin Amendment No. 75 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline. Page S497

Murkowski Amendment No. 98 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities. Page S497

Flake Amendment No. 103 (to Amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs. Page S497

Cruz Amendment No. 15 (to Amendment No. 2), to promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports. Pages S497, S507–08

Moran/Cruz Amendment No. 73 (to Amendment No. 2), to delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Page S497

Daines Amendment No. 132 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments. Page S497

Boxer Amendment No. 130 (to Amendment No. 2), to preserve existing permits and the authority of the agencies issuing the permits to modify the permits if necessary. Pages S512–13

Peters/Stabenow Amendment No. 70 (to Amendment No. 2), to require that the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration make a certification and submit to Congress the results of a study before the pipeline may be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained. Page S513

Collins/Warner Amendment No. 35 (to Amendment No. 2), to coordinate the provision of energy retrofitting assistance to schools. Pages S513–14

Murkowski Amendment No. 166 (to Amendment No. 2), to release certain wilderness study areas from management for preservation as wilderness. Pages S514–18

Sanders Amendment No. 23 (to Amendment No. 2), to increase the quantity of solar photovoltaic electricity by providing rebates for the purchase and installation of an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems by 2025. Pages S518–20

Merkley Amendment No. 174 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in communities in the United States while also helping to fund climate change adaptation in developing countries. Page S520

Merkley Amendment No. 125 (to Amendment No. 2), to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and provide infrastructure funding. Page S520

Cantwell/Boxer Amendment No. 131 (to Amendment No. 2), to ensure that if the Keystone XL Pipeline is built, it will be built safely and in compliance with United States environmental laws. Pages S520–21
Tillis/Burr Amendment No. 102 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide for leasing on the outer Continental Shelf and the distribution of certain qualified revenues from such leasing. Pages S521–23, S525

Markay Amendment No. 178 (to Amendment No. 2), to ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum. Page S523

Markay Amendment No. 141 (to Amendment No. 2), to delay the effective date until the President determines that the pipeline will not have certain negative impacts. Pages S523–24

Whitehouse Amendment No. 148 (to Amendment No. 2), to require campaign finance disclosures for certain persons benefiting from tar sands development. Pages S524–25

Booker Amendment No. 155 (to Amendment No. 2), to allow permitting agencies to consider new circumstances and new information. Page S525

Burr Modified Amendment No. 92 (to Amendment No. 2), to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Pages S525–26

Coons Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change and infrastructure. Pages S526–27

Carper Amendment No. 120 (to Amendment No. 2), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credits for new qualified fuel cell motor vehicles and alternative fuel vehicle refueling property. Pages S527–28

Heitkamp Amendment No. 133 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended to extend the credit with respect to facilities producing energy from certain renewable resources. Pages S528–29

Cardin Amendment No. 124 (to Amendment No. 2), to clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect. Pages S529–31

Cantwell (for Gillibrand) Amendment No. 48 (to Amendment No. 2), to modify the definition of underground injection. Pages S531–32

Cantwell (for Peters/Stabenow) Amendment No. 55 (to Amendment No. 2), to require a study of the potential environmental impact of by-products of the Keystone XL pipeline. Pages S532–36

Merkowski (for Barrasso) Amendment No. 245 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority. Page S536

Daines Amendment No. 246 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect. Pages S536–37

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 2:30 p.m., on Wednesday, January 28, 2015, Senate vote on or in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Cardin Amendment No. 75 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Peters/Stabenow Amendment No. 70 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Sanders Amendment No. 23 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Cruz Amendment No. 15 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Merkowski Amendment No. 125 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Moran/Cruz Amendment No. 73 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Whitehouse Amendment No. 148 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Daines Amendment No. 132 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Coons Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Collins/Warner Amendment No. 35 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Carper Amendment No. 120 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Murkowski Amendment No. 166 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Booker Amendment No. 155 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Stabenow Amendment No. 43 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Cantwell (for Gillibrand) Amendment No. 48 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Murkowski (for Barrasso) Amendment No. 245 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Cardin Amendment No. 124 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), Daines Amendment No. 246 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above), and Burr Modified Amendment No. 92 (to Amendment No. 2) (listed above); that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60 vote affirmative threshold for adoption, and that no second-degree amendments be in order to the amendments; and that there be two minutes of debate equally divided between each vote, and that all votes after the first in the series be 10 minutes in length. Page S537

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Wednesday, January 28, 2015. Page S547

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Richard T. Julius, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board for a term expiring September 14, 2019.

Albert Stanley Meiburg, of Georgia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be Associate Attorney General. Page S547

Messages from the House:

Measures Referred:

Measures Read the First Time:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:
Amendments Submitted: Pages S546–47
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S547
Privileges of the Floor: Page S547
Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 9:10 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2015. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S547.)

Committee Meetings
(Committees not listed did not meet)

GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY
Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine global challenges and U.S. national security strategy, after receiving testimony from General James N. Mattis, USMC (Ret.), and Admiral William J. Fallon, USN (Ret.), both a former Commander, United States Central Command, and General John M. Keane, USA (Ret.), former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, all of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution (S. Res. 42) authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

Also, committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development: Senators Scott (Chair), Crapo, Heller, Moran, Corker, Cotton, Rounds, Vitter, Menendez, Reed, Schumer, Tester, Merkley, Heitkamp, and Donnelly.


Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment: Senators Crapo (Chair), Corker, Vitter, Toomey, Kirk, Scott, Sasse, Moran, Warner, Reed, Schumer, Menendez, Tester, Warren, and Donnelly.

Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance: Senators Kirk (Chair), Cotton, Sasse, Heitkamp, and Warner.


Senators Shelby and Brown are ex-officio members of each subcommittee.

IRAN SANCTIONS
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine perspectives on the strategic necessity of Iran sanctions, after receiving testimony from Antony Blinken, Deputy Secretary of State; David S. Cohen, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence; Mark Dubowitz, Foundation for Defense of Democracies, Bethesda, Maryland; and Patrick Clawson, Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Washington, DC.

PRESIDENT OBAMA’S 2015 TRADE POLICY AGENDA
Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine President Obama’s 2015 trade policy agenda, after receiving testimony from Michael Froman, United States Trade Representative.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations: Senators Portman (Chair), McCain, Paul, Lankford, Ayotte, Sasse, McCaskill, Tester, Baldwin, and Heitkamp.

Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management: Senators Paul (Chair), Lankford, Enzi, Ayotte, Ernst, Sasse, Baldwin, McCaskill, Booker, and Peters.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management: Senators Lankford (Chair), McCain, Portman, Enzi, Ernst, Sasse, Heitkamp, Tester, Booker, and Peters.

Senators Johnson and Carper are ex-officio members of each subcommittee.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on supporting teachers and school leaders, after receiving testimony from Terry Holliday, Kentucky Commissioner of Education, Frankfort; Dan Goldhaber, American Institutes for Research National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, Bothell, Washington; Saul Hinojosa, Somerset School District, Somerset, Texas; Rachelle Moore, Madrona K–8, Seattle, Washington, on behalf of the National Education Association; and Christine Handy-Collins, Gaithersburg High School, Gaithersburg, Maryland, on behalf of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

BUSINESS MEETING
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing
expenditures by the Committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

**INTELLIGENCE**

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

---

**House of Representatives**

**Chamber Action**

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 39 public bills, H.R.539–577; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 10; and H. Res. 52–58 were introduced.

Pages H638–39

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H641

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

- H.R. 159, to stop exploitation through trafficking (H. Rept. 114–6, Part 1);
- H.R. 181, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking (H. Rept. 114–7);
- H.R. 285, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts (H. Rept. 114–8);
- H.R. 350, to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, and to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking (H. Rept. 114–9, Part 1); and
- H.R. 399, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–10, Part 1).

Pages H589–92

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

- **Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015**: H.R. 350, to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, and to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking;

  Pages H589–92

- **Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015**: H.R. 159, amended, to stop exploitation through trafficking;

  Pages H592–95

- **Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2015**: H.R. 285, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts;

  Pages H596, H600

- **Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015**: H.R. 181, amended, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking;

  Pages H600–07

- **Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015**: H.R. 460, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities; and

  Pages H607–11

- **Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015**: H.R. 398, to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately.

  Pages H618–20

LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 48, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 351) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 169 nays, Roll No. 46. Pages H611–16

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated on Monday, January 26th:

- **Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015**: H.R. 469, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, by a 2⁄3 yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 47; and

  Pages H616–17

- **Improving the response to victims of child sex trafficking**: H.R. 246, to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, by a 2⁄3 yea-and-nay vote of 411 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 48.

  Pages H617–18
Unanimous consent agreement to correct H.R. 515: Agreed by unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 515, the Clerk be instructed to make the correction placed at the desk.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, January 28.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H616, H616–17, H618. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE’S BUDGET AND ECONOMIC OUTLOOK
Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Congressional Budget Office’s Budget and Economic Outlook”. Testimony was heard from Douglas W. Elmendorf, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

WHAT ARE THE ELEMENTS OF SOUND DATA BREACH LEGISLATION?
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade held a hearing entitled “What are the Elements of Sound Data Breach Legislation?”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING PUBLIC HEALTH LEGISLATION TO HELP PATIENTS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Examining Public Health Legislation to Help Patients and Local Communities”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SUSTAINABLE HOUSING FINANCE: AN UPDATE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Sustainable Housing Finance: An Update from the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency”. Testimony was heard from Melvin L. Watt, Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency.

IRAN NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS AFTER THE SECOND EXTENSION: WHERE ARE THEY GOING?
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Iran Nuclear Negotiations After the Second Extension: Where Are They Going?”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NIGERIA ON THE BRINK?
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “Nigeria on the Brink?”. Testimony was heard from Robert P. Jackson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

THE EVOLUTION OF TERRORIST PROPAGANDA: THE PARIS ATTACK AND SOCIAL MEDIA
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled “The Evolution of Terrorist Propaganda: The Paris Attack and Social Media”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules, oversight plan, parking policy, and a resolution declaring the committee’s electronic repository.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE
Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 527, the “Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015”. H.R. 527 was ordered reported, without amendment.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress and a markup on H.R. 50, the “Unfunded Mandates Information Transparency Act of 2015”; and H.R. 313, the “Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act of 2015”. The committee adopted its rules and approved subcommittee assignments. H.R. 50 and H.R. 313 were ordered reported, without amendment.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules and oversight plan.
THE EXPANDING CYBER THREAT
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled “The Expanding Cyber Threat”. Testimony was heard from James Kurose, Assistant Director, Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorate, National Science Foundation; Charles H. Romine, Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology; Eric A. Fischer, Senior Specialist in Science and Technology, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules, rosters, and oversight plan.

REBUILDING AFTER THE STORM: LESSENING IMPACTS AND SPEEDING RECOVERY

BUSINESS MEETING; LEGISLATIVE HEARING
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a business meeting to designate Congresswoman Kathleen Rice to subcommittees and a hearing on H.R. 189, the “Servicemember Foreclosure Protections Extension Act of 2015”; H.R. 216, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Planning Reform Act of 2015”; H.R. 245, to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify certain existing provisions of law relating to effective dates for claims under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; H.R. 280, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and H.R. 294, the “Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act”. Congresswoman Kathleen Rice was designated to two subcommittees. Testimony was heard from Representative Grayson; the following Department of Veterans Affairs officials: David R. McLenachen, Acting Deputy Under Secretary for Disability Assistance, Veterans Benefits Administration; Susan Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Office of Policy and Planning; and Kim McLeod, Counsel, Office of General Counsel; and public witnesses.

A REVIEW OF THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “A Review of the Transition Assistance Program”. Testimony was heard from Curtis L. Coy, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Opportunity, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Teresa W. Gerton, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Veterans’ Employment and Training Service, Department of Labor; Susan Kelly, Director, Transition to Veterans Program Office, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

U.S. TRADE POLICY AGENDA
Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “U.S. Trade Policy Agenda”. Testimony was heard from Michael Froman, U.S. Trade Representative.

HEARING 3
Select Committee on Benghazi: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Hearing 3”, relating to status review of outstanding requests. Testimony was heard from Neil Higgins, Director of Congressional Affairs, Central Intelligence Agency; and Joel Rubin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, Department of State.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2015
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, rules of procedure for the 114th Congress, and subcommittee assignments, 4 p.m., SR–328A.
Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the impact of the “Budget Control Act of 2011” and sequestration on national security, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.
Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the Congressional Budget Office’s (CBO) budget and economic outlook for fiscal years 2015–2025, 10 a.m., SD–608.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine freight rail transportation, focusing on enhancing safety, efficiency, and commerce, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine MAP–21 reauthorization, focusing on Federal and state perspectives, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: business meeting to consider H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 11 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, subcommittee assignments, rules of procedure for the 114th Congress, and S. Res. 35, commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland, 9:45 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, committee rules of procedure, S. 192, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, an original bill entitled, “Strengthening Education Through Research Act”, and any pending nominations, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine protecting America from cyber attacks, focusing on the importance of information sharing, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: organizational business meeting to consider selection of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, committee rules of procedure, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine Indian country priorities for the 114th Congress, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of the Attorney General, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and rules of procedure for the 114th Congress, 10:30 a.m., SR–428A.

Special Committee on Aging: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and rules of procedure for the 114th Congress, 2 p.m., S–211, Capitol.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 9:15 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “A Case for Reform: Improving DOD’s Ability to Respond to the Pace of Technological Change”, 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 9:45 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “Supercomputing and American Technology Leadership”, 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Examining the Quality and Cost of VA Health Care”, 10:15 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 10 a.m., HVC–304. This meeting may close.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 28

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Wednesday, January 28

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of S. 1, Keystone XL Pipeline, with a series of votes on or in relation to amendments to the bill beginning at 2:30 p.m.

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 351—LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act (Subject to a Rule).
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