United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2015 No. 13

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 The 12 million 529 accountholders across the country are able to choose a plan whose funds will then grow and be withdrawn tax free to pay for college expenses such as tuition or room and board.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, 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

Printed on recycled paper.

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 legislation under 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 Snowbird. They first 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, stands as a memorial to his mother and as a sign of 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, Dahntay 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.

□ 1215

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my south Florida colleague, Congressman TED DEUTCH, in a resolution commemorating today, the International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi extermination camp at Auschwitz.

Today serves as a somber and grim reminder of the evil mankind is capable of as over 1.3 million people were systematically murdered in Auschwitz alone, including over 1.1 million Jews. As painful as it is to speak about the horrors of Auschwitz, we have a moral obligation to honor the memories of those who were murdered during modern humanity's darkest period.

As anti-Semitism grows throughout Europe, we must take a solemn vow that these deaths were not in vain and that we will never forget, that we will never allow such atrocities to occur again.

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 trying to pass 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, let's bring up the Border Security Results 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 strong 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 and to revise and extend her remarks.)

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 lives 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 survivors 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 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 common aspiration 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, as have most other States nationwide. Pennsylvania was also named as one of the five most improved States.

Our work on this issue, though, is far from over. Legislation this week takes important steps in the right direction, by streamlining law enforcement resources. It enhances victim services, and it criminalizes those who knowingly advertise the commercial exploitation of children. It also allows Federal grants to support shelters for victims.

I applaud the efforts of my colleagues in the House for raising awareness of this heinous crime, and I encourage bipartisan support of all of the human trafficking legislation that we are considering this week.

WE MUST REMAIN VIGILANT IN PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp.

Seventy years ago, following the atrocities of the Holocaust—which left 6 million Jews, 1 million Roma, 250,000 mentally and physically disabled individuals, and 9,000 homosexuals brutally murdered simply because they were different—the world's democracies stood together and declared: ''Never again.''

These two simple and powerful words greet visitors to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum as a reminder that it is our collective responsibility to promote religious tolerance and stand up against persecution or totalitarianism in any form.

The recent attacks at a kosher market and at the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo in Paris, the kidnapping of 276 Christian schoolgirls by Boko Haram in Nigeria, and beheading by the Islamic State of journalists and of 13 teenage boys last week for the simple act of watching a soccer game underscore the unfortunate and troubling reminder that we must remain vigilant and undeterred in our fight to protect the most human rights.

''Never again'' must be more than an aspirational statement; it must be fact.

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 youths 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, Braking 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 the service of this 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.

□ 1230

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 pricetag 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 of the 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 some 630,000 DREAMers, including 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, 2014.

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 1996, 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. ROS-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 catalogues 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 deterring individuals from committing trafficking 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 select 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 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. PROVISION OF HOUSING 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 at the end 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 all corners of our country. Studies 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 here 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 the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: 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, so that it 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. ED 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 criminal 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.

All 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 the problem 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 tainted 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 sex 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 nongovernmental 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 might I 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.

Witnesses testified at a Homeland Security Committee field hearing in Houston in March of last year, which I convened and brought Members of Congress to Houston for, which has a particularly serious problem.

First, one of the biggest limitations on the ability of area 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.

□ 1245

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. Without such refuge, these children will return to their traffickers, and their traffickers will be waiting for them. This bill provides funding for local shelters so they get the support they need to house survivors and to get these young people started on the path to recovery.

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. Most statistics indicate that the average age of a female when she is first victimized in human trafficking is a very young year of age. With this fact alone, we can understand why the majority of Federal investigations and prosecutions of trafficking involve minors. One of the statements we made on the floor today with all of these bills is that the minors are victims—they are not the criminals—and they need to be saved. That is what we are committing to.

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, with 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 human 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 Federal 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 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. Vulnerable youth are primary targets. They are more easily lured into prostitution and other forms of child exploitation, and while runaways 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 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 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 combatting 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 area 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. This bill provides the funding for local shelters to get the support they need to house survivors and get these young people started on the path to recovery.

Madam Speaker, 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. Most statistics indicate that the average age of a female when she is first victimized into Human Trafficking is years old. For this fact alone, we can understand why the majority of federal investigations and prosecutions of human trafficking involve minors.

I must share with you, however, the testimony of another witness at last year's field Houston 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 age 18–21. 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. 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 by ensuring that the laws we pass and the support/assistance we establish is also available to these 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 of 2015, 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 human trafficking by our actions today, there is still much more to be done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), the author of this bill.

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, for many years, my perspective of human trafficking was based off of a scene I had seen in a movie. It was a scene in which a father came to a playground, took the hand of his 6-year-old daughter, took her off to have sex with someone, and then brought her back to play. That was a scene from a country far,

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, and that is devastating for me for many reasons. 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 benefit the 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 admitting 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 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 know 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 brought 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 spend Federal resources 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 that they need 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 gentlewoman 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 is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 350.

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. 159) 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. 159

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 1701(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 in effect 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) discourages the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution or sex trafficking offense, based on the conduct described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) encourages the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including child welfare services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.''; and

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

''(5) 'commercial sex act' 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).

''(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. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''1590,'' the following: ''1591,'';

(2) by striking ''and 1594'' and inserting ''1594, 2251, 2251A, 2421, 2422, and 2423'';

(3) in clause (iv), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(4) in clause (v), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

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

''(vi) the number of individuals required by a 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

''(vii) the age, gender, race, country of origin, country of citizenship, and description of the role in 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. 7105(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, of 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 144(a)(3) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3194(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) A victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 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 566(e)(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:

''(D) assist State, local, and other Federal 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. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair 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 extraneous material on 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. SENSENBRENNER. 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 do bring children and other victims 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 victims 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,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 159, the ''Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 1015.'' Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 159 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 159, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill, or any other similar legislation, and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 159, the ''Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015,'' which the Judiciary Committee ordered reported favorably to the House on January 21, 2015.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 159 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

Finally, I am pleased to include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 159.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

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

The manager, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, 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. As 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, children who by their very ages are under the age of consent. Sex with a minor, again, is rape. The seriousness of the offense is not diminished by having the john pay for the sex, making him feel good. It is still rape. It is time we stopped referring to the customer—the person having sex with a child—with such a polite title as a ''john.''

In addition, we must label those who provide the johns with children, with minors, 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 earlier 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 take her to get 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 street and away 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 in our country. 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.

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. In an effort to help their recovery, 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 earner 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, and also arrest 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 non-governmental 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 in 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 comfortable 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 each 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 Brittany. Brittany was a very young girl who was violently raped, murdered, and then found dead in an impound lot last February. Unlike Dayanna, Brittany had a loving family. She worked with children at a local recreation center and taught dance lessons.

Despite these circumstances, Brittany was also a victim of sex trafficking but was too embarrassed to speak out until it was too late. As Brittany's mother told me: ''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 license exam. In fact, in most States, these girls would be considered criminals that should be incarcerated and charged with prostitution instead of being treated as victims.

We found that criminalization only traumatizes these girls and actually isolates them from the community and the services that they need and deserve. That is why, Madam Speaker, we need this legislation, H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which focuses on incentivizing States to have safe harbor laws.

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

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

Law enforcement can then focus on actually bringing the perpetrators of these awful crimes to justice. This bipartisan 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 legislation. After their safe harbor laws went into effect, guess what? Law enforcement 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 prosecution 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 enforcement agencies that are investigating missing child cases.

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

I want to thank my colleague GWEN MOORE from Wisconsin for her advocacy, 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, as well, in passing each and every one of these anti-trafficking bills and getting them on the President's desk, so we can continue to save the lives of children.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), who has championed these bills.

Ms. MOORE. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support 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 because, unfortunately, this is a bipartisan problem. Solving the problem of sexual exploitation of children will require 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 children in the United States of America are currently trafficked and another 200,000 are right on the cusp. They are at risk of sexual exploitation.

These victims are not ''women of the night'' or sexualized women who are doing it of their own free will—no. The average age of these victims is 13. It is an embarrassing statistic. It is embarrassing to report that my own hometown of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has become 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 juvenile girls from sex traffickers in Milwaukee. Trafficking is all too common in communities across the Nation—from urban settings, rural settings, suburban 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 gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. I am proud of this legislation, I am pleased to cosponsor it, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 159.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 without letting our colleagues know that we want every possible act of human trafficking to be reported at 1–866–347–2423. We want those who are victims to know that they can seek help, too, at 1–888–373–7888.

The statement we are making is that we are doing everything we can to extinguish and eliminate this heinous tragedy in our country. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and to recognize that we must stop exploitation through trafficking.

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

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

Madam Speaker, this is another example of bipartisan cooperation in the House of Representatives. I do wish to commend the principal author of the bill, Mr. PAULSEN from Minnesota, an original cosponsor; Ms. MOORE from Wisconsin; and my colleague, the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

We have all worked together. Hopefully, 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. SENSENBRENNER) 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.

□ 1315

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.

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,

SECTION 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: '', except where, in an offense under paragraph (2), the act constituting the violation of paragraph (1) is advertising,''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1591(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, or advertised''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, or advertised''.

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 extraneous material on H.R. 285, 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, the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act, H.R. 285, introduced by Mrs. WAGNER of Missouri, is an important yet modest bill. It uses one word, just one word, to clarify that, just as it is against the law to prostitute a child on the street, it is likewise against the law to prostitute a child through an advertisement.

By adding the word ''advertises'' to the existing Federal sex trafficking statute at 18 United States Code, section 1591, this bill makes clear that Congress intends to prohibit the knowing advertising of child sex trafficking to the same extent as the other conduct prohibited by law.

H.R. 285 is a technologically neutral bill and applies to all advertisements that sell children for sex over which there is Federal jurisdiction, regardless of whether they appear on the Internet or somewhere else. It is important to remember that these advertisements, as well as all speech promoting illegal activity, are specifically not protected speech under the First Amendment.

In order to bring a case against the trafficker under this legislation, the government must prove that the defendant knew that they were advertising and knew or recklessly disregarded the fact that the ad involved a minor or someone involved through force, fraud or coercion.

However, 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, the bill requires the government to show that these defendants knew that the advertisement 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 liability.

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.

Congress has criminalized advertising multiple times in recent years. Title 18 of the Federal criminal code currently prohibits advertising promoting counterfeit currency, section 491; obscene or treasonous material, section 552; and the unlawful sale of military medals, section 704, among other things.

It is wholly appropriate for Congress to prohibit the advertising of illegal goods or services. Having done so for illegal advertisements involving animal cruelty, prescription drugs, and counterfeit items, today we take the commonsense step of prohibiting advertising that offers sex with children and coerced adults.

While the Internet has indisputably done much good, U.S. law enforcement has identified online advertisements as the primary platform for buying and selling sex with minors.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), an active and committed member of the House Judiciary Committee and ranking member on the Commercial Subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 285, the SAVE Act.

Human trafficking is never okay. It is a vile crime that no one should be subjected to, but the SAVE Act goes too far.

This bill would impose a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 to 15 years for posting or facilitating the posting of advertisements online. We should be eliminating mandatory minimum sentences, not creating new ones.

This bill is not specific enough. It could potentially apply to communications providers and facilitators who are not actually engaged in sex trafficking.

For example, an employee at an online advertising network that has no role in the types of ads they receive could face 10 to 15 years in prison for simply going in to work every day and helping advance the business. Web hosts and ad networks oftentimes do not have advance warning of the ads that are being sent to them.

During our Judiciary Committee markup, I offered an amendment that would have removed mandatory minimums from the legislation, giving the judge hearing the case, of course, the discretion to impose a wise and just punishment.

I believe in the overall goal of the legislation, but I do not agree with its execution. Judges, working with the sentencing guidelines, should determine sentences, not legislators.

Mandatory minimums fail to reduce crime, they waste taxpayers' money, and often violate common sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of this bill.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this very, very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 285, the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation, or SAVE, Act.

But Madam Speaker, I also rise today in support of all the good work done by my colleagues here in Congress on the issue of human trafficking.

Madam Speaker, as a former United States Ambassador, I was exposed firsthand to the horrors of human trafficking on an international level. I witnessed 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 right here in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, right now there are young women being forced into prostitution in virtually every district across this Nation. In fact, 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 the survivors of 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 I have who 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 advertise 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 offer sex with 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 the sexual exploitation and enslavement 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 has served 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 the 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.

□ 1330

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, or why some drug dealer'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 anybody said they 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. SENSENBRENNER. 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 advertising.

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 all ads and other speech 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 that 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 up this bill. 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 out 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 exploitive 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 hard line as well, but they are out to get their victim. 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 marketplace 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 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 might throw in a word, ''net 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, has looked at this over the years.

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 communications 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 guilt. So authorizing life imprisonment is a good thing. It would allow sufficient latitude for the imposition of extremely lengthy sentences where appropriate.

I am hoping as we move forward with this legislation, which has a very important premise and point, that we will have the opportunity to discuss with our colleagues in the Senate to see how we can best make sure that this bill works to, in essence, target the bad guys and make sure that it does it fairly and directly, because sex trafficking, as I have always said on this floor, should be weeded out. Sex trafficking should not be.

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 marketplace 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 perpetrate heinous criminal schemes such as the selling of minors for sex.

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 of a particular case. 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 communications networks with respect to how advertisements are delivered, the role of the judge in evaluating each case is particularly important.

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 and Web sites 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 advertise the victims 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 advertising that offers a commercial sex act in violation of section 1591 of the Federal criminal code, which deals with the sex trafficking offense.

The SAVE Act doesn't 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 Web sites are protected, but it is absolutely critical that we go after those who are trafficking in persons and advertising and profiting off of it. They absolutely need to be held accountable.

Protection of America's First Amendment right to freedom of speech is fundamental, especially on the Internet, and that was one of the guiding principles of creating this. Less regulation of the Internet, low regulation of the Internet is important, but there are some things you have got to draw the line on. Profiting off of advertising or profiting at all from child sex trafficking is unacceptable, and this law fixes that to the best of our ability while still protecting folks' First Amendment rights.

I am proud to work with my colleague from Missouri, Representative WAGNER, in working to combat this terrible crime of human trafficking.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman, if he has any further speakers.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I have two additional requests for time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Congresswoman WAGNER, and all the other Members for their hard work 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 lives across the country. In Arizona's Second Congressional District, a lack of resources to identify victims, prevent instances of trafficking, and prosecute those who participate leads to many young girls and boys being 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 living 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 a single 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 treat victims like criminals. When they place online 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 trafficking victims. 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.

□ 1345

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 11 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 scourge, 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 those 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 the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act, H.R. 285, does focus on a particular niche that is heinous.

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, pinpoints 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 our 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—minor 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 ones 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 DETERRENCE GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended—

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

(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; and

''(E) implement and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of victims of child human trafficking for prostitution offenses;

''(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 victims, including—

''(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 assisting 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 be not 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;

''(3) 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

''(4) the establishment or enhancement of victims' 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.

''(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

''(A) disclose—

''(i) 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

''(ii) 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) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

''(C) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant; and

''(D) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

''(3) 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.

''(d) DURATION AND 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.

''(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall enter into a contract or other agreement with an academic or non-profit organization that has experience in issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct an annual evaluation of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section, and shall submit any such evaluation to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

''(f) OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section is subject to the requirements of section 10 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2014.

''(g) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section.

''(h) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section may not exceed—

''(1) 70 percent in the first year;

''(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

''(3) 50 percent in the third year.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'child' means a person under the age of 18;

''(2) the term 'child advocacy center' means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

''(3) the term 'child human trafficking' means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child; and

''(4) the term 'eligible entity' means a State or unit of local government that—

''(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

''(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking; and

''(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking.''; and

(3) in subsection (j) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''Secretary of Health and Human Services'' and inserting ''Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services,''; and

(B) by striking ''fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2019''.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE ACT OF 1990.

The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(5) (42 U.S.C. 13001a(5)), by inserting '', including human trafficking and the production of child pornography'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 214 (42 U.S.C. 13002)—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director and with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, may make grants to develop and implement specialized programs to identify and provide direct services to victims of child pornography.''.

SEC. 4. STREAMLINING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by inserting before ''section 1591'' the following: ''section 1581 (peonage; obstructing enforcement), section 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),''; and

(B) by inserting before ''section 1751'' the following: ''section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''human trafficking, offenses pertaining to child pornography, child sexual abuse, coercion and enticement of children,'' after ''kidnapping,''.

SEC. 5. ENHANCING HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORTING.

Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and a photograph taken within the previous 180 days'' after ''dental records'';

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

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

''(C) notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of each report received relating to a child reported missing from a foster care family home or childcare institution; and''.

SEC. 6. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''or maintains'' and inserting ''maintains, patronizes, or solicits'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''or maintained'' and inserting '', maintained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(B) by striking ''knew that the person'' and inserting ''knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person''.

SEC. 7. USING EXISTING TASK FORCES TO TARGET OFFENDERS WHO EXPLOIT CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall ensure that all task forces and working groups within the Violent Crimes Against Children Program engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the investigative capabilities of State and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and prosecution of persons who patronize, or solicit children for sex.

SEC. 8. HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.

Section 2423(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''a preponderance of the evidence'' and inserting ''clear and convincing evidence''.

SEC. 9. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(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 prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of such funds. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of covered grantees to be audited each year.

(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 from which it received a grant award during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subsection (g)(3).

(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—If a covered grantee is awarded funds under the covered grant program from which it received a grant award during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the covered grantee is ineligible for an allocation of grant funds as a result of subsection (b), the Attorney General shall—

(1) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the covered grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(2) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the Fund from the covered grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(d) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''nonprofit'', when used with respect to an organization, means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(2) PROHIBITION.—A nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall not be eligible to receive, directly or indirectly, any funds from a covered grant program.

(3) 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 criteria relied upon to determine such compensation.

(e) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(1) LIMITATION.—No 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, but less than $500 in such funds for each attendee of the conference, shall not be subject to the limitation under this paragraph.

(2) WRITTEN 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, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

(3) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual 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 at least 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:

(A) The grant program under section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b).

(B) The grant programs under section 214 and 214A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002, 13003).

(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 VICTIMS' 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)) and provided contact information for the Office of the Victims' Rights Ombudsman of the Department of Justice.'';

(2) 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

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) 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.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term'';

(B) by striking ''In the case'' and inserting the following:

''(B) MINORS AND CERTAIN OTHER VICTIMS.—In the case''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DISTRICT COURT; COURT.—The terms 'district court' and 'court' include the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.''.

(b) APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: ''In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) child human trafficking (as such term is defined in section 203(i) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b), as added by this Act) has no place in a civilized society, and that persons who commit crimes relating to child human trafficking should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law;

(2) the United States, as a leader in monitoring and combating human trafficking throughout the world, must hold all nations to the same standards to which we hold our Nation;

(3) those who obtain, solicit, or patronize a victim of trafficking for the purpose of engaging in a commercial sex act with that person, are committing a human trafficking offense under Federal law;

(4) the demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human rights violation of human trafficking, and the elimination of that human rights violation requires the elimination of that demand;

(5) United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking are not required to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled; and

(6) as matters stand on the date of enactment of this Act, there are insufficient services and programs for victims of severe forms of human trafficking in the United States, including United States citizens and lawful permanent residents.

SEC. 12. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS 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 subparagraph (F), as subparagraph (G);

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

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

''(F) NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members might have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials to H.R. 181, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as has been stated today, we are dealing with a very important and critical issue in America. It seems, however, that the Super Bowl is coming up this weekend.

The national media and Americans seem to be concerned more about the disappearance of air in footballs than they are about the disappearance of America's greatest resource: our children—children that are being trafficked throughout the United States, bought and sold for sexual assault.

It is not just an international crime; it is a crime here in America. Unfortunately, my hometown of Houston, Texas, is one of the hubs for trafficking because of its location.

We have today several bills, bills that passed yesterday and bills that will come up today—and hopefully all will pass—that deal with this scourge and slavery that is taking place in America.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. GOODLATTE from Virginia; and also the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER; the ranking member, SHEILA JACKSON LEE; and also the former ranking member, BOBBY SCOTT, for their work on these types of legislation that came up last year. Because the Senate didn't

act on them, these bill 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 working on trafficking issues long before I was ever in Congress, is the original cosponsor 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. 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 daughters. I have 11 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 slave trafficking.

Why is sex slavery such a moneymaker? Well, unlike drugs that are sold one time, children are sold numerous times. As our friend, KRISTI NOEM, of South Dakota mentioned earlier, children sometimes are 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 deal with all three 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, and 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 as well.

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. We need those animal shelters, 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 justice 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 for some people, 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—are the child molesters. 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 consumer. We need to know 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.

□ 1400

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—the demand and the 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 manager, Congressman POE, set the tone again for the vigorousness 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. 181, 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 to continue to work on important legislation such as the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I am glad that we are here again to move it so it can ultimately be signed by the President of the United States.

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, rancid 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. And as previously said, human trafficking, sex trafficking, is 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 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 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. While we habitually refer to those who solicit commercial sex acts from minors as ''customers'' and ''johns,'' and I have said this before on the floor, the cold, hard 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. Let us not let them hide behind polite names such as ''john,'' particularly when they prey on our children.

Federal courts have interpreted the existing statute, title 18 U.S.C. section 1591, to cover the acts of patronizing and soliciting. Therefore, the specifications of the terms ''patronize'' 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 text of section 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 call for this.

Let me say that I am also grateful that this bill emphasizes the local, State, and Federal collaboration. 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 seen runaways and we have condemned 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, not juvenile delinquents.

This bill recognizes and treats victims as victims, provides for more services and shelters for them, and provides 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 of Representatives, 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 has no place in a 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 outside the law.

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, one of whom was pregnant, and 19 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 and helping survivors begin their lives anew.

While the rescue of trafficking victims is necessary, so is the prosecution of traffickers. And while we habitually refer to those who solicit commercial sex acts from minors as ''customers'' and ''johns,'' the cold, hard 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 1591. Under this legislation, child rapists will find no 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. They are victims of criminal conduct, and 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 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 expresses the Sense 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 combatting human 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 ("TIP") Report after it passed amendments to its Trafficking in Persons Act. Those amendments stipulated harsher penalties for offenders with penalties of up to 30 years.

Despite this new legislation, Jamaican children subjected to sex trafficking in the country's sex trade remains a serious problem with reports of sex trafficking of children and adults occurring on streets and in night clubs, bars, and private homes. The Jamaican government realizes that it must move more vigorously to not only prosecute, convict and punish trafficking offenders, but to also identify, and assist more victims.

Madam Speaker, while it is entirely proper for the United States to hold all nations to the same standard to which we hold ourselves, it is also entirely proper for the United States to lend assistance to those nations that may lack the resources needed to effectively combat Human Trafficking. I hope that we will give consideration to providing such assistance in future anti-human trafficking legislation.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I must also thank Representative 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 3 minutes to 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 the 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 thousands 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 to combat it. H.R. 181, 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 probable 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 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. CAROLYN B. 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 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 of New York. 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.

□ 1415

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 into sex trafficking. Most of 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 crime 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 on it 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 Treasury Department 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, and the traffickers 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, child prostitution, sexual exploitation, and human smuggling offenses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlelady.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The bill also makes it clear that it is not the victim who is sold and exploited who is the criminal. The criminal is the john, the child abuser who solicits a minor or a trafficker who puts a woman or man out on the street to be bought and sold.

Human trafficking is harmful not only to the victims, but to society at large. Last May, this House passed this bill in total agreement, and I urge the Senate to follow it and pass it also. It is time to help the survivors get the resources they need to rebuild their lives and to punish the evildoers who purchase and sell these innocent children.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge POE for his great leadership in this very important area. It is so encouraging to see the bipartisan commitment. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE and Congresswoman MALONEY, for your strong support.

When I came to Congress, it was my perception that human trafficking was a concern found in other parts of the world, certainly not in North Carolina. After talking to our law enforcement, I found out that North Carolina was within the top 10 States for human trafficking.

As such, I realized that we needed to take care of our own in our own region and hosted a meeting for public officials, church leaders at the Billy Graham Center. We brought in wonderful organizations, Compassion to Act, Justice & Mercy, Neet's Sweets, and others who have been there on behalf of these women.

There are so many important ways that we can provide safety, security, a safe haven for these precious young girls that have been brought into slavery.

Human trafficking is one of the most tragic issues plaguing our world today. Nearly 21 million human beings are living in modern-day slavery, including 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 today to join in supporting the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 presented by Congressman POE. We need to ensure that we can provide to these young, domestic human trafficking victims the support that they need.

This week, yes, we in the House will devote ourselves to raising awareness of this heinous crime and passing legislation to take significant steps toward the eradication of trafficking, both domestically and abroad.

However, even as Human Trafficking Awareness Month draws to a close, our dedication must not waver. I thank the chairman for his leadership, and I thank my colleagues for their support.

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

The previous speaker indicated that we are in the national month acknowledging and recognizing the gravity of human trafficking, and I believe that it calls upon us to stand by the most vulnerable who really can't help themselves.

My last comment before yielding was the demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human rights violation of human trafficking, so eliminating that violation requires the elimination of the demand.

What I might not have added, which a number of Members have said, is the violence that goes along with sex trafficking and human trafficking, the violence that goes along when some entity—a person called a pimp, which is an old-time term, really becomes an abuser, a violent abuser and abuses the frail, small body of a little girl or boy because they really haven't risen to the occasion, provided them with their daily infusion of dollars to continue to do their dastardly work.

As I have heard mentioned on this floor, we are not alone here in the United States. For those of us who met the victims of sex trafficking and human trafficking around the world, we understand that America's standards will help others.

What is good about what we are doing today and the underlying bill is that we set a standard that the world can look at, that we are not going to tolerate or be sufferers of the abuse of little children.

Yesterday, as I listened to a great success story spoken about by the Prime Minister of Jamaica, relating their economic success, she was willing to talk about Jamaica's concerted effort at fighting human trafficking.

An island where it might be easy for that trafficker to move from one place to the next, here was a leader of government acknowledging the scourge of human trafficking and that Jamaican children were suffering and subjected to sex trafficking and that it remains a serious problem, but we are going to fight it.

I felt very good about that because you would think that an island that is very much dependent on tourism and entertainment would not have that calling and that cause; but, yes, the fight is spreading.

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 cutting them off from any kind of aspirations and hope that they could ever have.

Maybe we don't necessarily connect it, but we know the story of the three women that were held for a period of time in our own Nation. Some started 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of different entities involved in bringing this and other pieces of legislation to the House floor.

There are numerous organizations throughout the United States, small and large, that are determined to stop human trafficking, and I want to thank all of them for their input into this cause and this legislation. I call them the victims' posse. They have rounded up and made sure that we are going to deal with this important issue.

I also want to thank the Members of the House who are cosponsors of this bill, especially CAROLYN MALONEY, my friend from New York, and her tenacious work on this and other pieces of legislation.

I also thank the Members of the House because many times, when they go back home on this specific issue, as mentioned by my friend Ms. JACKSON LEE from Texas, they are holding public forums and hearings about this crime of human trafficking. In fact, there is another one in my district this weekend in Houston.

I want to commend the Members for bringing public awareness to this horrible situation; but not all is gloom, doom, and despair, Mr. Speaker, because of this legislation and other pieces of legislation, but more importantly, the moral will of the House and I think of America is to get a grip on this slavery.

When a crime like this is committed against a person, especially a child, we call it sexual assault, but it is really rape. It is rape, Mr. Speaker, of children. A rapist commits that crime to try to destroy that person, destroy their identity, destroy their self-worth, to steal their soul. That is what rapists do.

That is why we are going to solve this case or solve these cases as best we can, by preventing them from occurring, by going after those rapists, going after the trafficker, and rescuing the most precious thing we have in our country, which is our children. We are not going to allow the situation where America's children are bartered and sold on the marketplace for sexual assault. Those days are going to be over.

I appreciate all those who have brought this bill to the floor, both sides, and I ask that the House of Representatives vote unanimously on this legislation.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 181, 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.

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 180 days 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 deter, detect, and 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 relevant to their official duties and consistent with applicable information and privacy laws.

(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, where appropriate, in a 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 State, 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 17,500 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 and directs the Secretary 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 profitable 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 position-specific, relevant training 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 MEADOWS 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 cosponsoring this legislation.

Finally, I would like to thank each of the bill's cosponsors, 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 has hosted events on combating human trafficking, bringing together leaders from every sector of society. Together, we came up with new ideas to fight trafficking at the national 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 afraid to come forward and get help because they 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 Nation's largest hubs in 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, in essence, in shutting down strip clubs, illicit spas, and others.

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 cross-country through Houston, and the port make it a popular point. 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 huge geographic size and large ethnic and culturally diverse population is seen in and around the Nation, which creates optimal conditions. It is not the only city with that.

To combat human trafficking, the Department of Homeland Security, recognizing there needs to be a national campaign, launched the Blue Campaign in 2010. Through the Blue Campaign, DHS works in collaboration with law enforcement, government, nongovernment, and private organizations to protect the basic right of freedom and to bring those who exploit human lives to justice.

This legislation will begin to institutionalize the training. Last year, this training—the Blue training—was credited when two men were arrested at Miami International Airport. TSA personnel who had received training to detect trafficking observed the interaction between the young men and young woman and noticed the signs.

What we want to do today, again, is to institutionalize and codify this effort so that no human trafficker, no child being held by an adult but being trafficked can escape the eye of our trained Homeland Security personnel, and they can break that hand away from that adult that is trying to do that child harm because they will know that is not the friendly parent or wonderful grandparent or best aunt or uncle. They will know it is a dastardly act.

I support the underlying bill, ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, 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 afraid to come forward and get help because they 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 nation's largest hubs for 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.

The main factors that contribute to high levels of trafficking through Houston and the rest of Texas are proximity, demographics, and a large migrant labor force.

Houston's proximity to the Mexican border, I–10, a highway running across country through Houston, and the port of Houston make it a popular point of entry for international trafficking.

Additionally, the presence of two large airports provides ways in and out of the city.

Houston's huge 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 environment in which 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' frontline workforce is properly trained to fight it.

PRESIDENT'S INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE

PROGRESS IN COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS: THE U.S. GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO MODERN SLAVERY

Trafficking in persons, or human trafficking, is the act of recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, providing, obtaining, or maintaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sex acts through the use of force, fraud, or coercion. Sex trafficking of a minor under the age of 18 does not require the use of force, threats of force, fraud, or coercion. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–386), as amended, describes this compelled service using a number of different terms, including involuntary servitude, slavery, debt bondage, and forced labor.

Human trafficking can include, but does not require, movement. Under the TVPA, people may be considered trafficking victims regardless of whether they were transported to the exploitative situation, previously consented to work for a trafficker, or participated in a crime as a direct result of being trafficked. At the heart of this phenomenon are the traffickers' aim to exploit and enslave their victims and the myriad of coercive and deceptive practices they use.

Human trafficking is an opportunistic crime. Traffickers target all types of people: adults and children, women, men, and transgender individuals, citizens and noncitizens alike. No socioeconomic group is immune; new immigrants, Native Americans, 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 their 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 safe home, or a sense of belonging, even love. 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 (PITF) and its operational arm, the Senior Policy Operating Group (SPOG), bring together federal departments and agencies to ensure a whole-of-government approach that addresses all aspects of human trafficking—enforcement of criminal and labor law, development of victim identification and protection measures, support for innovations in data gathering and research, education and public awareness, enhanced partnerships and research opportunities, and strategically linked foreign assistance and diplomatic engagement. The agencies of the PITF are the Departments of State (DOS), Defense (DOD), Justice (DOJ), the Interior (DOI), Agriculture (USDA), 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 PITF, these agencies convene routinely to coordinate both federal policies to combat trafficking in persons and implementation of the TVPA.

Agencies of the PITF 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, his September 2012 speech announcing 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 their efforts in the year to come. 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, PITF agencies are enabling law enforcement and service providers to deploy resources more effectively and raising public awareness both at home and abroad.

Federal agencies also worked to expand partnerships with civil society and the private sector in order to bring more resources to bear in fighting this horrific injustice. Although the primary responsibility, for fighting 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 integrate the experiences and guidance of survivors and reach industries, local communities, schools, religious congregations, and multilateral partners. The U.S. government, for example, funds the National Human Trafficking Resource Center (NHTRC), a national hotline (1–888–373–7888) operated by a nongovernmental organization that provides emergency assistance every day of the year, as well as anti-trafficking task forces in which law enforcement and victim service providers combine efforts to respond to this crime in their communities. Significant partnerships and support for nongovernmental efforts have also taken root, including the Partnership for Freedom, where Humanity United and DOJ, HHS, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) launched the first of three challenge award contests, Reimagine: Opportunity, to develop innovative solutions to address human trafficking; twelve finalists will compete to expand access to housing, social services, and economic empowerment for trafficking victims. In addition, DOS has teamed up with Verité, an NGO leader in supply chain management, to implement a project in consultation with federal agencies and other stakeholders to help gather data on the risks of trafficking in the production of goods and provision of services. Working with partners the Aspen Institute and Made in a Free World, Verité will also convene stakeholders and develop a tool for federal contractors and businesses to analyze supply chain risks and adopt ethical sourcing guidelines and compliance plans that align with Executive Order 13627. Finally, partnering with survivors of human trafficking, federal anti-trafficking experts from DOJ, with partners from DHS, DOS, HHS, and the White House, hosted a day-long Survivor Forum and Listening Session to gain insight from a diverse group of survivors in developing more effective programs and strategies.

The Task Force has drawn strength and direction from these partnerships, which have brought procurement officers and CEOs, professors and human resources professional together with law enforcement and victim advocates in the service of freedom. Such effective collaboration has led to concrete results in the United States' efforts to advance government priorities and combat modern slavery both domestically and globally. This compilation of the Obama Administration's accomplishments represents merely a snapshot, as of February 2014, of the work made possible by the multifaceted approach the United States has adopted to combat trafficking in persons. Each day, the Obama Administration strives to improve its strategy and to enhance its partnerships in order to fulfill not only the mandates of the TVPA, but also the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015, and I commend my colleague from North Carolina and the gentlewoman from Texas for their advocacy on this really important issue.

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 United States attorney in 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 country that have been focused on human trafficking now for quite some time, but we must do more because even 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 these are very difficult crimes to prosecute. The reason they are so difficult to prosecute is because they are difficult to detect, it is difficult to lure victims out of these crime networks, and so we have to do more. We have to educate our law enforcement, we have to educate those who 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 had received 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.

□ 1445

Just a few years ago, in our own airport, a number of Chinese nationals—young women—were brought in, ultimately, to be held against their will. It was astute personnel who knew that even though girls traveled together that something was wrong.

That is why this legislation is so important. 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, to interdict a suspected trafficker during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities. Our front liners from the Department of Homeland Security are everywhere. There is not a place you can travel when entering this country—through our airports or through our ports—that our agents in some capacity, in some roles, are not there.

For the CBP, this means officers at our ports of entry will be trained on how to identify potential victims of trafficking—smuggling, human slavery. For the 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 environment in which the personnel receiving the training perform their official duties, streamlining it to make it work. 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. 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. January is National 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 by ensuring that DHS' frontline workforce is properly trained to fight 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 equip 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.

As 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 despicable 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 trafficking in persons, 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 training curricula 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 Lighting Initiative is a computer based training program that provides airlines with the added tools to help ID and report suspected instances 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

key and it is essential to ending the human trafficking epidemic that is stealing the freedom of nearly 27 million people worldwide.

Requires DHS to establish a human trafficking training program to be given in classroom or virtually, and to ensure DHS personnel receive this training within 180 days.

This training must include:

Methods to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking, and be relevant for each federal employee's particular location or professional environment.

This will help to ensure that DHS doesn't simply establish a generic, one-size-fits-all approach for all employees, and is able to provide thorough training specific to each employee's particular job setting.

Other topics determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

A post-training evaluation for personnel receiving such training.

H.R. 460 also allows DHS to provide the human trafficking training curricula to State, local or tribal government, or private organization at the entity's request. This will help these government and private entities establish their own training programs.

CBO: Does not expect H.R. 460 to increase federal spending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 460.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 351, LNG PERMITTING CERTAINTY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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. 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 that delays by the administration are preventing them from selling it. This decision, I think, comes at a terrible price for the millions of Americans who cannot find work. This decision comes at a terrible price for those in need of a good-paying job—perhaps even of a long career—that will help support their families, their communities, and, most of all, that will help make America stronger.

The administration's inaction also comes at a terrible price for our friends in Europe who are being bullied by thugs, namely the Russian Government. Currently, many of our allies in Europe are forced to buy natural gas from Russia instead of from the United States of America. We have seen how they use this leverage to push around our allies. Our other friends around the globe, such as India, Japan, and Haiti, also need energy, and this administration's inaction is also costing these allies dearly. Let me see if I can paint a picture of how the administration's decision has been executed.

The administration's Department of Energy has slow walked. It has taken an antiquated approval process for applications to export liquefied natural gas, which is known as LNG. Since 2010, the Department of Energy has only issued final decisions on five of the 37 applications to export LNG to countries with which the United States does not have a free trade agreement. These delays have nothing to do with the environment. In fact, natural gas is one of the cleanest sources of energy in the world. Yes, I think we know what the problem is. The problem is they simply do not want to participate in this marketplace for Americans to have jobs.

As a result of these delays, all of us in America are squandering the boon in liquefied natural gas, which has made the United States the world's largest provider of natural gas in oil beginning, really, in 2013. Here we are now, 2 years later, and it is time for America to come to action. That is, again, why the United States Congress—the Republican Congress—is coming to the American people with a bill to help do something about this.

The administration's broken application process is delaying good-paying jobs at a time when the labor participation rate in our marketplace is at historic lows. That hurts real people. That hurts real people who want and need opportunities to have jobs today, not to look up and find out that Washington is broken and is keeping them from good-paying jobs.

I have much to say about this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, my good friend, for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

The enduring reputation of the 113th Congress will be as the least productive ever. The previous House was also the most closed ever as it pertains to rules, passing more closed rules than any other Congress. Despite controlling both Chambers of the 114th Congress, my friends across the aisle have picked up the dysfunction right where they left off in trying to jam through another piece of legislation regardless of its merits and without giving the House a chance to review it through regular order. It must be understood that there are a significant number of new Members here who didn't have an opportunity, as I did and as the chairman did, to vote on this measure in the previous Congress.

Dysfunction reigns supreme, but don't just take my word for it. Last week, my friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman DENT, offered a summary of the 114th Congress' accomplishments so far:

> Week one, we had a Speaker election that did not go as well as a lot of us would have liked. Week two, we got into a big fight over deporting children, something that a lot of us didn't want to have a discussion about. Week three, we are now talking about rape and incest and reportable rapes and incest for minors . . . I just can't wait for week four.

That was from my colleague Mr. DENT.

Here we are in week four, in my view, wasting time and taxpayer money in debating a solution for a problem that does not exist.

Since the Department of Energy completed its economic impact study, export applications are receiving a decision within about 2 months. In fact, four LNG export projects have already won all of the necessary Federal permits from the Energy Department and from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, with the first project scheduled to come online this year. Therefore, despite H.R. 351's clever name, the only uncertainty regarding the bill is why the House is considering it at all.

This bill originated in the last Congress when we were told that it would help Ukraine shake its energy dependence from Russia. Let me repeat that.

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 this legislation in light of what I believe 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 gas will reach Ukraine.

Do you know where the highest prices for all liquefied natural gas are both 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.

□ 1500

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 our natural gas prices, since we are going to be sending more gas overseas, and it will be hardworking Americans paying the cost.

It is not like there are a whole lot of projects waiting to be approved either. With natural gas futures 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 industry. I have seen the attributes of energy policy and how important it is.

Let me tell you what: the Republicans have taken a keen interest in this. This is why the marketplace is producing gasoline at $1.72 a gallon. That is why gasoline prices have fallen, that is why natural gas is plentifully available at a great price—but, Mr. Speaker, it is also jobs behind this.

I will tell you one other thing. It is also a bipartisan idea. Yesterday, this gentleman that I am going to introduce, the sponsor of the bill, BILL JOHNSON, a 26-year veteran of the United States Air Force, came up to the Rules Committee and had one of the most delightful conversations on a bipartisan basis with other Democrats and Republicans and talked about the attributes of jobs and this natural resource.

Thank God we live in America and have these opportunities to where we can help other countries.

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 a historic and 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 American jobs and wealth for the United States, enhance our energy security, and provide a reliable source of fuel to our allies, some of whom depend on the mood of Vladimir Putin to meet their energy needs.

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 for businesses 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.

My bill, 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 a 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.

Numerous studies have found that LNG exports will create hundreds of thousands of American jobs, many of them in manufacturing, including the refining, petrochemicals, and chemicals 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 millions of dollars in new tax 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 greatly reduce their vulnerability to a single monopolistic supplier.

I am proud to author this legislation. It is a job creator. It helps America in

leveraging 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 reiterate that I would hope 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 sort of as 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 at $8 a 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 Ukraine 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 pie.

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 though he 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.

□ 1515

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 vibrant companies that 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.

But the first one, 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.

I want to address some of 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 exhausting and sometimes, 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 in another LNG facility in Port Lavaca 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 out 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 then 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, instead of going 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 from California, and ED WHITFIELD, the subcommittee chairman, about how the delivery of this LNG can be on American ships.

A shipbuilding industry to build the ships to meet the specifications that would be necessary to put them in the water to deliver these around the world can be an American-made product also.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I do want to point out that the President even understands that there is an ability there for the Ukraine. Speaking in Ukraine recently, he said: ''We welcome the prospect of U.S. LNG efforts in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners.''

That is a quote somebody sent me from President Obama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, at the Rules Committee, for the first time in a long time, we did not receive a Statement of Administration Policy that the President is opposed to this.

It was a bipartisan presentation in the Rules Committee yesterday. Not unprecedented but a really good feeling about us working together for the common interest, to make sure that the American worker comes out on top of this, that the taxpayer comes out on top of this, that we are producing good legislation that can go to the United States Senate, this time, to be heard and passed on, so that we can get this legislation so the President does earn that part of his check on the box that says: And thank you, Mr. President, for agreeing and working with us. Thank you for helping us out.

I think this can get through the House. I think it can get to the Senate, and I think the President will sign it.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not a positive declaration about the President seeing great things, and me wanting and needing and expecting the President to do what I think is the right thing, then we are simply miscast today.

This is a good thing for America. This is a good thing for both parties. But this is a good thing for our friends around the world and diplomacy also.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Friendswood, 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?

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 stable, 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 fossil fuel energy 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 have 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 enterprise 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 activate 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. It is an important issue, and it is one that bears supporting.

Support the rule, support this bill because it is not only important for America from an energy perspective, from a security perspective, but an international or world trade perspective, as well as world security. For foreign policy, it matters.

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 work hard have jobs—clean, 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 ways for us to 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.

□ 1530

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. But 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 of 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 been to.

I assuredly never got an answer from the chairman or anyone else regarding whether or not Ukraine—and it is not ''the Ukraine''; it is ''Ukraine''—didn't get an answer as to whether they were prepared to receive liquefied natural gas.

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 would urge that I still didn't get—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 urge 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 a 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 repeatedly, I will be the last person standing in this House of Representatives opposed to offshore drilling in my State of Florida no matter the views that others have. I believe there is enough wind from our respective oceans to double the amount of energy that we have, and, yes, my friend, there are aircraft that are powered without fossil fuel.

We were originally scheduled this week to also consider a border security bill, but that bill was scuttled yesterday amidst a number of things.

My friends, the Republicans, are pretty lucky. As bad as the snowstorm is, particularly for the New England area of our country, many of our colleagues could not get back here yesterday and probably won't be able to get back here today as well. The reason I say they are lucky is they can hide—by pulling the border bill—under the fact that there was a snowstorm and people couldn't get in here, and that is legitimate, in my view.

The other part of the concern—and we will see about it next week and the week after—is that many conservatives in the Republican Party are jumping ship on the border bill, and that was out there as well. Just like last week, just like last Congress, there is a rift in the majority, leaving it unable to even pass legislation that all of its Members can agree on.

Unfortunately, we have real problems in this country that my friends are going to have to address. So I look forward to my friends' plan to repair our crumbling roads and bridges in this country, and I can't wait to see how this body will combat the national security threat of climate change, in spite of all of your denials.

I hope that my friends intend to ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that many of the reforms in our tax structure allow for those persons who are ultrawealthy to pay their fair proportion of what they earn and to reform our Tax Code so that middle-income Americans can benefit and poor Americans can rise to the middle class.

With America's workers' wages stagnant for so long, including our own here in the House of Representatives, we are entering the seventh year without any increase in wages. And those of us who are poorer Members of Congress have experienced the kinds of difficulties of just being here in Washington and the cost for being here. I am seeking no sympathies. It is just a fact.

So with those wages stagnant for so long, I look forward to hearing from my colleagues on how they plan to raise the minimum wage in this country. Because until my friends can address their dysfunction and inability to lead, I am afraid our country is in for 2 more years of uncertainty.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate that most Presidents get a lot of credit on their watch and a lot of negative when things go wrong. For once, our gas prices are down, and my friends can't even bring themselves to say that this President deserves some credit. I do. I see it. He deserves some credit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as I explained earlier, Texas is the great American jobs machine. We talked about how we create jobs because we have effectively used the resources that, in many instances, Mother Nature and God have given us. So now it is time for Washington, I think, to learn from models that we do in Texas, where we learn to capitalize on all of

our resources—in this case, the energy revolution that is at hand.

Look, what Republicans have done today is brought a bill that is common sense to the floor to unleash our natural resources, to make sure that it helps out not only our foreign policy, but workers and jobs in this country, and that is important. So it is a policy issue. The Republican Party is dead-on. There is going to be a bipartisan vote today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 48 will be followed by 5-minute votes 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

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—169

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bera
Buchanan
Capuano
Crowley
DeFazio
Duckworth
Engel
Heck (NV)
Jones
Lee
Lieu (CA)
Marino
Meeks
Meng
Neal
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Schock
Slaughter
Walorski

□ 1606

Ms. MATSUI changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—410

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle (PA)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emmer
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—23

Bera
Buchanan
Capuano
Crowley
DeFazio
Duckworth
Engel
Hardy
Heck (NV)
Jones
Lee
Lieu (CA)
Marino
Meeks
Meng
Neal
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Slaughter
Walorski

□ 1616

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. 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—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—411

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle (PA)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emmer
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—22

Bera
Buchanan
Capuano
Crowley
DeFazio
Duckworth
Engel
Heck (NV)
Jones
Lee
Lieu (CA)
Marino
Meeks
Meng
Neal
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Slaughter
Walorski

□ 1623

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call vote numbers 46, 47 and 48. Had I been present, I would have voted no on Roll Call vote number 46, and aye on Roll Call vote number 47 and 48.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, January 27, 2015, I was unable to be present and missed the following votes:

On Roll Call vote 46, on Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 48 providing for consideration for the bill H.R. 351 to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes, I would have voted NO.

On Roll Call vote 47, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, I would have voted AYE.

On Roll Call Vote 48, on Motion to Suspend the rules and Pass H.R. 246, to Improve Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking, I would have voted AYE.

CORRECTION TO ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 515, INTERNATIONAL MEGAN'S LAW TO PREVENT DEMAND FOR CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 515, the Clerk be directed to make the correction I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, after line 25 insert the following:

(2) TO OFFENDERS.—

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

There was no objection.

TRAFFICKING AWARENESS TRAINING FOR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2015

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 398

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 ''Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015''.

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 paragraph (1);

(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 a school-based health center; 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), the extent to which the best practices developed under paragraph (1) are evidence-based; and

(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.

(b) CONTENTS.—The best practices developed through the grant awarded under subsection (a)—

(1) shall address—

(A) risk factors and indicators to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(B) application of Federal and State law, including reporting requirements, with respect to victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(C) patient safety and security, including the requirements of HIPAA privacy and security law as applied to victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(D) the management of medical records of patients who are victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(E) public and private social services available for rescue, food, clothing, and shelter referrals;

(F) the hotlines for reporting human trafficking maintained by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center and the Department of Homeland Security;

(G) validated assessment tools for the identification of victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(H) referral options and procedures for sharing information on human trafficking with a patient and making referrals for legal and social service assistance related to human trafficking when indicated and appropriate; and

(2) shall not address patient medical treatment.

(c) DISSEMINATION.—Not later than 24 months after the award of a grant to a school under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, shall—

(1) post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services the best practices that are identified by the school under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(7); and

(2) disseminate to health care profession schools the best practices identified by the school under subsection (a)(7)(A) and evaluation results.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''eligible site'' means a health center that is receiving assistance under section 330, 399Z–1, or 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b, 300).

(2) The term ''eligible school'' means an accredited school of medicine or nursing with experience in the study or treatment of victims of a severe form of trafficking.

(3) The term ''health care professional'' means a person employed by a health care provider who provides to patients information (including information not related to medical treatment), scheduling, services, or referrals.

(4) The term ''HIPAA privacy and security law'' has the meaning given to such term in section 3009 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300jj–19).

(5) The term ''victim of a severe form of trafficking'' has the meaning given to such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

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 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 while 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.

□ 1630

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. Members who serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee deserve the opportunity to deliberate on legislation within the committee's jurisdiction and offer amendments to strengthen the bills that we consider.

Additionally, while this 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, Mr. Speaker, that puts new requirements on the Federal Government without authorizing the 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 such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who is the Democratic sponsor of the bill.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. 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 and sometimes too rare a thing 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 tool to combat traffickers, 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 low-income women, foster youth, 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 will 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 of 2015 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 provider's head.

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 resource 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 several other trafficking bills being heard today on the House floor, including Representative BASS' bill to support youth most at risk for trafficking and Representative

NOEM's bill to encourage intra-agency and effective human trafficking intervention and prevention strategies.

These two bills, as well as Representative ELLMERS' and my bill, are all pieces of a larger puzzle, initiatives that, when put together, create a comprehensive and cross-sector response to human trafficking.

We all stand up together today, regardless of political party, to say we do not want to raise our children in a world or a nation where a person can be sold as if she is property to be used by anyone to whom the trafficker offers her.

I am proud to join my colleagues and Congresswoman ELLMERS in the battle to eliminate human trafficking, for my daughters, 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 his 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 my colleague, 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 New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, who has been a tireless and passionate 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.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding and thank her for her leadership, especially on this extremely important bill, H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would direct grant money to the development of best practices for medical professionals so that they will know how to recognize trafficking victims and how to respond if a potential victim comes into their hospital or clinic.

Mrs. ELLMERS and I, and others, were inspired to do this bill by a Global Centurion report, in collaboration with the Charlotte Lozier Institute, that showed some 88 percent of domestic trafficking victims sought health care at some point during the time that they were being trafficked. That is absolutely amazing. These victimized women have come in contact with health care professionals, and then they leave and go out the door and nothing is done because the health care professional did not recognize the signs of human trafficking. They were in a clinic, hospital, or doctor's office when they were being trafficked, right back out the door to be trafficked again.

With 99 percent of trafficking victims reporting serious health consequences of being trafficked and pimps eager to get their victims healthy for continued exploitation for profit, medical professionals are on the front lines of trafficking interventions. We must make sure that the health care professionals are equipped to assist in effectuating freedom for trafficking victims whenever possible. We must think carefully about protocols for how to report suspected victims to authority. We don't want to put her in further danger. We must strategize ways to ensure the victims receive the help that they need.

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 out there 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 it.

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, introduced by Energy and Commerce Committee member RENEE ELLMERS of North Carolina.

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 unnoticed and it 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 if 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 are 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, Nadiya Savchenko has been a beacon for liberty. I salute her bravery in the face of overt Russian aggregation. Her courage shines like a brilliant, brilliant beacon for liberty-loving people everywhere.

God bless her, God bless America, and God bless Ukraine.

□ 1645

REGULAR ORDER

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress has reconvened, none of the important legislation that we have considered here has gone through the regular committee process. Yet, with each election, we send people to the Congress of the United States with a wide range of perspectives, with lots of goodwill, with lots of good intentions—Democrats and Republicans alike. The simple truth, however, is that the House leadership has prevented these voices from being heard in the regular committee process. In fact, Congress has, sadly, become one of the most undemocratic institutions in America.

Mr. Speaker, stop denying the Members of Congress the opportunity and the public the opportunity to find common ground. The failure of the process is at the heart of gridlock. It is at the heart of congressional failure. Allow bills once again to come up through the regular committee process, where amendments are heard, considered, and voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, give Congress the opportunity to work together once again in the spirit of bipartisanship that the American people are so desperately hungry for.

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 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 the 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.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, ''Work makes you free.''

Today, I was thinking about that sign and about the psychological impact and the sadness that it must have had on millions of Holocaust survivors and on victims of the Holocaust as they walked into the concentration camps 70 years ago in Auschwitz and saw that sign, knowing they would never make it out free.

I rise today in remembrance of the 10th anniversary of the International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz.

On this day, we must take a moment to honor the memory of the millions who lost their lives and of those who survived but experienced unspeakable horrors. We must always remember the tragedy of the Holocaust in order to ensure that this dark time in human history is never repeated. Injustices and violence against any person because of one's faith, race, or ethnic background should never be tolerated. Today and every day, we must honor the memory of the Holocaust victims and ensure we renew our commitment to ''never again.''

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.

Sadly, 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.

Our 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 securities 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 it 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; our 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 gasses; 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—he formed a committee 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:

> Old 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.
>
> Maximizing American-made materials when rebuilding infrastructure has the potential to create even more jobs. Relying on American-made inputs can also mitigate safety concerns related to large-scale outsourcing.

□ 1700

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 over budget, 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, and the welds 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, I believe you have something to say about ports. The fact is that you represent the two biggest ports in America, you will argue: Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for having the leadership, certainly, 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 our colleagues in really pressing Congress this year to take action to improve our Nation's outdated, underfunded ports and to repair and replace 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 American businesses to 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, and ALAN LOWENTHAL represents the Port of 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 cochair 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 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 loved that in 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.

Policymakers 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 national freight trust fund about $2 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 fees.

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 huge 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 coauthor.

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 us no good 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 linkage 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.

Ms. KAPTUR, if you would join us on this issue of infrastructure and jobs and making it in America.

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. There 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 falling down, this 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 Great Lakes.

We built a new bridge, but the challenge there today is with the weather. Ice is forming on the tensile spans, and they have had to close the bridge for 3 or 4 days at a time, for fear that these ice plates will fall on trucks and cars. We have to fix this problem.

All these issues are all over the country, so the transportation and infrastructure bill is essential. I thought in discussing this tonight that I would put a couple of really important figures on the RECORD.

Congresswoman HAHN talked about ports and her championing the PORTS

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, but that translates into 47.5 million lost jobs in our country just due to trade—not technology, but more imports coming in than exports going out. We have lost two-thirds of our manufacturing jobs.

□ 1715

So when the gentleman champions development in America which yields jobs in America, these are just the figures relating to one 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 means lost American jobs, to other 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 Department of Transportation ruling. They gave a green light to long-haul, cross-border trucking by Mexican-based carriers, despite lingering safety concerns.

It is the jobs, but it is also the safety that you talk about. The Department of Transportation simply looked the other way when the inspector general found serious flaws in the pilot program meant to test this new authority.

Once again, NAFTA led to the lowest common denominator for the continent. Foreign corporate interests 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 time to start fixing the damage, not creating more. I thank the gentleman for allowing us the time to express our views this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much, Ms. KAPTUR.

You notice our Make It In America agenda, they have trade up here at the top, and you very well pointed out the problems that occur with an unfair trade deal, NAFTA being but one.

At this moment, the President has asked us, Members of Congress, to pass what is known as the Fast Track, which basically gives authority to the President to cut a deal and then bring it to Congress, and we don't get to amend it. It is either an up-or-down vote. They say that is the only way they can negotiate.

Well, if that is so, then that is no way to negotiate because we are the representatives—actually the Constitution very clearly leaves to Congress the issue of international trade negotiations.

It is our responsibility, and I am not about to find a situation in which we give to the administration unfettered authority to cut a deal on international trade when you consider what happened with NAFTA, when you consider some of the other trade deals that have hollowed out the American manufacturing sector.

You put that chart up so very clear. 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. KAPTUR. Yes, I thank the gentleman so much for pointing that out.

You know, when the administration and others talk about this latest NAFTA deal, they are calling it the TPP now. They always give it initials or something—NAFTA, CAFTA, 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. KAPTUR. 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 intervenes 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 Mexico the insurance on those trucks that, under NAFTA, were supposed to come into the United States.

At that time, and hopefully this has been solved—I am not the insurance commissioner now, but I remember very well—we were unable to develop with Mexico an insurance policy in Mexico that would transfer into the United States and cover 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 this 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 total 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 divert 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 from 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 to move on.

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 continued to thrive. Its parent company, Johnson Controls, even continues to receive Department of Defense contracts to manufacture the same air-conditioning, heating, and refrigeration machinery.

For nearly a year, 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 where 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 about foreign-dumped 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.''

The promise of jobs and 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 Congressman GARAMENDI to free our Nation from these flawed deals and make goods in America again so that 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, to China, and other places around the world. So we must focus on Mr. Hahn and on those who share that.

□ 1730

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 3,000 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 Amtrak to buy 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 the German 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 doorknobs or the system that attaches 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 called 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 export will take 100 ships 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. These are three strategic assets that the United States has.

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 assets. 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 American shipyards, 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.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is really exciting, Congressman GARAMENDI. And when you think about our strategic reserve in terms of the military, if America enters conflicts, often we don't have those fleets within the Department of Defense. We have to lease them from the private sector. So we would modernize that capacity for our country in the event it would be needed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly so. Exactly 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 rebuilt.

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 request for a proposal to manufacturers 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 requirements 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 with 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 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 middle class.

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 is what the 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 hemorrhage 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, a law put forth by 435 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 use their own tax dollars to 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 outbreak 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 or on the weekend. 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 when 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.

□ 1745

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 to take lives. 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.

Sometimes, as I said, 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 secure. 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 a feeling I could 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, and respect the law 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 conclude my opening 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 how 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 and 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.

Those 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 into the phone: My husband has a 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 be used on 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 death.

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 day in and day out, 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 with the main perpetrator 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 use times like 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 that 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 the crumbling towers to save people as everyone else was running out.

In 2010, an NYPD officer was the first one on the scene when a terrorist attempted to ignite a car bomb in Times Square.

□ 1800

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 their 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.

In Spokane, yes, Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich and Police Chief Frank Straub, we are so grateful for their

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 communities 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 worthy of our profound gratitude. For in America, we are blessed to live in a nation whose law enforcement officers will do everything they can to keep us safe.

So I thank those who serve in eastern Washington and all across the country for serving. These men and women deserve our respect, our thanks, and they deserve a lifetime of appreciation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for her comments and her support of law enforcement officers and sheriffs that she works with.

Ten years ago—well, a little longer ago than that—I was the president of the Washington State Sheriffs Association, and so I had the opportunity to work with all of the sheriffs and police chiefs in Washington State.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State for yielding to me, and I thank him for his very distinguished career in law enforcement for all of those 30-plus years. He had a great reputation, served honorably, and was involved in some very high-profile cases that are, I think, worthy of a lot of discussion.

I wanted to take time today to express my strong support for the brave men and women who serve on our Nation's Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies. Particularly, I would like to honor two New York City police officers, Officers Ramos and Liu, who were brutally slain in an ambush on December 20, targeted simply because they wore the New York Police Department uniform.

Officer Ramos was a devoted husband and the father of two young children. He had just celebrated his 40th birthday. Officer Liu, who married just 3 months ago, leaves behind his devastated young wife and parents. All across the Nation, the thoughts and prayers of grateful citizens go out to their families, friends, and officers who served with them.

I live in Allentown, Pennsylvania, not terribly far from New York City. I have to tell you, I believe the New York City Police Department is among the finest big city police departments anywhere in the world. I remember September 11, 2001, we saw firefighters and police officers and others rush down to the Twin Towers.

We recognized and celebrated their heroism because many of them gave that last full measure of devotion on that day. There was no profession more noble than being a police officer at that time, and particularly a New York City police officer. How times have changed in a fairly short period of time.

This extraordinary police department has come under fire because they have implemented very effective police practices 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 men and women who work there. It 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 appear 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, which ended successfully with the surrender of Frein, and there were no shots fired. Frein, I should note, is currently standing trial.

Police work is certainly, as Congressman REICHERT knows better than anyone in this room, and Congressman NUGENT, too, they know that police work is inherently dangerous. Officers must enforce the law in any number of difficult situations under pressures few outside the military could possibly understand, from routine traffic stops to domestic violence situations to hostage cases to murder scenes. America's finest must deal with it all. They deserve our support, and they most assuredly have mine.

While we have recently seen a handful of high profile cases of citizens clashing with police, anyone who has ever attended a local crime watch meeting knows that police officers care deeply about the communities they serve. I have attended so many of these meetings over the years, both as a State legislator and even as a Congressman, numerous crime watch meetings in some pretty tough areas, and I was always so impressed with the way the officers immersed themselves in the daily life of the neighborhoods for which they were responsible. No problem was too small. They would deal with it.

Now is the time for all of us to roll up our sleeves and work to address the underlying issues that have animated enormous emotions in communities across our country.

I should point out, too, as a new member of the bipartisan House Law Enforcement Caucus, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance Federal policy that supports all of the brave 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 serve us.

Mr. REICHERT. I appreciate your comments, Mr. DENT. For so many of the words that you shared, I could make a lot of follow-up statements, but our time is limited. But I do want to focus on one of the points that you made, just briefly.

One of the hardest things that I ever did in my career was in 1982 when my partner, as I mentioned earlier, was shot and killed. It was a 3-day manhunt for the person responsible in the Cascade foothills. Finally, he was captured, and I was the only homicide detective at the scene, and they put me in the backseat with the killer of my good friend and partner. He was handcuffed.

When I got into the backseat, I read him his rights. He had three things to say to me. Number one, of course, he wasn't sorry; number two, I'm thirsty; and number three, I'm hungry. I think he wanted his handcuffs loosened, too; they were too tight. So I loosened his handcuffs. We stopped at a Burger King and bought him food and got him something to drink, and then, of course, he went to jail.

But to sit in that backseat with the man who just took my partner's life—my good friend, my best friend—3 days before was tough. And those are the kinds of things that cops deal with every day. And thank you for recognizing the emotional difficulty, not only for the officers, but for the community. It was a heavy day, a heavy week, a heavy month for the entire 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 on this critical evening to express the will of so many Members of Congress that 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 King County as sheriff.

Mr. Speaker, when we get to call out some of our dear friends who are sheriffs or police chiefs, many times we

don't even refer to them by name. It is ''sheriff'' or ''chief.'' But tonight, I want to talk a little bit about what I call most of my law enforcement colleagues in western North Carolina. I call them friends. I want to tell a few personal stories.

Before I do that, I want to share a little bit about the gentleman from Washington who is leading this tonight, because it is real easy to see the professional side of a Member who serves with distinction here in this body, but sometimes the people back home miss the personal side.

Today, we were discussing a number of bills on human trafficking and the unbelievable blight that is on our Nation and on our world where we have more people today in modern-day slavery than at the height of the slave trade. But it is personal for this gentleman to my left because time and time again, in meetings, he has brought up the plight of those young girls, their being trafficked at the hands of so many that are out there. It is that personal side that we can applaud tonight, not only for my colleague, but for many of the sheriffs and chiefs that I have the honor of knowing because of being in this position.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell story after story, but there is one police chief in my area who shared a story about one of his officers who was working for him who puts his life on the line every single day, and he does it for a little over $12 an hour. When I heard that, I could hardly believe it, because as we start to see the dedication with which our law enforcement officers truly put themselves out each and every day, not only them, but their families—and we expect them to come home.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, as has been shared previously, sometimes, they don't come home; so we must do a better job of 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 who really 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, 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 is safe.

Mr. Speaker, they have my back, and I think it is time that the American people stand up and have their back. We need to make sure that we stand with them.

I thank the gentleman for his time, for his leadership on this issue, and for his service.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and also appreciate in the meetings and the hearings that we have been in your commitment to end—not just sort of have an impact on human trafficking, but ending, eliminating human trafficking in this country and across the globe. Thank you for your hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Washington.

I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to law enforcement, recognizing their service each and every day.

I had an opportunity a few weeks ago on this floor to thank and to recognize my local law enforcement community, law enforcement officers, law enforcement leadership from Pinellas County, Florida—the cities of St. Petersburg, Clearwater, Tarpon Springs, and others—and, with Tarpon Springs, remember an officer who our community lost just 4 days before Christmas, Officer Charles Kondek, whose end of watch was December 21, leaving behind a family and children.

We can pay tribute—which we should and which the vast majority of Americans do every day—but we also are a Congress who must offer solutions and who must act. One of the ways in which we can act is to ensure, just as we do for our men and women of the military, that our law enforcement have the tools and technology necessary to do their job.

While much of local law enforcement is, indeed, funded locally, there is a program—the 1033 program that has been debated so much during this past year—that provides equipment, protective equipment, tools, and technology for our law enforcement officers to do their job. That is a Federal program that should not be controversial.

I have introduced legislation—because we are a solutions-oriented Congress—to continue the 1033 program, but to simply require one thing to address the concerns of so many, and that requirement is that local law enforcement leadership certify before receiving equipment that they have officers trained and capable of using the equipment.

It is very simple. This is equipment that our local law enforcement officers need, and, frankly, if it is not available to them through the 1033 program, they will purchase it as required by their local force, and it will cost local taxpayers the money to do so.

Here is the importance of this legislation. It says two things. First, it says that this Congress, your Representatives, want to do our part to provide for the safety of our law enforcement officers, but, secondly, subscribe to this radical notion that should not be controversial: we trust our local law enforcement leadership to set the right policing 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 tools and technology to law enforcement officers and says: You know what, we, as a Congress, trust our law enforcement leadership back home because they know best how to provide for the safety of our communities, how to set the tone of policing in our communities, and how to protect our law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Washington having this Special Order and allowing me time this evening.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his staunch support of law enforcement and his 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. LAMALFA. 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 our 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 work.

When you speak to the officers sometimes—they always have an air of professionalism about them, but when you

really get down to it, 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 even 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 down to our beat officer that has 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, but 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 results 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 vast majority 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 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 in. 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 go through each day in their jobs if 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 have a domestic problem, what have you, they have got to get to a solution because someone's lives may be at stake inside that home, even though there might be something outside that would make you or I uncomfortable, a mean dog in the yard or some characters hanging around outside that you wouldn't normally want to deal with. They have to get to a solution on that because somebody called them, somebody dialed 911, and we expect that they are going to get to a solution.

Officers have to go into every situation prepared for the worst because it could mean their life, maybe their partner's life, or someone else in a vulnerable situation that has called upon them.

If you think about being in their shoes, we all have a responsibility to make their jobs simpler. It could even help us in not being in a mistaken situation because they have to plan for the worst and hope for the best.

I can certainly feel for them in that they might be a little stressed on every call, every car they might pull over for speeding or a broken taillight or having to answer to someone's household or even a bigger deal like a bank robbery.

They have to be prepared every moment because it is their life or the other lives around them. They have to have the protocol and the training to know how to handle that situation just right.

When you look at that high bar, you look at the amount of stress that they are going through to do that, they do an amazing, remarkable job of getting it right; so we need to give them a little grace, a little room to do their job as best they can.

Then we have a responsibility as regular citizens to make their job easier. If they ask for your driver's license and ID, just give it to them. If they ask you to stay in the car so that they can see where your hands are and stuff—they don't know who else is in that car—make it where they can do their job, and you are going to have a heck of a lot better interaction with them.

Use basic common sense. There are instructions out there how to get along with that. I have even seen comedians out there saying how not to get in trouble with the police.

Pay attention to the common sense 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 is tragic—trying to defend us.

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 for his comments in support.

There are a couple of things that he mentioned. One, some of those acts that police officers do each and every day to help families—people don't hear about those officers that buy groceries for families that are less fortunate.

I know when I worked on the Green River task force and working with families that had missing daughters or had lost their daughter to—I am not even going to mention his name—the monster serial killer from Seattle, delivering Christmas presents to those families, money out of their own pocket or time out of their own time in building a new bicycle for some young brother of one of the victims.

Those are things that the community in a neighborhood might hear about, but you never see on the news, you never see publicized, and you never really hear about it, so I appreciate that.

The second thing the gentleman mentioned was training, and I really believe that that is one of the things that we can do to help law enforcement officers across this country.

The National Blue Alert Act is another piece of legislation that we, I think, can work together to pass. It should be a bipartisan effort. The COPS Improvement and Reauthorization Act is another tool that we can provide and another bill to try to expedite the claims process for public safety officer benefits program.

In some cases, the Department of Justice has taken 3 to 4 years to decide whether or not a family should receive that benefit, that death benefit, when their spouse has been killed in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his comments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I introduce the next Member of Congress and yield time to him, my good friend and partner who is also a career law enforcement officer for a couple of different departments, his last tour of duty was as a sheriff in Florida.

There are two career law enforcement officers in Congress, as far as the two of us know, and we are standing right here.

I look at Mr. NUGENT, RICH NUGENT, as my backup here in Congress, and I know he considers me his backup and partners here in supporting our law enforcement officers across this great country, and I thank Mr. NUGENT for his service in law enforcement and to his communities.

I know he has faced some dangerous situations throughout his career. Sometimes, we sit on the floor and share those stories with each other. The only really two that can understand some of these stories are really cops.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. NUGENT.

□ 1830

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to 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, compared to my brothers.

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 Nation in that 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 in a shooting where he has 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 make 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 floor and we talk about that, about maybe, just maybe people should wait until the investigation is complete before you condemn somebody, until you walk in their shoes. The sheriff talked about the fact that I can remember back as a rookie having to work, and I took the shifts of guys that had families because I wasn't married when it came down to holidays. I didn't have a 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 many a time that I missed Christmas, missed birthdays, missed wedding anniversaries because of service, and that is just not me. That is all the men and women that serve this country in local law enforcement and other law enforcement agencies throughout the United States.

Most of the men and women that I served with, I guarantee you could go out and make more money doing something else. They were bright, bright people. But their calling was to be a law enforcement officer. To go out there in the dead of night, climb up in an attic—remember that—you climb up in an attic and you don't know what is up there, except you know there is a bad guy who is up there, and somebody has to go there and do it. At the end of the day, these men and women do it because they love the community they serve.

Congressman REICHERT talked about what police officers do with their own money in regards to buying turkeys for Thanksgiving for families, buying Christmas presents for children that would not have a Christmas, doing summer camps for free for children because these children don't have or didn't have the ability to go to one of those paid summer camps—that is pretty neat. And we would, in our sheriff's office, without using taxpayer money, with donations from clubs like Kiwanis and Rotary and others, pay for that so that these young men and these girls and boys could have the opportunity to interact with law enforcement, to actually see that, do you know what? We are human. That when we do these little games out there in the field and we have the things, water balloons or whatever it may be, that we are real people, because a lot of times, the only time they see a law enforcement officer is possibly during a domestic situation where they are arresting their mom or their dad. And that can jade anybody.

But it can also jade law enforcement, because the things that they see no one here would want to see. There were times when I went home, getting off 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—I can 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 three sons, 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.

But the men and women that put on the uniform and that badge do it because they love people, not because they hate them. They do it because they really want to make a difference in their community. Their families are the ones that suffer the most.

When I have had to go to scenes where I have had an officer killed in the line of duty, it breaks your heart. When I was a rookie officer outside of Chicago, right out of the academy, one of my academy mates was killed, 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 good-bye, 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 want.

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 some.

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 personality, 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. She was sitting home 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 up-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 admit that past trade deals haven't always lived up to the hype.''

So whether it was NAFTA—the North America Free Trade Agreement—or the Korean Free Trade Agreement, supporters of our past FTAs have promised these deals would create a good outcome, create United States jobs, create a lesser trade deficit, and improve global labor and global environmental standards.

□ 1845

Tragically, sadly, this has not been the outcome.

TPP supporters have said this one will be different. The Trans-Pacific Partnership, which could cover a great majority of the international economy, has its supporters saying that this will be a 21st century agreement, far different from those that have preceded it.

Leaked information from the TPP negotiators shows that it is being modeled by the negotiations, themselves, not by the negotiators, showing that it has been modeled on trade policies that have proven to offshore good-paying jobs in our economy and to force wages down for America's working families. That is why respected economists, including many who have previously supported free trade, such as Jeffrey Sachs, as well as Nobel Prize winners Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman, have expressed skepticism about the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiation. They are coming to realize what many of our constituents have long known: these trade agreements do not respond favorably to the American middle class.

Sachs' speech at a trade forum on Capitol Hill included comments that indicated:

> I don't think TPP and TTIP rise close to the standard of being 21st century trade and investment agreements, not even close. They are very much 20th century agreements which were already out of date by the time they were negotiated. This is a NAFTA treaty writ large or these are the same negotiations that we have had in many other cases.

In the New York Times, Mr. Krugman indicated:

> I am, in general, a free trader, but I will be undismayed and even a bit relieved if the TPP just fades away. The first thing you need to know about trade deals in general is that they aren't what they used to be. The glory days of trade negotiations and the days of deals like the Kennedy Round of the 1960s, which sharply reduced tariffs around the world, are long behind us.

Then Mr. Stiglitz, in the New York Times, is quoted as saying:

> Based on the leaks—and the history of arrangements 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 impacted, about child 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 agreements.

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 them. Look at what has happened in places like Youngstown, Ohio, or in upstate 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 and East Liverpool, Ohio; go down 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 libraries. Now there is 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—period, end of story. 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 to be 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 and bridges. 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 Ohios of America, then we need to do exactly what you are saying, Mr. TONKO, and what ROSA DELAURO is going to say and what others are going to say tonight. We need to reframe the way we talk about this.

I am very thankful for the invite here, and I appreciate your passion and how you believe and understand we have got to do real economic development in upstate New York and in places like my communities. Thank you for being a leader on this issue.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN, for bringing it right down to the basic, core ingredient, and that is the dignity of work for American families. You speak it so well for those you represent in Ohio.

This is about broken promises. It is about promises for jobs, promises for worker opportunity, promises for environmental standards, promises for labor standards. We need to let the American public know exactly what is happening. If you are a believer in fair trade—not necessarily in free trade. If you believe in fair trade and if you don't think of fast track, which is when we circumvent the authorities and responsibilities of Congress, then let your voice in Congress know that. Let everyone know what you are thinking, because these are critical moments.

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. DELAURO. 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 that, in fact, they are in jobs 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 on the issue of trade, I and 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 free trade 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 American jobs will be offshored 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 never 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 experience and the numbers are against them. So, instead, as with past trade agreements, we hear the fallback arguments based on foreign policy.

□ 1900

If you listened to the Trade Representative today in the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Froman, he talked about the danger of China, the specter of China. In the State of the Union, the President said that the TPP would help us counter China's growing influence. This is clearly not the case.

As the economist and Reagan appointee Clyde Prestowitz pointed out in the Los Angeles Times last week, ''The ever-closing linking of the U.S. economy to those of the TPP countries over the last 35 years has not prevented the rise of Chinese power.''

He continued, ''nor has it deterred U.S. trade partners and allies from developing ever closer ties with China.''

They will not stop doing so just because we sign a trade agreement. In reality, the argument about China is nothing more than an attempt to distract the American public with scare tactics and that we are going to take on China. The administration should be above this kind of fear-mongering.

Throughout this process, the administration has chosen not to consult the Congress fully. Members of Congress have been denied access to the full text of the agreement. The American people have been cut out of the negotiation; yet in the State of the Union, the President asked the Congress for fast-track promotion authority.

A key part of granting that authority has always been the negotiating guidelines that Congress gives to the administration. That is our job—to provide the negotiating guidelines—but the Trans-Pacific Partnership has already been under negotiations for years, first under President Bush and now under President Obama.

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 a decent job with good wages.

Thank you so much, Mr. TONKO, for listening.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative DELAURO. You strike a very encouraging cord at the end of your comments.

The American public needs to be engaged, if you believe that Congress should have overview responsibility, a checks and balances agenda, because these agreements need to be front and center about the well-being of American workers, and so call into this process, reach into this process, and share your opinion with those who speak for you in the House.

Is a fast track a thing you want to see—without the information exchange—or do you want Congress to review these contracts and understand what impact there will be on the American economy, on American jobs, on standards for the environment, for public safety, for child labor laws, a number of things?

We appreciate your comments.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just make one other point. So many years ago, when we were discussing the Affordable Care Act, the American public said: Read the bill.

That is what we are asking to do, very simply, to read the bill before we vote on it.

Mr. TONKO. Very well stated. Every bit of American style is about tethering the American Dream. The people come here to have the right to the dignity of work and to pursue that American Dream.

One of our newest faces in Congress in his second term, I believe, has been an outspoken voice for the American Dream. I yield to the Representative from Wisconsin's Second District to share his thoughts about the process here for fast track and free versus fair trade.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TONKO, for your leadership. I really enjoyed working with you over the last several years. We are actually getting to the point that it looks like this may be coming to a vote in Congress.

This is perfect timing, with another round of negotiations upon us. I am so glad we are on the floor tonight talking about this and trying to channel the energy from the gentlewoman from Connecticut. I love her passion.

This is an issue that goes far back for me. When I was 23, I started a small business in Madison, Wisconsin, a specialty printing business. One of the things we did is source American-made and union-made products. We screen-printed T-shirts and did promotional items like pens and lapel pins we wear as Members of Congress, all things that were done in the United States.

Over the last almost 28 years, 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 in other countries or overseas, 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, is the city of Janesville, where Representative PAUL RYAN is 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 region.

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 company. 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 lost their job and, 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 $25 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, Connecticut, Ohio, or Wisconsin, we have all seen the same 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. We have seen that. We have seen that the 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 isn't 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, but 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 W. Bush and 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.

There are 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 pacts.

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 POCAN. 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 Dream. 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 [Docket No.: 150102002-5002-01] (RIN: 0694-AG42) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 17-14 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; 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.

183. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-517, ''Lawrence Guyot Way Designation Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

184. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-518, ''Percy Battle Way Designation Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

185. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-551, ''N Street Village, Inc. Tax and TOPA Exemption Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

186. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-514, ''Promoting Economic Growth and Job Creation Through Technology Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

187. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-535, ''Dedication of a Public Alley in Square 752, S.O. 14-15491, Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

188. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-512, ''SeVerna, LLC, Real Property Tax Exemption and Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

189. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-538, ''Trash Compactor Tax Incentive Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

190. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-539, ''Behavioral Health System of Care Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

191. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-515, ''Winter Sidewalk Safety Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

192. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-519, ''Uniform Certificate of Title for Vessels Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

193. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-521, ''Cashell Alley Designation Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

194. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-549, ''Youth Tanning Safety Regulation Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

195. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-520, ''Department of Parks and Recreation Fee-based Use Permit Authority Clarification Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

196. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-501, ''Paint Stewardship Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

197. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-530, ''Conversion Therapy for Minors Prohibition Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

198. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-503, ''Public Space Enforcement Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

199. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-559, ''Insurance Holding Company and Credit for Reinsurance Modernization Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

200. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-502, ''Plan for Comprehensive Services for Homeless Individuals at 425 2nd Street, N.W., Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

201. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-558, ''Small and Certified Business Enterprise Waiver and Recertification Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

202. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-562, ''Inspector General Qualifications Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

203. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-556, ''Soccer Stadium Development Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

204. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-554, ''Turkey Bowl Revenue Generation and Sponsorship Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

205. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-561, ''Firefighter Retirement While Under Disciplinary Investigation Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

206. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-553, ''Closing of a Portion of Manchester Lane, N.W., adjacent to Square 2742, S.O. 08-3083, Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

207. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-560, ''Sex Trafficking of Children Prevention Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

208. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-552, ''Guardianship Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

209. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-534, ''Criminalization of Non-Consensual Pornography Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

210. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-533, ''D.C. No Taxation Without Representation Way Designation Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

211. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-532, ''D.C. Rocks, So We Need One Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

212. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-531, ''Wage Transparency Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

213. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-540, ''Copper Intrauterine Device Access Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

214. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-516, ''Dignity for Homeless Families Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

215. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-548, ''Community Development Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

216. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-550, ''Public-Private Partnership Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

217. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-511, ''Housing Production Trust Fund Baseline Funding Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

218. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 Agency Financial Report, as required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

219. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

220. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

221. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

222. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

223. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the FY 2014 annual report, as required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

224. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

225. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2014-15 Late Season [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2014-0017] (RIN: 1018-AZ80) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

226. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2014-0017] (RIN: 1018-AZ80) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

227. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Late-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2014-0017] (RIN: 1018-AZ80) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

228. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of the Fair Play Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0005; T.D. TTB-126; Ref: Notice No. 143] (RIN: 1513-AC07) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

229. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Property Qualifying for the Energy Credit under Section 48 [Notice 2015-4] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

230. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Services's IRB only rule — 2015 Prevailing State Assumed Interest Rates (Rev. Rul. 2015-02) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

231. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Automatic Approval of Change in Funding Method for Takeover Plans (Announcement 2015-3) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

232. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Application of Retroactive Increase in Excludable Transit Benefits [Notice 2015-2] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

233. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2015-3) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

234. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Administrative Notice rule — Reporting Sick Pay Paid by Third Parties [Notice 2015-6] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 159. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking (Rept. 114–6, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. 285. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts (Rept. 114–8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 350. A bill 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 (Rept. 114–9, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: 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.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 159 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 350 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 399 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 Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 539. 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. ELLISON, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

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 Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. 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 with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPER:

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. BOUSTANY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, 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 for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 545. A bill to add engaging in or supporting hostilities against the United States to the list of acts for which United States nationals would lose their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

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 exclude 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 require the EEOC to approve commencing or intervening in certain litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 550. A bill to direct the Equal 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 Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 551. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; 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 Federally-imposed mandates over the local budget process and financial management of the District of Columbia and the borrowing of money by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MESSER:

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. MEEHAN):

H.R. 555. A bill to require an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to notify individuals in the case that personal information of such individuals is known to have been acquired or accessed as a result of a breach of the security of any system maintained by the Exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 556. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists 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. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

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, 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 Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 558. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 South Pioneer Boulevard in Springboro, Ohio, as the ''Richard 'Dick' Chenault Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 559. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to designate New Jersey Task Force 1 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. BENISHEK, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. REED, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 560. 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. 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 Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 562. A bill to improve transfer of earned school credits for foster youth; 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 Mariner Equity Compensation Fund to provide benefits to certain 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 Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. SCHRADER):

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. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SPEIER, 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 initiatives, and 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 highly-paid 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. MCNERNEY):

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 potable hot water; 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 Martí and Television Martí broadcasts to Cuba; 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

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. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PITTENGER, 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 while such enterprises are in conservatorship or receivership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. BENISHEK):

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 Financial Services, 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 Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BARR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 577. 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. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution recognizing the challenges and burdens associated with the rising costs of a college education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. BERA):

H. Res. 52. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the democratic Constitution of the Republic of India and United States-India relations on India's Republic Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H. Res. 53. A resolution condemning the cowardly attack on innocent men, women, and children in the northeastern Nigerian town of Baga; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 54. 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. Res. 55. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ethics in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COOK, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H. Res. 56. 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. LIPINSKI, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 57. 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. THORNBERRY:

H. Res. 58. 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 states to propose amendments 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. 539.

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 for elibigle oral health professionals to purchase mobile dental units to provide free dental services to underserved

communcities. Furhtermore, increasing access to no- or low-cost dental and oral health services improves the nation's public health, or ''general welfare[.]'' Therefore, the Action for Dental Health Act is a valid exercise of the Taxing Clause.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the civil asset forfeiture procedures and Section 8, Clause 9 extends to Congress the power to create inferior courts and to make rules of procedure and evidence for such courts.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 541.

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. HARPER:

H.R. 542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

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 1 Section 8 US Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 548.

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. 549.

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. 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. 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. MESSER:

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. MESSER:

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 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8. ''Congress shall have the 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 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 18.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 561.

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. GRAYSON:

H.R. 562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

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 1: 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. ISRAEL:

H.R. 567.

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. 568.

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 enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. McCOLLUM:

H.R. 570.

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. 571.

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. MULLIN:

H.R. 572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power 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. POSEY:

H.R. 573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 (''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''), 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''), and 18 (''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power 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 1, 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 1, 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. 93: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 131: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 141: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 159: Ms. BASS and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 173: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 174: Mr. BOST and Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 181: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 198: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 199: Mr. PETERS and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 217: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

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. 258: 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. DEUTCH.

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: Ms. 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. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 401: Mr. SCHOCK, 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. LUMMIS.

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. TITUS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. 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, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BERA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ELLISON, 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, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, 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. BARR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIND, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. LOEBSACK.

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. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 478: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

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. HUFFMAN.

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. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H. Res. 17: Mr. HURT 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. RIBBLE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Res. 28: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 32: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WALZ, 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. 351 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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2015 No. 13

Senate

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 35 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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

of Homeland Security in Washington, DC, will run out of money. It is hard to imagine that the agency responsible for combating terrorism in the United States has its budget in question, but that was the design when the people sat down to write the Omnibus appropriations bill last year. The Republicans in the House insisted that if we were going to fund the rest of government, we had to withhold regular funding for the Department of Homeland Security. That is why the deadline of February 27 is looming.

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 Secretary of this 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 critical agency? Because they are exercised by 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 a life in America if they have no serious criminal issues, if they have graduated from high school, if they are prepared to step forward, go to college, or serve in the military. The DREAM Act was introduced 14 years ago with a basic concept: Don't hold children responsible for bad 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 weekend 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 in my neighboring State of Iowa. 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 the 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 STEVEN 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 this 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 treasurer of the National 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 DACA was established in 2012? Ola has become involved in public service. In 2013 she worked as an intern in the office of our former colleague Senator Carl Levin. She continued her studies. This spring Ola will graduate from the University of Michigan with a double major in biochemistry and women's studies.

Keep in mind 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 at the Michigan Nanotechnology Institute for Medicine and Biological Sciences. Last year Ola's work was published in the Journal of Physical Chemistry. I want to read the name of the article which Ola Kaso published. I hope I will be spared, a liberal arts lawyer, if I stumble over some of these words. But just to give you an idea of her research, the article was entitled ''Atomic Force Microscopy Probing of Receptor-Nanoparticle Interactions for Riboflavin Receptor Targeted Gold-Dendrimer Nanocomposites.''

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 language which was included as part of 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: Leave. 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 ''DACA Works.''

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. They refused, refused 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, 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 arm agency personnel.

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.

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.

Flake 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 resulted in the murder of 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 camps and 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 months prior to the liberation, an elderly French inmate urged a young Jewish prisoner named Olga to watch everything she saw, and when the war was over, to tell the world what she had seen. Olga 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 witnesses 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 signed the Child Soldiers Accountability Act, which I also introduced. In 2010 the Child Soldiers Accountability Act was used to deport Liberian warlord Dr. George Boley.

I have also authored the Trafficking in Persons Accountability Act, the Human Rights Enforcement 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 meant death 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 whenever and wherever 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 working with my colleagues in the Senate to make progress toward ending genocide and human rights abuses everywhere they exist. We should 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 and to urge my colleagues 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. DHS's role extends far beyond immigration. The agency is also responsible for aviation security, emergency management and response, counterterrorism, and cyber security.

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 us to choose between shutting down the Department of Homeland Security or deporting 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 firsthand. 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 difficult 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 together. 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 by allowing certain students and families to register, work legally, and pay their taxes. His action is rooted in the reality that our immigration enforcement officers need to exercise discretion on whom to go after with limited resources and in a broken 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 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 classmates at school.

They are people such as Bianca, a woman who lives in Hawaii with her family. After moving to the United States on a visa 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 visa were 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 citizens. 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 respect. 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 simply common sense, 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 supported our bipartisan immigration bill.

Our bipartisan bill was a compromise. It strengthened border security, modernized our 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. Comprehensive 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 the fact that Speaker BOEHNER refused to give the bill an up-or-down vote in the House. Recklessly shutting down the Department of Homeland Security will not fix our broken immigration system. 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 Americans support.

Both sides of the aisle agree that we are a nation of immigrants and our immigration system is broken. We don't need to shut down the Department of Homeland Security or round up and deport millions of families and individuals.

We can start that process with a clean DHS funding bill, and I urge my Republican colleagues to bring one to the floor quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I rise this morning to join our colleagues in discussing the need for a clean, full-year bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Just 30 days from today, funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires unless Congress acts.

I know that sometimes in congressional time 30 days may seem like a long time, but with a scheduled recess in a few weeks and the certain fact that the House-passed bill cannot pass the Senate, we must act soon to prevent a shutdown and provide the resources to keep our country safe.

Luckily, there is a path forward to prevent a shutdown. We should pass the bipartisan, bicameral, Homeland Security funding bill that was agreed to last December.

Just a few weeks ago, Senator MIKULSKI, then Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Congressman ROGERS, Chair of the House Appropriations Committee, negotiated spending bills for the entire government, including the Department of Homeland Security bill. This was a compromise measure. Not everyone got what they wanted, but the bill funded the Department at levels that would ensure the Department can fulfill its mission to secure the homeland.

Then, unfortunately, politics came into play. Some House Republicans demanded the homeland bill be removed from the larger budget because of immigration issues, and now the entire Department is funded on a short-term basis through February 27. Now we face a fundamental question: Are we going to put the country at risk because of an ideological disagreement?

Since Senator MIKULSKI and Congressman ROGERS reached that agreement in December, we have seen many threats to our Nation and to our allies. The U.S. law enforcement community is on high alert for terror threats after attacks in Australia and Ottawa, Canada, and in Paris. Recently, an Ohio man was arrested when it was discovered he was plotting to blow up the U.S. Capitol in an ISIS-inspired plan. Now is not the time to be holding up funding for the Department of Homeland Security because of ideological reasons.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit the Department of Homeland Security's cyber security center in Arlington. The center is where officials are working every day to prevent attacks not just against the Federal Government or against State governments but against the private sector, against U.S. companies such as Sony, and against critical infrastructure such as nuclear powerplants and the electric grid.

Last week, in the Armed Services Committee, former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said that he views cyber security threats to be ''as dangerous as nuclear weapons.''

We must continue to make important investments in our cyber defenses. But if we fail to fully fund their budget—the clean budget that was agreed to by the House and Senate—their efforts to identify the newest technologies and strategies to protect our cyber infrastructure will be put on hold.

One of the things they talked to me about when I visited the center includes two areas I think are particularly important to our national security. One is the effort to identify a secure emergency response line, which is very critical when we have national emergencies—even the snowstorm we are seeing in the northeast in New Hampshire, where we have several feet of snow that is being predicted. We also need a secure emergency response line so our first responders—the people there on the ground when an emergency happens—can communicate with each other. That is at risk if we pass a CR rather than a clean funding bill.

The other thing at risk is the effort to identify the next generation of cyber threats. There are things being worked on that we don't even know yet, and unless we are ahead of that curve we are not going to be there to protect our cyber system throughout the country. So we need to give the Department of Homeland Security budgetary certainty so it can plan and prepare for these kinds of threats. That is why a short-term continuing resolution should be off the table. We need to pass a bill that funds homeland security for the rest of this fiscal year.

A short-term budget means the Department is on autopilot. That would be extraordinarily bad for business and for our national security. If Homeland Security operates under a short-term budget, new projects and grants are halted, contracts and acquisitions are postponed, hiring is delayed, employee training is scaled back, and grants to our first responders—those people on the ground when something happens—are not going to be awarded, and congressionally targeted reductions—those reductions we want to make in wasteful programs—are also put on hold.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to visit New Hampshire's fusion center. Every State has a fusion center. This is a network of centers designed to serve as a focal point in each State to coordinate terrorism-related information and threats to our national security, to our State security, and to our municipalities. It is a place where first responders, local law enforcement, and in New

Hampshire's fusion center, in addition to our State and local folks being represented, someone from the FBI is there on hand, someone from the Department of Homeland Security identifies potential threats and relays that information up and down the chain of command.

In New Hampshire, the fusion center has also been very critical in working to address drug interdiction and to help identify the heroin abuse epidemic that, sadly, we have seen not only in New Hampshire but in northern New England. If we have a short-term budget, new grants to our fusion centers, which are on the front lines of protecting our States and municipalities against security threats, and the security grants to State and local law enforcement will not be awarded.

Why would we threaten this important public safety and security funding for unrelated ideological reasons?

Secretary Jeh Johnson recently said:

> As long as this Department continues to operate on a continuing resolution, we are prevented from funding key homeland security initiatives. These include, for example, funding for new grants to State and local law enforcement, additional border security resources, and additional Secret Service resources to implement the changes recommended by the independent panel. Other core missions, such as aviation security and protection of Federal installations and personnel, are also hampered.

That is a direct quote from the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson.

In addition to what he lays out there, I want to highlight a few specific examples of why a short-term budget—a continuing resolution—is problematic for the Department and for our national security.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement—ICE—could not fund all of its current detention, antitrafficking, and smuggling requirements under a short-term budget. Under a short-term budget, ICE will not have the funding they need to meet their legal mandate to have 34,000 detention beds in place for immigration detainees nor funding for a new family detention center.

So for those people concerned about our border security, concerned about people coming into this country, why would we want to deny funding to address efforts to interdict people coming across the border, to interdict surveillance efforts, to build a new family detention center so we can find out who these people are and whether they should go back to the country they came from? It makes no sense.

Under a short-term budget, there is no funding to hire additional investigators for antitrafficking and smuggling cases to combat the influx of unaccompanied children at the southern border.

Under a short-term budget, no funding is provided to address Secret Service weaknesses identified after the recent White House fence-jumping incident.

Yesterday we saw concerns about how the Secret Service operates. This time I think everybody acknowledged they could not have been expected to intervene in the drone that got dropped on the White House lawn, but it highlights again the threats that are there and why we need to ensure the Secret Service has the resources to reform itself and to make sure the President and officials are protected.

A short-term budget would delay the contract for the Coast Guard's eighth national security cutter we need for maritime security.

In New Hampshire, we have a border with the ocean, so we very much appreciate the work of the Coast Guard, but I think it is critical throughout the country. And one of the things that would be put on hold is upgrading the Coast Guard's ice-breaking fleet.

Last winter alone, when the Great Lakes froze, $705 million in shipping was lost and 3,800 jobs because we didn't have a Coast Guard ice-breaker that can open a channel on the Great Lakes.

Under a short-term budget, aging nuclear weapons equipment will not be replaced. That causes gaps in an area where mistakes are simply unacceptable and too dangerous even to comprehend.

A short-term budget would delay upgrades to emergency communications for first responders—something I have already talked about—as we think about how they respond to local emergencies.

The best way forward is to provide certainty and stability for the men and women who fulfill homeland security's mission to protect the United States from harm. To ensure our local communities and our States that we are providing the resources they need, we need to pass a clean bill—a clean bill that was agreed to last December.

Lurching from funding crisis to funding crisis is a terrible way to govern. It is an especially terrible way to govern when our Nation is dealing with major threats. The clean bill that was agreed to by the House and Senate last December provides a good budget that strengthens our Nation, protects against known threats, properly supports homeland security and those who serve on the front lines of protecting this country.

The negotiated agreement includes critical increases in funding and support for border security, for cyber security, and for other national security initiatives. It maintains strong maritime security operations provided by the Coast Guard. The agreement fully funds continued cyber security advancements. It invests in innovative solutions for border security, for biological defense, and for explosives detection.

Senators on both sides of the aisle have talked about the importance of border security and a clean bill that robustly funds border security requirements. The clean bill funds customs and border protections requirements to apprehend, care for, and transmit unaccompanied alien children, while maintaining 21,370 Border Patrol agents on our borders and safely facilitating legitimate travel and trade.

The agreement also funds enhanced border security technologies as well as air and marine surveillance along our land and maritime borders to help the Department better interdict illegal crossing of people and narcotics.

It allocates grant funding to train and equip first responders, continuing real progress and efficient preparedness, as was so evident in New England in the response to the Boston marathon bombing.

And the agreement fully funds known disaster needs and prepares us for the next disaster.

In closing, let us support our national security funding by passing a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of this fiscal year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, today 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.

I 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 environmentally responsible way to transport oil is through a pipeline. I am certain Keystone will also prove a success.

In supporting Keystone, I am also standing for a larger, more important principle—the ideal that the Federal Government should be a partner in opportunity, a partner in progress, not an obstacle. I am standing in support of what has defined this country for centuries—the idea of the American dream.

The American dream is still alive in my home State. Yes, we have major challenges, like all States. But in Alaska, we still have hope. We still dream

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 of Alaska that give us our 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 year. Over three-quarters 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. Yet, in 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's office is shuttered or 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 waters can't be fished 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 government. What 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's approach to 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 despite 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, a 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 16 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, some of 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 responsibilities, it needs 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. So many of them don't make 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 our citizens.

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 in 1970, 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 was 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 sensible regulations that are 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 neighbor.

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 powers are derived from 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 reignite the American dream.

Despite challenges, despite big government's creep 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 and big hopes. 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 majority 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate our new colleague from Alaska. Well said, and welcome. The two Senators from Alaska have dominated the start of this new session, and we are glad they have because they are bringing very important legislation and decisions to this body. So I congratulate both the senior and junior Senators from Alaska for their efforts, and I look forward to working together to accomplish what we all want to accomplish—a growing economy and better opportunities for Americans. The Senator from Alaska is certainly an important component of that in leading the way to that goal.

INDIANA HEALTH CARE

Mr. President, this morning we received the announcement that after nearly 2 years of negotiations, the State of Indiana and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services have reached a major breakthrough, an agreement that approves Indiana's Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0 waiver application by allowing it to move forward and be implemented.

This agreement is great news for hundreds of thousands of low-income Hoosiers and a testament to the effectiveness of the current Healthy Indiana Plan. Now an expansion of that will be made possible through this waiver. It solidifies Indiana's position at the forefront of Medicaid reform and the advancement of consumer-driven health care. Those are key words—reforming a current dysfunctional and broken Medicaid system, advancing consumer-driven health care, getting consumers into the role of making decisions about their health and not just having a government agency say: This is what you can get, and this is what you cannot get or this is what makes you healthy. The Healthy Indiana Plan incentivizes consumers to determine what is best for their own health.

The Healthy Indiana Plan was originally crafted under Indiana's former Governor Mitch Daniels. He extended health care coverage to lower-income residents who earned too much to qualify for Medicaid but too little to afford quality health coverage.

The guiding principle of the original plan was simple. Individually owned and directed health care coverage has a positive effect for individual citizens and the health care system as a whole. We have proven that giving people a stake in their own health care decisions works.

Governor Daniels put it well in a 2010 Wall Street Journal article, stating:

> Americans can make sound, thrifty decisions about their own health. If national policy trusted and encouraged them to do so, our sky-rocketing health care costs would decelerate.

The original plan had three main objectives: individual control of health care spending, taxpayer protection based on the stipulation that enrollment could not grow faster than available funding, and disease prevention by incentivizing preventive care.

Then in 2013 our current Governor, Mike Pence, announced plans to reform and expand the original Healthy Indiana Plan to cover more low-income Hoosiers. Today, after more than a year and a half of negotiations, the Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0 has received a green light from the Obama administration. Coverage will begin on February 1 of this year.

I applaud Governor Pence, and I applaud Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell for working together to move forward to continue Indiana's successful consumer-driven approach that empowers members and provides access to quality care.

This agreement will expand an existing proven 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

be transitioned into the new plan just approved through this waiver.

The answer to our Nation's health care problems is not the broken status quo of ObamaCare. Indiana has shown, and will continue to show, that reforming traditional Medicaid and offering innovative health care solutions is the right way to empower individual citizens as they seek access to quality health care. Once again, Indiana is leading the way nationally by creating State-based innovative ideas for governing.

As I serve individuals and Hoosiers here in Washington, I have often turned to what I call the Indiana model as a blueprint for a more efficient and fiscally responsible Federal Government. I developed a legislative roadmap that I call the Indiana Way—a 10-point plan that takes the model of Indiana, which it has put in place and proven over the last 10 years, and the ideas that I have gathered from Hoosiers as I travel about the State—ideas and plans that will make our State and Nation stronger. Innovative and effective solutions put forward in Indiana are what is desperately needed in Washington today to put our country back on a path to economic growth and opportunity.

I congratulate Governor Pence and our State on this terrific news, and I look forward to continuing to highlight Hoosier's success stories and the Indiana way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge my colleague from Alaska, and I appreciate the comments he made this morning in his first speech on the Senate floor and in choosing to clearly focus on the opportunities that we have as a State and the challenges we face.

I do feel it is unfortunate that, as a State, it seems that our largest battle is against our own federal government. How unfortunate is that? I feel very fortunate to have him as a partner here in the Senate as we take on these initiatives that have such impact and are of such import to our State and to how we fit with the other 49 States. We have no shortage of issues to take up when it comes to Federal overreach and the impact it has on our Nation and our State and how we will be able to develop our resources. I look forward to working with the Senator in these different areas.

I do have to comment, given where we are in the discussions here on the Senate floor about the Keystone XL Pipeline and what benefit that infrastructure will provide to this country by way of a resource that will help us with our energy security and truly helps us with our national security, is it not better to receive oil from our friend and our ally Canada than it is from Venezuela? To me these are subjects that should not even merit that level of discussion because it is just common sense.

Yet this President and his administration have taken 6 years to get to a point where they may decide on this issue. It has taken 6 years to decide whether it is in our country's best interest to receive oil from a friend and neighbor rather than from those who would do us ill. And then in a stunning act on Sunday—in one breath—this administration has taken an area that has been identified as the greatest source of oil potential that we have in this country, outside of Prudhoe Bay, with an estimated mean average of 10.3 billion barrels, which could provide 1 million additional barrels a day that would come down the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, which my colleague has talked about, and would help us to provide our Nation with the resource we need and would not only help us from a jobs and energy perspective but also from a security perspective.

On one hand, the President is saying, nope, I think I would rather continue to receive oil from Venezuela and Nigeria and all these other countries, and then on Sunday he just decides to put it off limits—the greatest source of oil we have identified in this country to date.

Just this morning, the President released his 5-year lease-sale plan, which is putting off—not deferring but withdrawing—areas in the Beaufort and the Chukchi, which will limit our opportunity for the 23 billion barrels of potential in the offshore there.

As my colleague has noted, the President has taken off half of the national petroleum reserve—the area we have designated for accessing our oil and gas resources. There is a move underfoot right now where this administration, I believe, is going to make the first production in NPRA and push it to a place where it will be uneconomic.

We have a stunning situation. This administration says they want an all of the above energy policy, except maybe in Alaska. We can't do it in ANWR. We are going to push you off of NPRA, and offshore we are going to make it that much more difficult for you. We are going to put the throttle on Alaska's energy opportunities for this country. We are going to put the throttle on Canada and say: Don't run it through the United States—not down into the gulf coast where we have these refineries.

What is he doing? He is putting our national security at risk with actions such as these.

So when we talk about Keystone XL, this is more than just a pipe or piece of infrastructure crossing the border. We are talking about energy security and national security. Then we have actions from this administration this week that choke off Alaska's energy opportunities. This is why I need my colleague in this fight. Believe me, the Alaska delegation is prepared for it.

It just causes us to wonder why. What are they thinking? What about energy security and national security for this country? We have the potential 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 that.

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 glidepath 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. The Senator from Utah.

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 LINDSEY 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, affirmed repeatedly by the Supreme Court, that enemy combatants can be held at least until a conflict is concluded.

If an individual is held for a violation of the laws of war, that means they are being detained until they can be prosecuted for a war crime they are alleged to have committed.

The detainee population of Guantanamo contains battle-hardened terrorists. Indeed, the threat they pose is amply demonstrated since 29 percent of Guantanamo detainees released so far are confirmed or suspected of rejoining the fight against the United States.

Now, Mr. President, Cliff Sloan, who was the State Department's envoy for closing Guantanamo Bay, recently wrote in a New York Times editorial that this nearly 30 percent recidivism rate was ''deeply flawed.'' It appears Mr. Sloan only wants the Congress and the American people to consider the confirmed rate rather than the combined confirmed and suspected recidivism rate.

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 Taliban 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.

Now, I personally believe current Supreme Court precedent would enable us to hold both law of war and violations of law of war detainees in the United States. However, if these detainees are moved into the United States, every attorney representing detainees would rush to federal court and file new lawsuits seeking their clients' release. Indeed, there exists a very real possibility that a court might release a detainee into the United States, especially in light of the Obama administration's unwillingness, in some cases, to defend against detainees' habeas petitions to the fullest extent. As such, the risks of transferring these detainees into the United States are great.

Guantanamo Bay also affords us a much better environment to bring and hold newly apprehended terrorists. Inside the United States, the Supreme Court has mandated that criminal suspects be read their rights—including their right to remain silent and right to a lawyer—subject to only a narrow public safety exception. Such limits on interrogations severely hinder our ability to gather information from captured terrorists, who have time and again proven to be the source of vital intelligence.

Consider, for example, how officials were only able to interrogate the Boston Marathon bomber for just 16 hours before he was read his rights and immediately stopped cooperating. As one of the longest serving members ever of the Intelligence Committee, I can assure you that it takes far longer to gather all of the important information we can from most terrorists.

Moving detainees into the United States also presents serious domestic security concerns. A number of terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula have become quite adept at jailbreaks. Bringing a concentration of terrorist detainees into the United States therefore could create a particularly appealing target in the homeland for jihadist radicals, whereas at Guantanamo Bay they are essentially isolated in a facility well secured by the U.S. military.

Clearly there are ample and compelling legal and national security reasons to maintain our detention operations at Guantanamo Bay. That is why Senator AYOTTE's legislation is so important. It ensures we will continue to use this vital facility by restoring the transfer restrictions that have enabled us to keep these individuals in such a secure location.

A little over a year ago, there was a profound change in the laws governing the transfer of Guantanamo detainees overseas. Before fiscal year 2014 legislation, the Congress had repeatedly enacted provisions in the annual Defense Authorization Act which all but prevented the transfer of Guantanamo detainees.

Specifically, these previous laws required the Secretary of Defense to certify in writing, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, that certain criteria had been met before the transfer of a detainee abroad could occur—in particular, that the foreign entity receiving a detainee has ''taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States'' as well as ''taken or agreed to take such actions as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity.''

Despite this, with few exceptions, the law prohibited the transfer of detainees to countries to which detainees had previously been transferred and subsequently reengaged in terrorism. Yet the law did afford the Secretary of Defense a national security waiver that negated the requirements if other standards were met.

So the bottom line here is that under the old law it was very difficult—as it should be—to transfer Guantanamo Bay detainees overseas.

But the Obama administration, bent on an ideological crusade to empty Guantanamo no matter the cost, successfully lobbied to relax these restrictions in 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.'' This is, of course, a lesser standard than requiring a certification that the individual cannot threaten the United States or reengage in terrorist activity.

In addition, under the Fiscal Year 2014 law, the Secretary could even authorize the transfer of a detainee as long as the Secretary determined the transfer was in the interest of the United States and action had been or was to be taken which will substantially mitigate the chance 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 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.

These deeply troubling moves by the Obama administration demonstrate the vital importance of Senator AYOTTE's bill. It restores the previous transfer restrictions. Specifically, it requires the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to certify that certain safeguards are in place and that threat of recidivism is very small before a transfer can be undertaken.

Furthermore, this legislation also places a 2-year ban on the transfer of detainees to Yemen. This restriction is especially important because approximately half of the remaining detainees at Guantanamo are from Yemen.

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 within Yemen's borders, the security situation there is dire, and it seems to be deteriorating as we speak.

Just last week the Houthi, a Shia rebel group, seized control of Yemen's Presidential palace, forcing the resignation of the 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 needed 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 real 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 ''opportunistic,'' if you can 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 to describe the disturbing 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 first came 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 stunts were simply 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 this bill better, pick up 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 Yellowstone River. Six thousand 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.

This oilspill was unacceptable. What is worse, it was completely preventible. 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 plussed up the budget for PHMSA—the agency that does pipeline inspections—giving PHMSA the resources to hire more than 100 pipeline safety inspectors. It is clear we need to get these folks hired, trained, and working on the ground. We also need to look at how PHMSA spends those dollars and whether resources are adequate to inspect the Nation's 2.6 million miles of pipeline.

Despite the criticisms, pipelines are still the safest way to transport oil. We have seen the headlines—we have all seen them—in recent years of oil trains exploding, trucks running off the road that carry oil.

In 2013, one explosion in Canada leveled an entire town. It killed 47 people. Months later, another oil train traveling in North Dakota burst into flames and caused an entire town to evacuate.

In northwestern Montana, the resort town of Whitefish is situated a few miles west of Glacier National Park. The town is home to a world-class ski hill and one of the world's most pristine lakes. Every day oil tank cars run past Whitefish Lake carrying thousands of gallons of oil. The environmental impact of an explosion or spill on that railroad would devastate that lake, and it would devastate that region, its water supply, and have serious impacts on the State's economy.

In fact, in 1989, a freight train derailed as it was circling Whitefish Lake and four cars slid into the water and leaked out some fuel. Twenty-three years later—just 2 years ago—they finally finished the cleanup. Imagine if those cars were carrying crude as they do today.

Pipelines are the fastest way to transport oil. Until this body can agree that climate change is real and start making smart investments in alternative energy sources, our economy still needs traditional ways.

I have said many times I still power my farm equipment with diesel fuel. I don't have any options. So it is clear to me we need a way to transport oil, and Keystone is that way. And, yes, in Montana, it will create jobs. According to the State Department's analysis, construction of the pipeline would create 3,700 jobs. Over $700 million worth of construction materials and support costs would come to eastern Montana. That is not to mention the tax base that would be increased. But safety must come first. We need the best materials; we need more inspections. We simply cannot afford another spill.

Finally, I want to talk about eminent domain. Everyone in this body should agree that a foreign corporation should not be allowed to seize private property here in America. That is a fact. Unfortunately, we couldn't agree on that last Thursday. There was an amendment 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 CARDIN 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 of Americans. 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 and over the long haul, but we need to debate this bill. We need a chance to make it better, to make the pipelines safer, and send a message to the American people we are serious about investing in our long-term energy future. If we don't do that, we won't build the Keystone.

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 than it is about 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, from 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 was a discovery 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 over $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 to have an outlet? They had to cross the Rocky Mountains. Of course that was going to be expensive. It was also going to roil up a bunch of the Canadian environmentalists. So the idea of the Keystone XL was born.

What does XL stand for? Extra large. Well, if it was extra large, it implies there is an existing pipeline. Indeed there is. I want to show it to you. This orange line is an existing pipeline coming from Alberta, northeast of Calgary, across Saskatchewan into Manitoba, and then it comes down through North Dakota, South Dakota, eastern Nebraska, and there it forks right at the Kansas line. One line goes east all the way into Illinois, and the other line goes south through Kansas into Oklahoma.

I said at the outset this is much more about politics as opposed to energy policy, as well as economics because this all heated up—XL, extra large—during the last Presidential election. Of course those who raise this issue were trying to say: Unless you embrace this XL you are against the United States being energy independent.

Well, an interesting thing happened along the way. From Cushing, OK, there was no line directly going to the gulf coast, where the refineries are in Houston and Port Arthur. The President approved that. That has been constructed. I am advised that has just opened in the last few days—so the existing line, all the way from Alberta, Canada, through the heartland of America, all the way to the gulf coast. That is that.

But XL, extra large, to carry more oil, was proposed. The route that is now proposed is here. That looks like it makes sense because it cuts off the dogleg and does a straight line. But originally it had come much further to the west, right over the environmentally sensitive lands of the aquifer in central Nebraska where so much of the water resources for the entire Midwestern United States come from.

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 do you not run it just 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-energy and others 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.

No. No. No can do. This foreign oil, for those who are proposing what we are about to vote on, is going right down the gullet of America, right down the middle of America to the gulf coast, and it is going to be exported to foreign countries. So a little old country boy such as I wonders: Now, wait. Let me get this straight. You want foreign oil to build a big oil pipeline to run right through the middle of America as a conduit to send right out to other foreign countries and not be utilized in this country?

Sadly, the answer to that is yes. That is what we are confronting. We had an amendment that Canada could not export it. We could use it here for American purposes. But sadly that amendment was defeated by the purists who want it to be exactly as they want it to be, a tool of foreign oil to send through the middle of America in a conduit to other foreign nations.

This Senator does not think that is in the interests of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I come first of all in celebration, in celebration that the Senate is finally working again. In just 27 days we have seen more amendments voted on on the floor of the Senate than under the Democratic majority in the entire year of 2014. We once again have a Senate where Republicans and Democrats can offer their amendments, can debate their amendments, and can vote them up or down.

One of the resounding consequences of the election in November is the American people were tired of the Democratic do-nothing Senate. We have a Senate that has shown up to work.

The bill we are voting on, the underlying bill, is an example of what the priorities should be in the Senate. The Keystone Pipeline bill ought to be a no-brainer. It ought to be an example of bipartisan cooperation.

Indeed, one of the very first things I did 2 years ago when I was newly elected to this body was join with 10 Senators, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, in sending a bipartisan letter to the President saying approve the Keystone Pipeline now.

Why? No. 1, it will produce jobs, tens of thousands of high-paying jobs. No. 2, it will increase tax revenue. It will increase revenue for the Federal Government, for State and local governments. That revenue can be used to pay down our national debt to provide for our vital needs.

No. 3, it will enhance our national security by allowing us to move toward North American energy independence

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-wearing, tree-hugging, Green Peace activist, you should love the Keystone Pipeline, because if 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, 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 an example of where 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 of the Democratic Party. 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 want good, decent-paying jobs, who want to provide for their kids, and who are tired of the stagnation of the Obama economy.

Only last week we heard the President give his State of the Union Address, where he talked about how swimmingly the economy is going.

Well, you know, he was right. If you happen to be one of those California environmentalist billionaires, if you happen to be in the top 1 percent—the millionaires and billionaires whom the President demagogues—then you have indeed become richer under President Obama.

Today the top 1 percent earn a higher share of our economy than in any year 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.

Yet what is the Democratic Party doing? Marshalling 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 merit. Let me commend the majority as well for focusing on the issues that matter to the American people—namely, bringing back jobs and economic growth and opportunity.

Now, in the course of this open amendment proceeding, I have submitted three different amendments. One would get rid of the longstanding anachronistic ban on exporting crude oil that was put in place in the 1970s. It makes no sense in the current environment and is hurting jobs and economic growth.

A second would obviate the need for having this fight every time a cross-border pipeline was built. It would streamline the process for building pipelines so we could move ahead with economic growth.

Both of those amendments, I believe, are sound policy. I think they are supported by the interests of Americans across this country.

After long conversations with my friends and colleagues, Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator HOEVEN, we have agreed that we are going to have committee hearings in the coming months focusing on both of those issues, laying out the facts and the data to make clear that these are unambiguously good—whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent or a Libertarian—if you want jobs and economic growth. These reforms are sound reforms to bring back jobs, economic growth, and opportunity.

AMENDMENT NO. 15

The third amendment I have submitted, which I am hopeful we will vote on either today or tomorrow, is an amendment to expedite exports of liquid natural gas. That is what I wish to speak about for just a few minutes.

The amendment that I am presenting will expedite LNG exports to World Trade Organization members, removing unnecessary delays that have been caused by the arbitrary Department of Energy approval process.

Currently, countries under free-trade agreements with the United States enjoy a streamlined, expedited approval process to import our LNG. For projects to FTA countries, current law deems those ''in the public interest'' and they get a permit ''without modification or delay.''

Yet those without such an agreement must, instead, submit to an arduous case-by-case nonstandardized process that ends up discouraging LNG trade and related investments. It ends up killing jobs.

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 open the doors of trade to more than 160 countries in the World Trade Organization to receive this same expedited treatment that we currently have in place for free-trade countries.

This is particularly important not only for economic development, not only for jobs, not only for growth but also for the enormous geopolitical advantages that it will present to the United States.

In the past several years we have seen the consequences of the Obama-Clinton foreign policy. We have seen the United States receding from leadership in the world, and we have seen other nations—foreign nations—step into that void and use energy as a weapon, as a cudgel—whether it is Venezuela or Iran or Russia.

Allowing expedited LNG exports strengthens our hands against those who would be enemies of America, and it strengthens the hands of our friends and allies. Here at home, according to a 2013 study, in the United States LNG exports could create up to 450,000 new jobs by 2035.

So we will see, when Republicans and Democrats vote on this amendment, where each Senator stands on whether we should allow the private sector to create up to 450,000 new jobs. Every Democrat who votes no can expect to go back to his or her State and face constituents—face the union members who would like to get some of those 450,000 new jobs—and explain why he or she voted against that hard-working man or woman having a job.

Over the same time, GDP growth could generate anywhere from an additional $15.6 billion up to $73.6 billion. By 2035 the net gain in manufacturing jobs could mean up to 76,000 new jobs. A lot of the Members of this body like to talk about manufacturing, like to talk about the steel industry, the car industry. It used to be that the backbone of the American middle class was the blue-collar jobs where you could work with dignity, where you could provide for your family, and where you could provide for your kids.

Every Senator who votes no to 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 he or she 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. We stood over and over—standing, quite literally, alongside Ukraine. If we want action to match those words, then every Senator should vote yes on this amendment.

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 blackmail on 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 of today, 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 countries such as Ukraine. 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, who likewise 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 snowstorms.

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—and, of course, millions of pizzas, 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. But the sad reality is 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 cleared from the field and the fans catch their flights home, the work to end this heinous crime known as human trafficking will continue.

As a matter of fact, January is National Slavery and Human 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 scourge 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 weekend—we may actually see some underage girls or others 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.-Mexican 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—1 out of every 10 tips. And Texas 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 smugglers—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 there has been a lot of good work by Members on both sides of the aisle, and one of the things we have needed the most is to have the help of many nongovernmental organizations—these are faith-based organizations, these are

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 Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, Senator KLOBUCHAR 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 urged him 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, and it would 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 restoration.

It is no secret the victims of this terrible crime end up with a lot of psychological baggage 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 cosponsors. So don't 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. DURBIN. Mr. 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.

In a hearing before 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 exploiting young people, 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 are being exploited and, 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 looking closely at his legislation and I hope we can work closely together on that.

AMENDMENT NO. 67

Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about a pending amendment which troubles me. I don't know 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. They conduct investigations, 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 dangerous confrontations. The EPA reports its agents have frequently encountered weapons and armed individuals when they have conducted their work.

I took 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 get out and about to see the 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 Larkin 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 rival, 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 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 they are to do so unarmed.

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 comfort of being trained professional law enforcement officers equipped with firearms to protect themselves and enforce the laws of the United States.

Senator SULLIVAN wants them to enforce the laws, but he doesn't want them to carry a firearm. That to me is ridiculous. In fact, it is dangerous. It is dangerous to send these men and women with the responsibility of doing their job into circumstances where they could literally lose their lives because of the Sullivan amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated January 24, 2015, signed by Jon Adler, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2015.

Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: On behalf of the 27,000 members of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the misguided ''Keystone'' amendment put forth by Senator Sullivan that calls for the disarming of EPA Criminal Investigators.

EPA-CID currently employs approximately 180 sworn Criminal Investigators, all of whom have completed the mandatory Criminal Investigator Training Program at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. These highly trained law enforcement officers complete the same basic academy training as their counterparts at the U.S. Marshals Service, the Secret Service, NCIS, ICE and other credible federal law enforcement agencies. They receive quarterly tactical training to ensure firearms proficiency, defensive tactics capability, and enforcement operation readiness. They should not be denigrated and belittled like some Barney Fife aberration gone wild.

Unfortunately, Senator Sullivan has opted to employ inflammatory language to mischaracterize EPA-CID 's execution of court-issued search warrants as stampede-styled ''raids.'' EPA Criminal Investigators employ proper law enforcement tactics and techniques, while wearing the appropriate protective equipment during field work. They issue proper verbal commands, and do not scream ''Charge!'' like some reckless group of bandits. Contrary to Senator Sullivan's alarmist assertions, EPA Criminal Investigators invoke a proper command presence in order to protect their safety as well as those around them.

While Senator Sullivan seeks to minimize the law enforcement relevance of the EPA-CID mission, it is important to note that the Criminal Investigators enforce the criminal statutes of the United States Code, and investigate alleged violations of the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. If Senator Sullivan takes exception to a particular statute, he should focus on amending the law and not disarming and jeopardizing the safety of those who risk their lives to enforce it. Furthermore, he should respect the fact that there are criminals who knowingly and willfully harm our environment, and EPA Criminal Investigator's expertise is needed to investigate and apprehend these criminals.

Recent current events, both domestic and abroad, have made clear that terrorist groups are targeting law enforcement officers. In New York City, a lone-wolf terrorist assassinated two heroic NYPD Police Officers. In France, a terrorist cell brutally murdered three law enforcement officers, as well as civilians. So how does Senator Sullivan come to any rational conclusion that it's appropriate to disarm law enforcement officers who are protecting our homeland? Perhaps Senator Sullivan is unaware of terrorists' intent to deploy biological, chemical and radiological weapons to harm our citizenry and institutions? EPA Criminal Investigators are an integral, indispensable component of our homeland defense against such attacks. Does Senator Sullivan 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 that employs highly trained Criminal Investigators to investigate allegations of excessive force or misconduct. This includes the EPA. In reaching his ill-advised conclusion to disarm EPA Criminal Investigators, did Senator Sullivan draw upon any Inspector General report to substantiate his position? While there is no evidence to suggest any widespread incidents of excessive force or misconduct by EPA Criminal Investigators, a reasonable person is left to question the rational motivation of Senator Sullivan's amendment.

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 safely without a means to protect ourselves.''

Respectfully submitted,

JON ADLER.

Mr. DURBIN. This letter says it all. It spells out how dangerous this is if the Sullivan amendment passes. To think that, for whatever reason, a U.S. Senator is going to take a firearm away from a law enforcement officer of a Federal agency who is putting his or her life on the line every single day is just plain wrong.

If Senator SULLIVAN wants to take away the enforcement authorities of this Agency, so be it. We can argue and debate that. But to require this Agency to execute warrants and make arrests but require that their law enforcement officials be unarmed is sending them into dangerous—even deadly—situations. This Sullivan amendment is not well-thought-out. To offer this I think is a serious mistake.

The Senator is offering it, he says, because of a 2013 incident in which EPA agents were part of a law enforcement task force that investigated a mining operation in Alaska based on allegations of environmental allegations. I don't know the particulars of that incident, but there was a review of the incident commissioned by the Governor of Alaska—a Republican Governor of Alaska—that found no evidence that these EPA agents broke any laws during the investigation.

Isn't it odd that we have reached the point where, when we try to introduce an amendment which says that you will not sell a gun, a firearm, to someone at a gun show who is on the terrorist suspect list—many argue against that, saying even terrorist suspects have Second Amendment rights—and then turn around with the Sullivan amendment, this ill-advised amendment, and say law enforcement does not have a right to carry a firearm. That is the Sullivan amendment. I hope we vote against it on a bipartisan basis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the legislation before this body, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. I wish to address three issues that have been brought up as we have continued this discussion.

I start out by thanking the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington who are leading this effort to bring forward amendments from both sides of the aisle. I think they are doing great work. They are heavily engaged in trying to make sure the people's amendments are brought forward and that we have a vote. So I thank them for that and again encourage everyone to work with both these bill managers who I believe all of us feel are doing an excellent job. So let's get going. Let's get voting on these amendments. Let's make them pending and have that vote.

This is again, after all, an effort not only to advance this legislation but also to reestablish regular order in this body and move to an open amendment process—which is so important again not just in terms of people being heard on this legislation, having votes on amendments, but for other legislation that Senators want to bring forward for the good of this country, to have the debate, to offer their ideas, to get a vote, and to get things done for the American people. That is what it is all about. We have to keep that in mind and not lose track of that. This is truly about not just this legislation but getting to regular order, which I think is so important for the work we do, to accomplish the work we need to do on behalf of the American people.

Let me touch on three aspects of the current legislation that have been brought up. One is that it is a bill for Canada rather than for the United States. It is something that is very much in the interest of the United States, so I want to address that. I also want to talk about some of the environmental aspects from the standpoint that there are hundreds of millions of dollars being invested in new technologies by major companies in the oil sands in Alberta, Canada, that are going to help deploy and develop things

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 enables us to produce 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 that produces more 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 Glendive, 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—we need 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 and update it with the 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 I think 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 do 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 somehow, 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—out of this region of our country. So it is going to move both 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 in our part of the country, in 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 get backed 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. We produce 11 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 other parts of the world that 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 for the oil we use. In fact, 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 low-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 Canada so that 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 China and we will continue to import oil 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

been on the floor and I have talked about various aspects of the project based on the science and based on the fact that there have actually been five environmental impact statements produced. The environmental impact statements produced by the Obama administration say there will be less greenhouse gas emissions with the pipeline than without it because we will be able to move that 830,000 barrels a day of oil by pipeline, rather than moving it by either 1,400 rail cars or sending it to China where the refineries have higher emissions than ours do.

But I would like to go beyond that and talk for a minute in a broader sense about our energy future and how we not only produce more energy more cost-effectively from all sources, from all kinds of energy, but how we can do it with better environmental stewardship. And the way forward there is really technology. It is the American ingenuity, the investment in technology, and the creativity of our companies and our entrepreneurs. That is the real key to success in the future in terms of producing more energy more cost-effectively, more independently, and with better environmental stewardship—by leading the way forward with technology development. We cannot export our regulations, but as we develop technologies, those, in effect, get exported around the world because other countries adopt those technologies.

So I will talk just a minute about the technology development that is going on in the oil sands. Since 1990 the greenhouse gas emissions on a per-barrel basis in the oil sands have gone down by 28 percent, almost one-third. On a per-barrel basis they have reduced their greenhouse gas emissions by 28 percent since 1990. They are engaged in major projects now to develop and deploy new technologies that will help them produce oil in the oil sands region with a smaller footprint—which is what I am showing here—through in situ development and also through carbon capture and storage.

We talk so often about developing carbon capture and storage in this country. That is being developed and deployed in the oil sands right now. The Quest project, which is a project Shell Oil Company is undertaking—let me read from a bit of a summary on their Quest project, which is a project for carbon capture and storage they are developing right now.

This is a picture of it. It is in situ—which means drilling and using steam to bring the oil out rather than excavation, which is the old style—so it has a much smaller environmental footprint, but it also reduces greenhouse gas emissions because they capture the CO_2 and they store it.

A point of inquiry, Mr. President. I would like to ask the bill managers if they are ready to move forward or make any announcement. If we have any amendments, I would gladly yield the floor for that purpose.

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 several additional Democratic 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 as early as 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 ranking member now on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I want to remind everyone that this bill deals with environmental law.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I can call up amendment No. 130.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself and Ms. CANTWELL, proposes an amendment numbered 130 to amendment No. 2.

Mrs. BOXER. 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 preserve existing permits and the authority of the agencies issuing the permits to modify the permits if necessary)

On page 2, strike lines 20 through 23 and insert the following:

(c) PERMIT SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act shall affect the status of any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a).

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have a very simple amendment. I hope it will be unanimously accepted. I think anyone within the sound of my voice who cares about the health and safety of people would support this amendment because we know this underlying bill facilitates the building of a Canadian project, with all the benefits going to Canada, none to America. We have established that there will be 35 permanent jobs. We have established that we could have oilspills because we have already had several serious oilspills and this oil is very hard to clean up. We have established by the Republicans' votes that they will not vote to keep the oil in America, so it doesn't even help us with energy independence. They even voted against the amendment to make sure the steel was from America. They voted against that.

So this is a Canadian bill. This is a wonderful bill for Canadian oil interests. Frankly, that is not why I was elected. I was elected to fight for California, fight for American jobs, fight for middle-class jobs, and not sit by while we see what is happening here, which is that the very first bill brought to us by this new Republican Congress turns out to be a bill for Canadian oil.

One of my colleagues—I don't know if it was Senator CANTWELL who coined this or Senator MARKEY—said it is basically a big straw that runs from Canada and has the potential to spill all the way down, and then it is refined here, and all the filth and dirt gets stored here and goes into the air, and then it goes out of the country. It doesn't do a thing to help us. So all I am asking for is a little bit of relief for the people of this Nation.

Right now, S. 1 says that all permits ''shall remain in effect'' for this TransCanada pipeline regardless of any actions taken in building the pipeline, even if the company violates the permits.

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. They 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 willy-nilly get permits from the Commerce Department, EPA, the Corps of Engineers, or other entities 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 carcinogens. We know this. 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 and 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 and the protection of the air and water that this company is getting. They could literally avoid following any of the steps they committed to in their permit, and this legislation gives them a free pass.

My amendment simply says that we are able to revoke a permit if it is not followed.

I would ask the Senator from Washington if I could at this point yield the floor. My amendment is pending. I appreciate the work of the Senator from Alaska in allowing this amendment to be offered, and I appreciate the work of my colleague from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

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 I 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 Ms. STABENOW, 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 submit to Congress 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—

(1) 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 on 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 commonsense 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 just as it provided 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, MI, 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 remind folks that the Great Lakes now provide drinking water to over 40 million people and support 1.5 million jobs. It would be a disaster not just for folks in the State of Michigan, but throughout the Great Lakes region and throughout the country, if there were a pipeline break. We know it firsthand from what happened in Kalamazoo, the most expensive pipeline break in the history of this country.

We have to ensure that the pipelines that operate in the Great Lakes, particularly in the Straits of Mackinac, which connect 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 Senator COLLINS 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. 7801));

(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(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(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(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 Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over 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 effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

(B) to form partnerships with Governors, 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 to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

(A) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

(B) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

(C) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

(D) to promote—

(i) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

(ii) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

(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 for States, local 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 I 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 the creation of 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 I said, 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 clerk will report.

The bill clerk read 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 a wilderness 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) Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

(b) FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE LAND.—With respect to land administered 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 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 amendment. This is about the wilderness study areas that we see that are currently on the books.

According to the Congressional Research Service, as of the beginning of this year, 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 manages 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 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. 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 study areas. Since 1980 Congress has taken a look at some of these. Some have been designated as wilderness and others have been released for nonwilderness uses. 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 the 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—the agencies 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 or is not 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 have 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 figure out whether they should be 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 come to the floor 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 points, but right 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 some time, 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 impact 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 accelerate, then, 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 transported 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 on the backs of working 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 CO_2 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 such as 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 compares to actual data. So the actual 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 heard that. It was based on 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 summertime 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 than it was in 2012.

Senator MURKOWSKI, that is an increase 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 at its record recorded levels.

There have been dire 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 almost 10 years. I think that is the longest period maybe this century.

According to Dr. Roger Pielke, a professor at the University of Colorado-Boulder, who testified before our EPW Committee last year, he said hurricane seasons in the United States are 20 percent less intense and have seen 20 percent fewer landfalls than in 1900.

We have received testimony in the Environment and Public Works Committee from Dr. Roy Spencer, who said this:

> There is little or no observational effort that severe weather of any type has worsened over the last 30, 50, or 100 years.

He said that in his testimony before the committee.

The IPCC, the International Panel on Climate Change, fifth climate assessment released in 2013, what did they say about these predictions? Quote:

> Current data sets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the last century.

So I suppose they have acknowledged that prediction to be incorrect.

That same report talked about floods. We have been told we will have more floods.

The IPCC says:

> 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, CO_2 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 CO_2, grow, and create carbon stalks and emit oxygen, which is good for us. So in itself, CO_2 is not an inherently bad product.

From 1982 to 2012, when we had some of the greatest increase in CO_2—I guess the greatest increase in CO_2 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 by the end 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 receive.

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 more than normal 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 rejected the legislation. So 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 in a critical case. It empowered EPA—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 CO_2 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 CO_2.

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 hundreds of billions 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. The Nation 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 idea. I am not a climate denier. I don't know what the truth is and what history will teach. I have assumed over the years scientists are on to something when they claim that CO_2 will be a blanket effect in our atmosphere and temperature might increase. I do know that if we burn fossil fuels, burn plants, it creates CO_2. I know that. It increases it in the atmosphere. The models which are predicted increasing temperatures from this steady rise in CO_2 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 from 1975 to 2025, a projection 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, those modeled effects, 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 a 50-year trend. Look 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 burden this American economy weak 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 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.

It is not being done in China. It is not being done in Russia. It is not being done in Brazil. So it is of utmost importance that the American people know about these claims and the effects of regulations before we go headlong into enacting them.

The blocking of Keystone Pipeline is a clear example of what has happened. We will be denying struggling Americans and businesses another source of energy that will put further downward pressure on energy prices. We can have only one effect to produce the greatest supply and to help contain the price of oil. Whatever the price of oil is, it will be less with Keystone Pipeline than if we didn't have that source from the Keystone Pipeline in Canada.

This will make us more dependent on foreign suppliers, many of which are not our friends. Canada is our friend, our best trading partner in the world, perhaps our best ally in the world. It is already causing great frustration with our friends in Canada.

I met with the Canadian parliamentarians. Last year we had a meeting. I was surprised how deeply they felt about this. They were hurt. They cannot understand why we can't get this done. It is such a commonsense thing to them.

Some of our Democratic colleagues argue our economy will not be affected by the agenda, the President's Climate Action Plan. Others acknowledge the cost but justify this as a speed bump and not significant. Congress represents most closely the people of the United States, and Congress has never voted to give unelected bureaucrats and officials the power to regulate CO_2. 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.

As 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, trillions 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 I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I know the ranking member had intended to offer an amendment on behalf of one of her colleagues, and she is off the floor right now. I want to respect the understanding we had, but I also want to respect that the Senator from Vermont is here and I believe prepared to speak to his amendment. I just want to acknowledge that Senator CANTWELL intended to offer a couple of amendments.

I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment, amendment No. 23, the Ten Million Solar Roofs Act, and it be made pending.

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 Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE, proposes an amendment numbered 23 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. SANDERS. 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 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)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. _____. 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) an energy storage system, if the energy storage system is integrated with the photovoltaic system; and

(E) any other hardware necessary for the installation of a 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, not less than 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 60,000 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, business, nonprofit entity, 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 a 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 our country and around the world, that we have a limited opportunity to try to transform our energy system so 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 wanted to say a word about 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 bring forward 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 elect 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 the Republican candidate for President, Mitt Romney, spent about $446 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 avoid dealing with 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 most of 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 if we invest $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 us to do just that. That is 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 onerous cost of a college education, this new tax would greatly diminish the 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. For the past 14 years 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 paycheck withholding, is just $175 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 these accounts, but then came a powerful 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 $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 afterschool and summer jobs, so too grows their appreciation of financial responsibility and self-reliance.

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 the question 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 perhaps 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 has a high percentage of students who are the very first in their families to attend college. Every day, I saw how hard parents and students worked, how many sacrifices they made in order to make higher education a reality.

My experience at Husson is the chief reason why one of the very first bills I introduced in this Chamber was the College Affordability and Access Act. That bill called for creating tax-preferred education savings account—the precursor to the Coverdell savings accounts—tax incentives for employer-provided educational assistance, and a tax deduction for student loan interest. 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 and thank my colleague from Maine for bringing up this very 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 what 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. 174 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise to 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. ____. 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 to fund climate change adaptation and mitigation 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 amendment No. 125.

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 Amendments.'')

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);

(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 wrapped 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 was set to intervene and 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 and deem this approved. So 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 met to ensure 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 just to compensate. However, 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 plans that itemize construction, erosion control, and revegetation procedures for those fragile areas . . . To reduce the potential impacts related to severe wind and water and erosion, 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 bullet points outlined 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 people would say 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—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 stop—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 qualify welders.

So in 1 week alone, 72 percent of TransCanada's welds had to be replaced. 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 this 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 interests.

Madam President, I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. 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, who is with us to offer an amendment.

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. BURR, 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:

TITLE _____—ATLANTIC OCS ACCESS AND REVENUE SHARE ACT OF 2015

SEC. ____01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Atlantic OCS Access and Revenue Share Act of 2015''.

SEC. ____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 8(g) 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) Florida;

(B) Georgia; and

(C) South 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. 1344) 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 that are 30 miles or less 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 Mid-Atlantic Planning Area in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to Mid-Atlantic Producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 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 in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) 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 Mid-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 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—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(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) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area.

SEC. ____05. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM SOUTH 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 South 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 South Atlantic Producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG SOUTH 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 South Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each South Atlantic producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each South 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—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(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) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the South Atlantic Planning Area.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, earlier this week—actually, yesterday and today—the Department of the Interior announced a plan that will allow the 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 that 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 jobs in some of the hardest 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 ultimate 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 make sure we get it 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 other thing it does 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, this is a picture 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 beyond the sight 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 renourish 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 renourishment.

We are also looking to have 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 outdoor recreation activities.

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 Markey 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. MARKEY] proposes an amendment numbered 178 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MARKEY. 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 ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. INCLUSION OF OIL DERIVED FROM TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL.

This Act shall not take effect prior to 10 days following the date that diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of section 4612(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I have a second amendment, Markey amendment No. 141. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Markey amendment No. 141.

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. MARKEY] proposes an amendment numbered 141 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. _____. 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 over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, 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 actual 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 events 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 that were 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 impact that those 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 clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE], for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HEINRICH, proposes an amendment numbered 148 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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 campaign finance disclosures for certain persons benefitting from tar sands development)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____. CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) DISCLOSURE BY TAR SANDS BENEFICIARIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) 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 (other than covered disbursement reported under subparagraph (A))and received covered transfers (other than a covered transfer reported under subparagraph (A)) in an aggregate amount in excess 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 any person sharing or exercising direction 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.

''(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

''(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 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, expanding, and retrofitting import and export terminals in connection with tar sands;

''(VI) transportation by pipeline, rail, and barge of tar sands;

''(VII) refinement of tar sands;

''(VIII) importing crude, refined oil, or byproducts derived from tar sands crude;

''(IX) exporting crude, byproducts, or refined oil derived from tar sands crude; and

''(X) use of production 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) is made—

''(I) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than 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 the 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, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference 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 has 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).

''(5) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered transfer' means any amount received by a covered entity for the purposes of making a covered disbursement.

''(6) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'disclosure date' means—

''(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000; and

''(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

''(7) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE; COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS; ETC,.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.''.

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 this 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 it was going, 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 went from the corporations that are going to make so much money from this, whether it is more than $1 million made 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 disclosure 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 Presiding Officer, and also recognize that he is a member of the nascent Cory caucus, and I respect that quite a bit.

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.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BOOKER] proposes an amendment numbered 155 to amendment No. 2.

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) relieves any Federal agency of the obligation of the Federal agency to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the obligation of the Federal agency to prepare a supplement to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement described in subsection (b) in connection with the issuance of any permit or authorization needed to construct, connect, operate, or maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the environmental impacts resulting from the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline and cross-border facilities, including from greenhouse gas emissions associated with the crude oil being transported by the pipeline.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I want to say that amendment No. 155 is a very important amendment. It is common sense. It is practical. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA as it is known, is one of the most emulated statutes in the world. It is something that many people see as valuable in other countries because NEPA, in fact, by many is referred to as the modern-day environmental Magna Carta.

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 quite surprisingly—would deem 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 statements if 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 and not provide 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. 102

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. 92 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

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 appropriations 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

Water Conservation Fund. Let me say to my colleagues, this is the best organization to choose where to make that investment. This is not about a land grab; this is about providing contiguous pieces of land that have restored value. But this is not about initiatives to create new national parks. It is to protect the infrastructure that is out there in their control, and we have battled for years.

I would love to come to the floor right now and say I want to offer an amendment for full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which should be $900 million a year, but we appropriate $350 million to $450 million a year to fund it.

Unfortunately I am not here to offer that amendment, although I think it would receive tremendous support in this body, primarily because I would have to find about $8 billion worth of offsets. This is incredible, that we could have a trust fund that is funded with the royalties off of production that has an $8 billion balance but to actually say if we are going to begin to fully fund it, you have to come up with $8 billion worth of offsets because we spent the money on something else. We spent the money on something else, therefore we have got to find an offset.

So I am not coming to the floor today to propose we fully fund it, although I am an advocate of it, and I think many people are.

In a minute I will ask unanimous consent to have amendment No. 92 pending, which is the Burr-Bennet-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 fights for another day. 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 North Carolina, [Mr. BURR] for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BENNET, 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 amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. 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 expenditure in any fiscal year under section 200303 shall be used for projects that secure recreational public access to existing Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes.''.

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 Treasury.

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 pending amendment so that I can call up my amendment No. 115.

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. 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 regarding climate change and infrastructure)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is already impacting the safety and reliability of the critical infrastructure systems of the United States, including buildings, roads, bridges, tunnels, rail, ports, airports, levees, dams, and military installations through sea level rise, rising temperatures, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(2) significant energy, industrial and transportation infrastructure in the United States is located near the coast, in floodplains, or in other areas vulnerable to sea level rise;

(3) the impacts to infrastructure described in paragraph (1) have caused tangible economic costs that are likely to increase over time;

(4) it is fiscally prudent to prepare for and seek to mitigate the impacts described in paragraph (1), as it is estimated that every dollar spent on mitigation saves $4 in disaster relief;

(5) the Federal Government self-insures, offers insurance programs such as crop insurance and the national flood insurance program, and, in the case of extreme weather events, also serves as the insurer of last resort for public and private infrastructure;

(6) the Federal Government has a crucial role to play as a partner in working with State, local, tribal, and territorial jurisdictions to help ensure coordinated efforts to keep communities resilient;

(7) the role of the Federal Government should include prioritizing climate resilient projects when administering Federal grants, providing technical support, and sharing of data and information in user-friendly and accessible formats, among other actions;

(8) Federal agency climate change adaptation plans that assess the risk to physical assets and missions of the Federal agencies can help create savings for taxpayers; and

(9) Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, should quantify the economic value of the physical risks of the agencies from climate change.

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 consequence, the impacts on our local 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 bake resiliency into the future of our community.

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 assess and 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. 115.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, two Senators from Delaware, back to back—a double shot.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up my amendment No. 120.

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. CARPER], for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. HEITKAMP, proposes an amendment numbered 120 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARPER. 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 amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credits for new qualified fuel cell motor vehicles and alternative fuel vehicle refueling property)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR NEW QUALIFIED FUEL CELL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 30B(k) 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 property purchased after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 30C, as amended by the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 5. OFFSET.

(a) 100 PERCENT CONTINUOUS LEVY ON PAYMENT TO MEDICARE PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS.—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.''.

(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 today.

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 within literally 6 months 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 what they call the 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 next to this garage 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 there. We also have 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 racing. I drove 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 was powered by fuel cells.

I said to the guy I was driving with, how much does this vehicle cost if I wreck it? He said, probably $1 million. I said, I better be careful. And right about then somebody came out of the infield and drove right in front of me and scared the guy next to me to death. I was able to avoid a crash.

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 SUVs. 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 money—actually quite a bit—just as 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 offer a great driving experience. 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 commercial 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 heard about fueling stations. 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 build 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. I hope they will.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 133 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. ____. 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 energy policy of 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 track 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, slowing the ability of the wind industry to cut costs, as compared to what would have occurred 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 (1);

(B) paragraph (2)(A);

(C) paragraph (3)(A);

(D) paragraph (4)(B);

(E) paragraph (6);

(F) 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 (1) 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 opportunity. I don't think there could be an amendment that is offered that would fit more 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 marker that this is an important part of our energy and jobs future. Importantly, as we have watched the ups and downs of our tax policy, or lack thereof, in the Senate and Congress, we have seen short-term extensions—or as we call them, extenders—being passed in the last moments of Congress, which does not give the certainty we need to provide the incentives that are included in those extenders.

This sense of the Senate—to the extent it becomes legislation—would, in fact, for the first time give us an opportunity to provide certainty with a glidepath out, and everyone understands that eventually this industry is going to have to stand alone.

I wish to talk about the importance of the wind energy industry, not just from the energy standpoint but from the jobs standpoint. Today the wind energy industry sustains approximately 73,000 jobs and directs over $17.3 billion a year in private investment to the U.S. economy, including thousands of well-paid wind manufacturing jobs at over 500 factories in 43 States that supply the United States industry.

The United States currently has over 60,000 megawatts of installed capacity, and according to the American Wind Energy Association and USDA's Energy Information Administration, the United States produced over 167 billion kilowatts of wind power last year alone.

If my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are serious about this being a jobs bill and serious about this being an energy bill, then they you will want to vote in favor of this amendment. Wind energy and the continued buildout of additional capacity in this country is an absolute critical piece of the ''all of the above'' energy policy. Every person in this building and every person you talk to about what their energy policy is will say all of the above. That has to have meaning, and it has to include this important and critical infrastructure and this important and critical tax credit for wind energy.

The other benefit of this amendment is—as you have heard, we have 43 States somehow involved in the manufacture and production of equipment in this industry, but we have over 1,000 utility-scale wind projects, which represent over 62,000 megawatts and over 46 wind turbines and are installed across 39 States and Puerto Rico. There are also more than 500 wind manufacturing facilities spread across those 43 States.

I am a little bias because we in North Dakota like to say we are the Saudi Arabia of wind, and wind is a critical part—in fact 15 percent—of our capacity. We think we could do a lot more, but I will tell you the economic impact just in my State. A lot of you know the great energy renaissance that is going on in America that involves the development of fossil fuels—North Dakota being the second largest oil and gas producer with the shale development.

What you don't know is that North Dakota truly represents all of the above. I want to talk about what we do in wind before I close out here. We have almost 1,600 megawatts of wind capacity installed and another 740 megawatts under construction. The industry has invested over $3.4 billion in my State with annual lease payments—and these are to farmers who are grateful for that additional revenue. The towers are on their property and over $5 million of lease payments goes back to farmers.

I talked to farmers all across North Dakota who are proud that they are part of the energy renaissance in our State and grateful for the additional revenue.

We have two educational institutions in our State that have wind energy training centers and do tremendous jobs training the workforce for additional wind energy. The wind energy industry supports close to 3,000 jobs in North Dakota, and in a State of around 700,000 people, that is a significant factor. In 2013 wind energy was 15 percent.

These are numbers that—I saw the Presiding Officer grin when I said that

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-like 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. 124 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 124 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. __. 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, Indian tribe, individual Indian, 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. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, my amendment states that S. 1 may not ''change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States without consultation with, and the informed express consent of, any affected Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization.''

The need for this amendment becomes particularly relevant because on January 11 of this year, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association wrote to President Obama to express the association's unequivocal opposition to the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The association speaks on behalf of 16 sovereign American Indian tribes and asserts that the pipeline violates the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868.

I am not taking a legal position on whether the assertion is correct. Rather, I think it is important that the Senate go on record that our trust obligations and treaty requirements, which are with sovereign Nations, must be honored and that any changes to those obligations may only occur with consultation and their consent.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated January 11, 2015, from the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association and the Association's resolution regarding the KXL pipeline be printed in the RECORD.

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

GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION,
Rapid City, SD, January 11, 2015.

Re Veto Legislation to Approve the Keystone XL Pipeline and DO NOT Approve a Permit for the Pipeline.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President, United States of America, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: The Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association (GPTCA) is made up of the 16 Sovereign American Indian Tribes in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska. All of our Tribes have signed Treaties with the United States in which the United States pledged to protect Indian Tribes, guarantee the right to Self-Government and obligated itself to undertake Trust Responsibility. 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.

We are writing to alert you that TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP (TransCanada) is in the midst of the recertification process of its 2010 permit from the South Dakota Public Utilities (SDPUC) for the Keystone XL pipeline. While we are aware the Nebraska Supreme Court issued a decision to vacate a lower court decision that held a Nebraska statute concerning the Keystone XL pipeline unconstitutional, we write to urge you to consider the fact that TransCanada's permit to traverse South Dakota is still under review and does not authorize construction of the project in South Dakota unless and until the SD PUC grants certification.

Four Federally Recognized Tribes have signed on as Party Intervenors in the SD PUC proceedings as well as numerous Native and nonnative concerned citizens. The Tribes include the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Rosebud Sioux Tribe and the Yankton Sioux Tribe. Other Great Plains Tribes are poised to comment and are monitoring the proceedings. The pipeline is planned to traverse through our homelands that still possess substantial treaty obligations, cultural and natural resources and water rights for all the Great Plains tribes. These are also the homelands of numerous animals, birds and fish including several endangered species.

Under South Dakota law, TransCanada must declare that the conditions under which the permit was issued in 2010 remain the same despite submitting along with its application a matrix of 30 Changed Conditions. These 30 Changed Conditions show that significant design and construction changes are planned for the pipeline that make it substantially different in our eyes. The 2010 permit was also issued with 50 Special Permit Conditions that TransCanada also must prove it still meets before it can legally commence construction of the project. While there is an evidentiary hearing currently set for May 2015, it is unclear when a final decision will be issued in that case.

We therefore urge you, consistent with your stance on the previously pending Nebraska litigation, to refrain from making any decision regarding whether the Keystone XL pipeline would be in the national interest until you have all the necessary facts before you. Tribal leaders request you deny the permit as contrary to the national interest.

It is the position of the GPTCA that your administration does in fact have incontrovertible evidence that the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would be a detriment to the American public and the national interest regardless of whether the SD PUC ultimately authorizes construction under TransCanada's 2010 permit due to the risks the project poses regardless of the particular route through South Dakota. The GPTCA urges you to deny the Presidential Permit for the reasons set forth in the attached GPTCA Resolution among others. However, should you have reservations about denying the Presidential Permit at this time, please grant South Dakota the same respect you accorded Nebraska and refrain from making your decision until after the legal processes regarding the South Dakota permit have been resolved. We strongly urge you to veto any legislation passed by Congress that mandates the issuance of a presidential permit to TransCanada. We believe, consistent with federal separation of powers, that a decision to deny TransCanada a federal permit must be made by your Executive branch and it is not appropriate for legislation.

We further assert that construction of any pipeline violates the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, which impact the greater population of the Oceti Sakowin or the Seven Council Fires of the Lakota, Dakota and Nakota Tribes. We are known to many as the Great Sioux Nation and are the keepers of the sacred, cultural and natural resources located in the KXL corridor. Literally, thousands of sacred and cultural resources that are important to our life-ways and for our future generations will potentially be destroyed or compromised by the pipeline construction. Many of these sacred sites have not been surveyed by outsiders less they be looted or plundered but are known to those designated by our people considered to be sacred 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 sited.

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 spilling into the tributaries that lead into the Missouri River or leaching into the Oglala 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 Oglala Aquifer supplies drinking water throughout the Great Plains region. All of this development further impacts reserved rights of our Oceti Sakowin which were unceded by treaties, including the right to live in a safe manner and be in control of our human, cultural and natural resources as outlined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Consultation has not 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 KXL Pipeline and the continued development of the Alberta tar sands will increase the carbon footprint in our sacred lands for the enrichment of foreign countries and oil companies. As you know, climate change will impact and affect all of us including the generations to come unless we do something to stop it now. The Oceti Sakowin tribes are making important strides toward renewable energy with the Oceti Sakowin Power Project (OSPP) that recognizes fossil fuels are relics that contribute to phenomenal climate change. The OSPP leaders met with the White House representatives in our effort to turn the tide against globing warming through solar and wind development 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, who as our Trustee, has a responsibility to hear directly from tribal leaders in a government-to-government meeting. We are prepared to put forth our concerns for inclusion in the forthcoming Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) regarding the impacts the Keystone XL pipeline may have on Tribal homelands as well as our sacred sites, cultural resources, natural resources and water rights protected by treaty and other agreements.

The Executive Director of the GPTCA, Ms. Gay Kingman-Wapato, is the contact for the GPTCA and is empowered to work with your administration staff to coordinate a meeting at Secretary Jewell's earliest convenience. She can be reached at Cell: 605–484–3036 or e-mail, Kingmanwapato@rushmore.com

Sincerely,

JOHN STEELE,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION NO. 30–9–28–11

GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION (GPTCA)

Opposition to Keystone XL (''Keystone II'') Pipeline now being considered for authorization by the United States 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 recognizes the status of Indian Tribes as sovereigns and the status of American Indians as tribal citizens; 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 Indian reservations and lands as permanent homelands for tribes; and,

Whereas, On September 28, 2011, the Tribal Chairmen and the Tribal Council representatives from the Tribal Nations that are members of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association, have been meeting at the GPTCA/BIA/USACE Tribal Water Management Summit, discussing issues of great importance to the Indian Tribal Nations of the Great Plains Region and their members; and

Whereas, a major oil transmission pipeline is planned to extend from northern Alberta, Canada, from areas that have sand mixed with tar and oil, called ''tar sands'', to refineries in the United States; and

Whereas, the route of the pipeline, called Keystone II, or Keystone XL, because it is the second oil transmission pipeline to be constructed by the same company that built the first Keystone pipeline, crosses through Indian country in northern Alberta, Saskatchewan, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska, near and potentially over, many culturally significant areas for Tribal Nations within those provinces and states; and

Whereas, based on the relatively poor environmental record of the first Keystone pipeline, which includes numerous spills, U.S. regulators shut the pipeline down in late May, 2011, and, therefore, based on the record of the first Keystone pipeline, and other factors, it is probable that further environmental disasters will occur in Indian country if the new pipeline is allowed to be constructed; and

Whereas, the First Nations of Canada, representing the vast majority of First Nations impacted by ''tar sands'' development, have unanimously passed resolutions supporting a moratorium on new ''tar sands'' development and expansion until a ''cumulative effects management system'' is in place, and are also in opposition to the pipeline; and

Whereas, many U.S. Tribal Nations are also in opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline, including several Tribal Nations in the Great Plains, because it would threaten, among other things, the Oglala aquifer and other major water aquifers, rivers and water ways, public drinking water sources, including the Mni Wiconi Rural Water System, agricultural lands, animal life, cultural sites, and other resources vital to the peoples of the region in which the pipeline is proposed to be constructed; and

Whereas, Indian tribes including the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians are also in opposition to the Exxon-Imperial ''Heavy Haul'' proposal to transport ''tar sands'' equipment through the Nez Perce Reservation and across scenic highways, and several Indian tribes have joined in litigation to stop this proposal; and

Whereas, the pipeline is unnecessary as a number of other pipelines are not at full capacity to carry oil from Canada to refineries in the U.S., and the oil is also not likely to end up on the U.S. market but will be exported to foreign countries; and

Whereas, Tribal Nations and First Nations within Indian country near the route of the proposed pipeline have already stated their opposition to the proposed route of the pipeline, and because of earlier opposition from both Tribes and environmental groups, a supplemental environmental impact statement has been required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency from the proposed operators of the pipeline, a draft of which is now available for public comment; and

Whereas, since the pipeline is designed to cross the U.S.-Canadian border, the United States Department of State is the lead U.S. agency in evaluating whether the pipeline should be allowed to be constructed in the U.S.; and

Whereas, the First Nations of Canada and Tribal Nations within the U.S. have a long history of working to ensure protection of their environment, and the Keystone XL pipeline poses grave dangers if it is constructed; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of State is continuing to accept public comments until October 7, 2011, but despite the concerns of the numerous Tribal Nations and the First Nations of Canada has recently received notice from the U.S. Environmental 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

Whereas, Tribal Government Chairs and Presidents, Traditional Treaty Councils, and US property owners, met with the First Nations Chiefs of Canada, impacted by TransCanada's proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline and tar sands development present at the Rosebud Sioux Tribe Emergency Summit, September 15–16, 2011, on the protection of Mother Earth and Treaty Territories, developed the Mother Earth Accord for sign on by all First Nations and Tribal Nations: Now, therefore, be it

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 disagrees with the Finding of No Significant Impact issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and agrees to file these comments regarding this opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline with the Secretary of State as soon as possible; and

Be it further 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

Be it further resolved that the United States is urged to reduce its reliance on the world's dirtiest and most environmentally destructive form of oil—the ''tar sands''—that threatens Indian country in both Canada and the United States and the way of life of thousands of citizens of First Nations in Canada and American Indians in the U.S., and requests the U.S. government to take aggressive measures to work towards sustainable energy solutions that include clean alternative energy and improving energy efficiency; and

Be it finally 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 the Mother Earth Accord and voice the concerns of the US Tribal Nations and the First Nations of Canada opposing the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline across Treaty Lands as not in the national interest: Now, therefore be it finally

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 28, 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 28th 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.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

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 jobs of 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 Americans—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 of investment 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 been a core value of our Federal Government from its very founding. It is in no small part what the Federal Government was created to help do.

Last Tuesday the President laid out ideas for thinking more creatively about how to make these core investments—from improving efficiency to bringing private capital off the sidelines—and I am encouraged to hear Republican colleagues discussing infrastructure as an initiative they can work on with us. So let's get this done. Let's solve our highway trust fund challenges for good and make the long-term investments that will put people back to work and strengthen our Nation's economic backbone.

Second, the President's proposal to expand access to community colleges is an initiative that I hope will spark a broader discussion about how to make higher education more accessible and more affordable. I understand there is real disagreement here about how best to pay for it or how wide its scope should be, but that is what we can and should work on together.

We all know that higher education is necessary to ensure Americans have the skills they will need in the 21st century. We know community colleges can and should play a central role in achieving that mission. In manufacturing in particular, community colleges such as Delaware Tech in my home State play a central role in partnering with local businesses to create a talent pipeline that sustains a community and its economy. In Delaware the SEED and Inspire scholarships give students who are willing to work hard the chance to go to college and to learn the skills that will help them to contribute to Delaware's economy after they finish school. We can replicate Delaware's example across the country and find ways to work together to make community college and further higher education affordable and accessible. So let's work on this together.

Lastly, the President laid out some commonsense tax and work proposals to help give middle-class families more of a realistic leg up. Expanding the tax credits for families with children and streamlining childcare support makes sense to me. Making it easier for middle-class families to save for their kids' college education and to save for retirement at the same time would go a long way toward helping families to plan for the long term.

Around the country, too many of our work places lack family and medical leave policies that appreciate what it really takes to raise a family and live a healthy life. The President's proposal to work with States to improve their policies would be a great step and would help those communities that choose to, to create policies that suit their own local situations.

Let's work together on these ideas. Let's do something for middle-class families in our country. With a Republican Congress and a Democratic White House, we need to come together if we are going to get anything meaningful done. As President Obama made clear, we have a lot of important and difficult work to do. Our economy has come a long way from the great recession, but there is still work to do to strengthen our middle class. There is still work to do to broaden the opportunity 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. 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 Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], for Mrs. GILLIBRAND, proposes an amendment numbered 48 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 modify the definition of underground injection)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. 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.''.

Ms. CANTWELL. 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 three times, I think—at various times 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. ___. 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. 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.

One of the aftermath effects 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 see 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 Martynushkin, 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 I rise 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 that will never be shared, never be known, and the lost potential of a generation that perished in that camp between 1940 and 1945.

Ivan Martynushkin and his unit entered the camp thinking there would be a Nazi ambush, and then they noticed people behind barbed 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 their fellow man—7,000 prisoners left behind, 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, 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 90 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 24, 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 had been burned 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 ''interest-rate 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 the revocation of the Jew's 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 world 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 fight 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 possible reminder 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. The extreme characterization 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 basic 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 liberated 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, now, 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.

EXECUTIVE ACTION

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 provided that where 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 conformed its conduct to law.

His administration therefore has undermined the rule of law. Often patterns repeat. The President proposes legislation that the American people do not want, so 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 take various actions but fails to produce 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 laws 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 coercive to 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 or to its own power.

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 that it was his own view that the EPA is ''asserting 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 President'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 Obama 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 limits of Presidential power.

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 documents to remain without congressional approval.

In fact, at a recent Judiciary Committee hearing we heard testimony that the administration's misuse of parole 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 supporters of the rule of law must reject.

Texas and a number of other States have already filed suit challenging the immigration order'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, State laws to the contrary are unconstitutional.

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 using its 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 unelected 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 Guantanamo in exchange for an American sergeant. As the nonpartisan 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 they prepared 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.

The 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 obvious to 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 APA, 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 interpretation 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 letters 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 also 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 ruling in the Eighth Circuit.

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 the other 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 encumbrance 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 gratitude, 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 Department'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 before it is made final. 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 under 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, these unelected agencies violate the whole separation of powers. They act legislatively in violation of the limited authority Congress provides a particular agency. 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 already headed 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 provide him with the powers Congress would give a President in the event of a foreign invasion.

Those are extensive powers. But he was determined to ask Congress for power, not to act unilaterally because the ends justified the means. He wanted to use all the powers available under the Constitution, not exceed those powers.

Not only does the Constitution further government compliance with the rule of law through the separation of powers, it also sets up an executive branch that can act to check itself. Executive officials have their own legal powers that the President cannot interfere with. They can also refuse to carry out illegal Presidential orders.

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 rubberstamp for wild claims of Presidential power that exceed the Constitution and violate the laws.

What lawyer 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 recess 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 rule of law 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 endowed 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:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. BARRASSO, proposes an amendment numbered 245 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 clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. 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, 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 (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 246 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 246.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 246 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. DAINES. 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. _. 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 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 our public lands. Hunting, fishing, and hiking on our public lands are important parts of many Montanan's 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.

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 vote in relation to the following 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 to 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. _____. 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 expenditure under section 200303 or $10,000,000, whichever is greater, shall be available each fiscal year for projects that secure recreational 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 our 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 grandfather with tears in his eyes, 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 thought what a gift. I thought again of Mary 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 GOES BEYOND READING

(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, ruts, and shattered branches have created endless road stubble. Traffic is infrequent. Leahy hasn't seen Camel's Hump, a breathtaking view normally framed by her house's large west-facing windows, for almost a week due to stubborn low-hanging clouds. No other structure or human being intrudes.

In this isolated spot, Leahy has spent 20 years thinking through what it means to be literate. She believes it all comes down to creating communities that welcome everyone.

Two years ago Leahy, a Montpelier native, retired from Central Vermont Adult Basic Education after 34 years as co-director and four years before that as a field tutor. Throughout her tenure, she says in her soft voice, she worked to make adult literacy programs ''as inclusive as any other form of education, so that everyone could become part of the cultural community.''

Leahy is sitting in her living room, her telltale shock of white hair the same color as the walls inside and the snow piled outside. She can tell hundreds of stories about people she has encountered over the past decades. One woman holds a special place in the evolution of her thinking. According to Leahy, when this woman came to be tutored in reading, Leahy asked her why she felt the need to learn now, long after she had left school. She replied that she had a big maple tree in her front yard, and a dream that one day when she finished her chores, she would take a book and sit under that tree and read it.

''That became the beacon for the rest of my work,'' Leahy says.

One book in particular provided more inspiration. A middle-aged man under Mary's tutelage asked if they could read ''Black Beauty'' together. '''Why that book?''' she remembers asking. He had shown no interest in horses. He explained that ''Black Beauty'' had been popular when he was in school, but he could never join in the discussions about it because he couldn't read. He wanted to know how it ends.

''I think 'Black Beauty' was the most formative book I read as a child. It taught me about being compassionate. I read it over and over and over,'' she says.

And then there was a favorite nun at Leahy's college, St. Catherine University, in Minneapolis. She taught Leahy that ''work has to serve the world.''

After graduating and returning to Vermont, Leahy briefly tried her hand at farming before she started working in literacy.

''Literacy took up my imagination,'' Leahy says. ''It took up my heart, and I could see the changes in people's lives.''

Among the mementos from her father's shop that Mary Leahy keeps in her house is the letterpress type that once printed the ''ICE'' cards that people would put in their front windows when they wanted the iceman to make a delivery. Beautifully rendered in wood to begin with, the letter faces are as smooth as glass after decades of use. Beside them is a well-used brass can that contained solvent to clean the type.

Soon, 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 fill out the 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 cultural 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 clients, 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 have learning disabilities that weren't 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 stressed 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 independence, forming a board, fundraising, starting an alternative high school program for teens, and very important, from her perspective, hosting reading and discussion programs. In 1989 she helped organize the first statewide conference for Vermont's newly literate, ABE

students who had once believed their opinions did not matter.

Leahy learned early in life what it means to be part of a community. Her father, a printer, had a shop near 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 these 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 first grandchild. ''Things are going to be different than they were for me and your mother,'' he wrote. ''Your mother would bring papers home from school, and I'd 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, will resonate for generations. Another student was 93 when he learned to read. He had vowed to learn to read before he died.

These Vermonters and all the others whose lives Leahy has touched in her life's work are no longer outliers.

''We all belong to a very special group of people,'' she says. ''We can read and write.''

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator BROWN, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

RULE 1.—REGULAR MEETING DATE FOR COMMITTEE

The regular meeting day for the Committee to transact its business shall be the last Tuesday in each month that the Senate is in Session; except that if the Committee has met at any time during the month prior to the last Tuesday of the month, the regular meeting of the Committee may be canceled at the discretion of the Chairman.

RULE 2.—COMMITTEE

[a] Investigations.—No investigation shall be initiated by the Committee unless the Senate, or the full Committee, or the Chairman and Ranking Member have specifically authorized such investigation.

[b] Hearings.—No hearing of the Committee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia except by agreement between the Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Member of the Committee or 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 either 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 or by a majority vote of the Committee.

[d] Interrogation of witnesses.—Committee interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Committee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Committee.

[e] Prior notice of markup sessions.—No session of the Committee or a Subcommittee for marking up any measure shall be held unless [1] each member of the Committee or the Subcommittee, as the case may be, has been notified in writing via electronic mail or paper mail of the date, time, and place of such session and has been furnished a copy of the measure to be considered, in a searchable electronic format, at least 3 business days prior to the commencement of such session, or [2] the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee determines that exigent circumstances exist requiring that the session be held sooner.

[f] Prior notice of first degree amendments.—It shall not be in order for the Committee or a Subcommittee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee unless fifty written copies of such amendment have been delivered to the office of the Committee at least 2 business days prior to the meeting. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Senator to offer a motion to strike a single section of any measure under consideration. Such a motion to strike a section of the measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee shall not be amendable. This section may be waived by a majority of the members of the Committee or Subcommittee voting, or by agreement of the Chairman and Ranking Member. This subsection shall apply only when the conditions of subsection [e][1] have been met.

[g] Cordon rule.—Whenever a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall be before the Committee or Subcommittee, from initial consideration in hearings through final consideration, the Clerk shall place before each member of the Committee or Subcommittee a print of the statute or the part or section thereof to be amended or repealed showing by stricken-through type, the part or parts to be omitted, and in italics, the matter proposed to be added. In addition, whenever a member of the Committee or Subcommittee offers an amendment to a bill or joint resolution under consideration, those amendments shall be presented to the Committee or Subcommittee in a like form, showing by typographical devices the effect of the proposed amendment on existing law. The requirements of this subsection may be waived when, in the opinion of the Committee or Subcommittee Chairman, it is necessary to expedite the business of the Committee or Subcommittee.

RULE 3.—SUBCOMMITTEES

[a] Authorization for.—A Subcommittee of the Committee may be authorized only by the action of a majority of the Committee.

[b] Membership.—No member may be a member of more than three Subcommittees and no member may chair more than one Subcommittee. No member will receive assignment to a second Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members of the Committee have chosen assignments to one Subcommittee, and no member shall receive assignment to a third Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members have chosen assignments to two Subcommittees.

[c] Investigations.—No investigation shall be initiated by a Subcommittee unless the Senate or the full Committee has specifically authorized such investigation.

[d] Hearings.—No hearing of a Subcommittee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia without prior consultation with the Chairman and then only by agreement between the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

[e] Confidential testimony.—No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Subcommittee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

[f] Interrogation of witnesses.—Subcommittee interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Subcommittee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee.

[g] Special meetings.—If at least three members of a Subcommittee desire that a special meeting of the Subcommittee be called by the Chairman of the Subcommittee, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman of the Subcommittee for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of the Subcommittee of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman of the Subcommittee does not call the requested special meeting, to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Subcommittee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Subcommittee will be held, specifying the date and hour of that special meeting. The Subcommittee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify all members of the Subcommittee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the Chairman of the Subcommittee is not present at any regular or special meeting of the Subcommittee, the Ranking Member of the majority party on the Subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

[h] Voting.—No measure or matter shall be recommended from a Subcommittee to the Committee unless a majority of the Subcommittee are actually present. The vote of the Subcommittee to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Subcommittee voting. On Subcommittee matters other than a vote to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee no record vote shall be taken unless a majority of the Subcommittee is actually present. Any absent member of a Subcommittee may affirmatively request that his or her vote to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee or his vote on any such other matters on which a record vote is taken, be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter and to inform the Subcommittee as to how the member wishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman of the Subcommittee any time before the record vote

on the measure or matter concerned is taken, the member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies shall be kept in the files of the Committee.

RULE 4.—WITNESSES

[a] Filing of statements.—Any witness appearing before the Committee or Subcommittee [including any witness representing a Government agency] must file with the Committee or Subcommittee [24 hours preceding his or her appearance] 75 copies of his or her statement to the Committee or Subcommittee, and the statement must include a brief summary of the testimony. In the event that the witness fails to file a written statement and brief summary in accordance with this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee has the discretion to deny the witness the privilege of testifying before the Committee or Subcommittee until the witness has properly complied with the rule.

[b] Length of statements.—Written statements properly filed with the Committee or Subcommittee may be as lengthy as the witness desires and may contain such documents or other addenda as the witness feels is necessary to present properly his or her views to the Committee or Subcommittee. The brief summary included in the statement must be no more than 3 pages long. It shall be left to the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee as to what portion of the documents presented to the Committee or Subcommittee shall be published in the printed transcript of the hearings.

[c] Ten-minute duration.—Oral statements of witnesses shall be based upon their filed statements but shall be limited to 10 minutes duration. This period may be limited or extended at the discretion of the Chairman presiding at the hearings.

[d] Subpoena of witnesses.—Witnesses may be subpoenaed by the Chairman of the Committee or a Subcommittee with the agreement of the Ranking Member of the Committee or Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Committee or Subcommittee.

[e] Counsel permitted.—Any witness subpoenaed by the Committee or Subcommittee to a public or executive hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his or her own choosing who shall be permitted, while the witness is testifying, to advise him or her of his or her legal rights.

[f] Expenses of witnesses.—No witness shall be reimbursed for his or her appearance at a public or executive hearing before the Committee or Subcommittee unless such reimbursement is agreed to by the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee.

[g] Limits of questions.—Questioning of a witness by members shall be limited to 5 minutes duration when 5 or more members are present and 10 minutes duration when less than 5 members are present, except that if a member is unable to finish his or her questioning in this period, he or she may be permitted further questions of the witness after all members have been given an opportunity to question the witness.

Additional opportunity to question a witness shall be limited to a duration of 5 minutes until all members have been given the opportunity of questioning the witness for a second time. This 5–minute period per member will be continued until all members have exhausted their questions of the witness.

RULE 5.—VOTING

[a] Vote to report a measure or matter.—No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. The vote of the Committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Committee who are present.

Any absent member may affirmatively request that his or her vote to report a matter be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter, and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman any time before the record vote on the measure or matter concerned is taken, any member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies shall be kept in the files of the Committee, along with the record of the rollcall vote of the members present and voting, as an official record of the vote on the measure or matter.

[b] Vote on matters other than to report a measure or matter.—On Committee matters other than a vote to report a measure or matter, no record vote shall be taken unless a majority of the Committee are actually present. On any such other matter, a member of the Committee may request that his or her vote may be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter, and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman any time before the vote on such other matter is taken, the member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies relating to such other matters shall be kept in the files of the Committee.

RULE 6.—QUORUM

No executive session of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be called to order unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, are actually present. Unless the Committee otherwise provides or is required by the Rules of the Senate, one member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence, the swearing in of witnesses, and the taking of testimony.

RULE 7.—STAFF PRESENT ON DAIS

Only members and the Clerk of the Committee shall be permitted on the dais during public or executive hearings, except that a member may have one staff person accompany him or her during such public or executive hearing on the dais. If a member desires a second staff person to accompany him or her on the dais he or she must make a request to the Chairman for that purpose.

RULE 8.—COINAGE LEGISLATION

At least 67 Senators must cosponsor any gold medal or commemorative coin bill or resolution before consideration by the Committee.

EXTRACTS FROM THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

RULE XXV, STANDING COMMITTEES

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * * * *

[d][1] Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Banks, banking, and financial institutions.
2. Control of prices of commodities, rents, and services.
3. Deposit insurance.
4. Economic stabilization and defense production.
5. Export and foreign trade promotion.
6. Export controls.
7. Federal monetary policy, including Federal Reserve System.
8. Financial aid to commerce and industry.
9. Issuance and redemption of notes.
10. Money and credit, including currency and coinage.
11. Nursing home construction.
12. Public and private housing [including veterans' housing].
13. Renegotiation of Government contracts.
14. Urban development and urban mass transit.

[2] Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to international economic policy as it affects United States monetary affairs, credit, and financial institutions; economic growth, urban affairs, and credit, and report thereon from time to time.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FOR PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Procedures formally adopted by the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, February 4, 1981, establish a uniform questionnaire for all Presidential nominees whose confirmation hearings come before this Committee.

In addition, the procedures establish that:

[1] A confirmation hearing shall normally be held at least 5 days after receipt of the completed questionnaire by the Committee unless waived by a majority vote of the Committee.

[2] The Committee shall vote on the confirmation not less than 24 hours after the Committee has received transcripts of the hearing unless waived by unanimous consent.

[3] All nominees routinely shall testify under oath at their confirmation hearings.

This questionnaire shall be made a part of the public record except for financial information, which shall be kept confidential.

Nominees are requested to answer all questions, and to add additional pages where necessary.

DEFENDING THE JONES ACT

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the Jones Act, an important law for our Nation's maritime industry and for our national security. Senator MCCAIN has filed an amendment to repeal the Jones Act, and I urge its defeat.

In Louisiana, we know how important the maritime industry and Jones Act-related jobs are to our State and our economy. According to the American Maritime Partnership, Louisiana leads the Nation in maritime jobs by a number of measurements of the domestic maritime economy. For domestic maritime employment, Louisiana has more jobs than any other State—55,000 jobs out of close to 500,000 nationwide. Louisiana also leads the Nation in per capita maritime jobs, with 1 in 83 jobs being tied to our domestic maritime industries, nearly twice that of any other State. For total economic output from domestic maritime activity, Louisiana again leads the nation with more than $11 billion per year.

Louisiana's 2,800 miles of navigable waterways handle more waterborne commerce than any other State. Tugboats based in Louisiana facilitate entry of cargo into the Mississippi River and then up the river and throughout the Nation on our inland waterways. This vast infrastructure

and the maritime operators using it directly benefit the entire Nation. For example, 60 percent of export grain travels to the Gulf of Mexico through Louisiana. Also, one-fifth of our domestic energy is produced off the coast of Louisiana with support from the domestic fleet of offshore workboats.

The Jones Act helps ensure the strength and stability of our domestic maritime industry, and it will help ensure that it continues to flourish. These jobs and the economic benefits from them would be at risk if the Jones Act were repealed. I have no doubt that our industries can and will compete effectively against their counterparts around the world. However, they cannot compete fairly against the heavy subsidization that foreign governments give to their industries. Also, there cannot be fair competition when foreign vessels are not subjected to the same requirements for safety, fuel containers, labor standards, training, incidental vessel discharges, other environmental regulations, taxes, and more that our industries have to follow.

Also, the Jones Act is vital to the military as it protects our national security. In order to ensure our Navy remains the best equipped and most powerful Navy in the world, we must have domestic skills base and shipbuilding capacity. Also, we need to have an adequate domestic fleet to ensure the fast and secure delivery of vital military cargoes around the world.

For our homeland security, the Jones Act helps keep our ports and waterways safer from attack. Imagine if our inland waterways and ports were fully open to foreign vessels. The Coast Guard and our other law enforcement agencies would have no real, effective way to know if vessels are safe as they travel through our river communities, if the crews are properly licensed for the vessel's operation, or if anyone or anything on the vessels pose a risk. The Jones Act helps our first responders and law enforcement better know any potential threats and allows them to be better prepared to act in an emergency.

In short, any legislation to repeal or lessen the protections of the Jones Act would threaten jobs, economic growth, military strength, and homeland security. I will continue working to support the U.S. maritime industry.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

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 and his more than six decades of service to his family, friends, community, and the State of Delaware.•

REMEMBERING JAMES ALLEN

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor the life and legacy of Rogers Police Chief James Allen, who passed away on Thursday after a long battle with cancer.

After more than three decades of public service, Chief Allen was well respected in the law enforcement community across Arkansas. He was a dedicated leader who devoted his life to law enforcement.

Chief Allen graduated from Arkansas State University with a degree in criminal justice. Following graduation he joined the Jacksonville Police Department and within a few short years was named the captain of the Pulaski County Sheriff's Office. Chief Allen was the youngest police chief to serve on the Bentonville Police Force, a position which he held for 22 years. During his time at the helm of the Bentonville Police Department, Chief Allen graduated from the FBI National Academy. In 2011, he became the Rogers police chief.

I am greatly appreciative for Chief Allen's continued service over the years to Arkansas and Rogers, the community I call home. Chief Allen was a man of the law, and he was always looking for opportunities to improve the resources for his staff and the community by applying for grants. I was happy to help support his endeavors.

I pray for his family and friends during this trying time, and I hope they find comfort knowing that Chief Allen touched so many lives in the State. He will be missed but leaves a lasting legacy.•

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 Carson Irrigation 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 Committee. Although I missed him by 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. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 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 also 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 Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 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 Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

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; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 272. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 42. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By 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.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. THUNE):

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. GRASSLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, 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 reductions to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE:

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. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, 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. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, 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. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, 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. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COATS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BURR, and Mr. BLUNT):

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. WYDEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. PETERS):

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 or 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 names 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. THUNE, 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 care coverage mandate.

S. 143

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes.

S. 144

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 144, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, 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. BOXER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) 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 38, 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. HEINRICH) 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.

S. 214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of 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.

S. 234

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.

S. 247

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.

S. 255

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 255, a bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 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.

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. BURR, 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

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 fora 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 reprimanded 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-paid 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 served by a case manager, 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 survey.

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 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,

SECTION 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—

(1) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (5)(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 (i), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(IV) by striking clause (ii); and

(V) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(ii) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

''(6) unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes who—

''(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 shall include—

''(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or

''(ii) living in a room in a motel or hotel.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'other Federal statute' has the meaning given that term in section 401; and

''(2) the term 'public housing agency' means an agency described in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)).'';

(2) in section 401—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) by striking clause (iv); and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi);

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking ''Federal statute other than this subtitle'' and inserting ''other Federal statute''; and

(ii) by inserting ''of'' before ''this Act'';

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (33) as paragraphs (15) through (34), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

''(14) OTHER FEDERAL STATUTE.—The term 'other Federal statute' includes—

''(A) the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.);

''(B) the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

''(C) subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.);

''(D) section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(h));

''(E) section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

''(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(f)(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 publically 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.'';

(4) in section 422—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) RESTRICTION.—In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not consider or prioritize the specific homeless

populations intended to be served by the applicant if the applicant demonstrates that the project—

''(A) would meet the priorities identified in the plan submitted under section 427(b)(1)(B); and

''(B) is cost-effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives identified in that plan.''; and

(B) by striking subsection (j);

(5) in section 424(d), by striking paragraph (5);

(6) in section 427(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(II) in clause (vii), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (viii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(II) in clause (iv)(VI), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (v);

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (F); and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(7) by amending section 433 to read as follows:

''SEC. 433. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report, which shall—

''(1) summarize the activities carried out under this subtitle and set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary as a result of the activities; and

''(2) include, for the year preceding the date on which the report is submitted—

''(A) data required to be made publically available in the report under section 409; and

''(B) data on programs funded under any other Federal statute, as such term is defined in section 401.

''(b) TIMING.—A report under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 4 months after the end of each fiscal year.''.

By Mr. INHOFE:

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.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to name the Federal courthouse serving the Western District of Oklahoma after the late Judge William J. Holloway.

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 service, 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 unequivocally 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 text of the bill and a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 261

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

SECTION 1. WILLIAM J. HOLLOWAY, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the ''William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA,
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, August 14, 2014.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: We are writing to respectfully request that the United States Courthouse in Oklahoma City be named the ''William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse.'' Judge Holloway died on April 25, 2014, at the age of 90. At that time, he was the longest serving judge in the history of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, having served for over 45 years. During his remarkable tenure on the court, Judge Holloway authored over 900 opinions and participated in the decision of thousands more.

Judge Holloway was a kind, compassionate man who quietly and diligently spent his lifetime working for justice. He did so without fanfare, seeking only to fulfill the great responsibility given to him. Though Judge Holloway is deceased, we can think of no more noble name for our courthouse than the ''William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse.'' He embodied every trait that all federal judges should strive to achieve.

This request is made by every federal judge in Oklahoma City. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you have any questions about our request.

Yours very truly,

Jerome A. Holmes, U.S. Circuit Judge; Vicki Miles-LaGrange, Chief U.S. District Judge; Robert E. Bacharach, U.S. Circuit Judge; Robin J. Cauthron, U.S. District Judge; Stephen P. Friot, U.S. District Judge; Timothy D. DeGiusti, U.S. District Judge; David L. Russell, Senior U.S. District Judge; Gary M. Purcell, Chief U.S. Magistrate Judge; Suzanne Mitchell, U.S. Magistrate Judge; Sarah Hall, Chief U.S. Bankruptcy Judge; Joe Heaton, U.S. District Judge; Lee R. West, Senior U.S. District Judge; Tim Leonard, Senior U.S. District Judge; Shon T. Erwin, U.S. Magistrate Judge; Charles B. Goodwin, U.S. Magistrate Judge; Niles L. Jackson, U.S. Bankruptcy Judge.

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 in 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. A recent 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 the basic services 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 address the needs of 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 leaving home 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 new 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 as part of the Leahy-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 was proud to support as the most senior member of the Appropriations Committee. But we must not forget the importance of investing in prevention efforts as well, and I was disappointed that Congress failed to pass the bipartisan Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. If we are to make a real difference to end modern day slavery, we must protect those who are most vulnerable and prevent the exploitation in the first place. We cannot simply 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; we are not doing enough. 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 encourage the development of successful, productive young adults.

I have heard from dozens of service providers from across the country, including in my home state of Vermont, that these programs work. I am proud to say that last year, 95 percent of youth receiving services from the Vermont Coalition for Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs were able to exit to a safe living situation upon their completion of programming. Without the programs funded through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, hundreds of thousands of children would be left on the street and vulnerable to exploitation. Congress has an opportunity to respond in a meaningful and historic way.

I thank Senators COLLINS, BOOKER, and AYOTTE for working with me on this legislation and for joining me as original cosponsors. We have the chance to make a real difference by passing the Runway 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 their 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 the amount of 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 benefits by 2013. 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. However, many more of our veterans remain unjustly impacted by the denial of concurrent receipt.

For me, this is a simple matter of fairness. There is no reason to deny a veteran who has served their country honorably the right to the full value of their retirement pay simply because their service also resulted in a disability that affects them each and every day for the rest of their lives. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the current law does. This legislation will bring that indefensible practice to an end.

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 utmost 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

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 ''Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' 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 (c) 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, $0.''.

(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 uniformed services who—

''(A) is entitled to retired pay (other than by reason of section 12731b of this title); and

''(B) is also entitled for that month to veterans' disability compensation.''.

(2) DISABILITY RETIREES.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

''(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

''(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member.''.

(b) 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.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 42—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SHELBY submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 42

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs (in this resolution referred to as the ''committee'') is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

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 under this resolution shall not exceed $3,119,153, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $8,370 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

(2) not to exceed $503 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 FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed $5,347,119, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $14,348 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

(2) not to exceed $861 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed $2,227,966, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $5,978 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

(2) not to exceed $358 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.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except 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.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account 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. 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; 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. LEE, 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 245. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed 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, supra.

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, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

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. 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. __. PROHIBITION ON LISTING THE NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall not list the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

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. 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. PROHIBITION ON LISTING THE NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall not list the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 245. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed 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. ___. 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, as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

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. __. 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 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.

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 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Perspectives on the Strategic Necessity of Iran Sanctions.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance 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 ''President Obama's 2015 Trade Policy Agenda.''

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 haven't 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. JULIUS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 14, 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 PERCIASEPE, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STUART F. DELERY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE DEREK ANTHONY WEST, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to recognize the 100th anniversary of Kiwanis International. Annually, Kiwanis clubs in 80 countries raise more than $100 million and dedicate more than 18 million volunteer hours to strengthen communities and serve children.

Meeting the needs of children has always been one of Kiwanis members' foremost priorities. Under their new motto, ''Serving the Children of the World,'' Kiwanis members have helped to establish programs that ensure the health and education of young children. In Central Florida, Kiwanis members generously give their time and resources to provide scholarships and community-building opportunities for local students, as well as care for the underprivileged.

Kiwanis members' commitment to serving their neighbors and the self-sacrifice that entails represents what is good and noble in our nation. There are children and others whose lives have been permanently impacted for good by the work of Kiwanis members.

I am truly grateful for the Kiwanis Club members of Central Florida. Our community is stronger, and the future of our youth is brighter because of their service.

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 the growing problem of human trafficking in the United States. These bipartisan bills will provide support and services to the victims of 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.

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.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the National Federation of the Blind.

For 75 years NFB has served as the voice of the blind in Washington and through their affiliate organizations in every state across the country. I congratulate them on this milestone of service, their advocacy efforts on behalf of blind Americans, and their continued work to make our communities more just, equal, and safe for blind individuals.

As the largest organization of blind and low-vision people in the country, NFB works day in and day out to change what it means to be blind and to help realize the complete integration of blind individuals into society.

On this 75th anniversary, I join in celebrating the National Federation of the Blind's long-list of achievements and look forward to their continued success representing the million-plus blind individuals in the United States.

IN HONOR OF SPECIALIST JOSHUA FERNANDEZ

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the House of Representatives to the remarkable performance of one of my constituents, Specialist Joshua Fernandez, proudly serving in the California National Guard. A native of Soledad, California, Specialist Fernandez was selected as the 2015 California National Guard Soldier of the Year. This title is only bestowed to those soldiers who emerge victorious from the Guard's Best Warrior Competition; a grueling, four-day contest that includes a 6-mile road march, a chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear knowledge report, and a series of physical fitness and rifle and pistol competitions.

SPC Joshua Fernandez serves as a Team Leader with Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 184th Infantry Regiment. He served three years active duty service at Fort Stewart, Georgia with the 3rd Infantry Division prior to enlisting in the California Army National Guard. He has served in one combat deployment during Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan attached to a Special Operations Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Specialist Joshua Fernandez for his steadfast commitment to service to our great Nation on behalf of the House of Representatives. He is a shining example of the dedication and sacrifices made by the men and women who serve in United States Armed Forces.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 469, Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015. Human trafficking is a form of modern-day slavery. This bill would make it possible to accurately identify and help children from the child welfare system who are trafficked into the sex trade.

The sickening fact is that human trafficking 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, Democrats and Republicans, in taking additional steps to protect our sons and daughters from this horrible crime.

As we recognize January as Human Trafficking Awareness month, I urge 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.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

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

have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MR. CUB, ERNIE BANKS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. 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, cheers would always erupt 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 open 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.'

It's clear that the next generation appreciates the impact of Mr. Cub. We can honor the legacy of Mr. Cub by doing our own part to break down barriers and build a better community. We will miss you, Ernie.

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

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 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 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.

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 colleague to join me in voting for its passage which will help bring an end to the evil practice that is child sex trafficking.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET AUTONOMY ACT OF 2015

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, District of Columbia residents raise billions of dollars annually for their local budget, and, like Americans everywhere, claim the right to control the funds they themselves raise to support their city as fundamental to their American citizenship. Therefore, today I introduce the District of Columbia Budget Autonomy Act of 2015, the second bill I introduce this Congress, to allow the District's local-taxpayer-raised budget to take effect immediately when passed by the city, without being subject to congressional approval.

Control over the dollars raised by local taxpayers is central to local control, the oldest American government principle. Beyond this core principle, permitting the city's local budget to become law without a redundant congressional approval would have multiple practical benefits for both the city and Congress. For the city, a timely budget means eliminating the uncertainty of the congressional approval process, which has a significant negative effect on the city's bond rating, adding unnecessary interest costs for local taxpayers; improving the District's ability to make accurate revenue forecasts; and reducing the countless operational problems that result when the city's budget cannot be implemented until Congress approves it (even when it is not delayed, which rarely occurs). Also of major importance, the bill would permit the District to use the typical state and local government fiscal year (July 1–June 30), which is used to provide ample time to prepare for the opening of schools in September, instead of the current federal fiscal year (October 1–September 30), used for the convenience of Members of Congress, not the needs of the city. Moreover, the D.C. local budget consumes valuable subcommittee, committee, and floor time in both houses of Congress, the most inefficient and redundant annual process in the Congress. Yet the D.C. budget is of interest only to those members who use it to promote their own issues, violating a principle of local self-government that they value for their own districts and states.

Increasing recognition of the hardships and delays caused by the congressional approval process has led Congress to begin freeing the city from many congressional constraints. We made significant progress in the last Congress on a major element of budget autonomy. There is unprecedented bipartisan and bicameral support for preventing D.C. shutdowns, which have been constantly threatened as the Congress now almost always fails to pass appropriations bills. Under the fiscal year 2014 D.C. Appropriations bill, D.C. was, for the first time ever, exempt from shutdowns for an entire fiscal year—2015. The fiscal year 2015 D.C. Appropriations bill also exempts D.C. from shutdowns for all of fiscal year 2016. In addition, the president's budgets last Congress and the Senate's D.C. appropriations bills would have granted D.C. budget autonomy. This progress from both Congress and the Executive invites the inevitable next step—a permanent shutdown exemption bill.

The importance of eliminating shutdown threats to the District was definitively 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 District's outstanding general obligation bonds, Standard & Poor's Rating Services and Fitch Ratings both favorably cited the provision, 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 nearly secured 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 grant it. We also got budget autonomy introduced as a stand-alone bill in the Senate.

We kept the budget 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 permanently ban the District from spending its local funds on abortion services 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 a 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 takes 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 providing paid parental leave. The U.S. is 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. It costs nothing—but it means everything. 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 must-pass 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 Schock 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 for 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.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF DELANO'S CENTENNIAL

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Delano, California in honor of its centennial.

After its founding by the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1873, Delano was incorporated on April 13, 1915. It is an extremely culturally diverse community, with residents who have ties to Mexico, Spain, China, France, Japan, Yugoslavia, the Philippines, Russia, and India.

Delano is also an area with rich history. During World War II, a prisoner of war camp was located in Delano. Additionally, a squadron of Northrop P–61 Black Widow planes that protected the Pacific coast from invasion during the war was based there. Delano played an important role in ensuring the safety of the homeland throughout this conflict

Located in the Central Valley, Delano plays a substantial role in our nation's agricultural industry. The local farmers in Delano are known for the grapes, oranges, almonds, pistachios, and cotton they farm. Without the hard work of Delano's farmers, the economy of the Central Valley and the food reserves in the United States would be dramatically compromised.

In honor of Delano's centennial, the city will be hosting a 100th Year Gala Celebration on January 31, 2015. The celebration will provide the people of Delano with the opportunity to look back on their city's past with pride and look forward to its bright future with excitement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the City of Delano on their centennial and honoring the city for its immense contributions to our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVE BRAT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 41, I was present on the House Floor and attempted to vote ''YES'' via my electronic voting card. However, it has been brought to my attention that my vote was not recorded.

Had I been present, I would have voted YES.

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.

That 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 clinical 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. In 2011, 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 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 Boston 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 dream in his business 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, WGGR 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, an 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. 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 unquestionably deserves the nation's utmost attention. It is particularly difficult to see the victimization of the very young who are sold or tricked into becoming victims of Human Trafficking.

I join 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 clubs 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 Texas urban areas Houston, San Antonio and El Paso and dozens of mid- and small sized 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 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 February 7th. Elise Jones Martin has been a stalwart of her community in Columbia, South Carolina for decades, and is very deserving of this recognition she is receiving from people all across the State of South Carolina.

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 on its 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 her valuable contributions 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 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.

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 Georgette 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 even 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.

In addition to her official duties, Georgette was generous, donating 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 during Saturday evening mass. One of her favorite retirement roles was reading 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, Martie and Monique, her 7-year-old grandson, Taylor, her many, 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 closes 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 civilians serve 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.

Widely 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 Armor Association honored her with the Order 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 TRAFFICKING 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," which strengthens the 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.

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.

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.

Houston is a popular trafficking hub in part because the city is so diverse, with large Hispanic, Asian and Middle Eastern populations, which allows traffickers and their victims to blend into local communities.

A recent report estimated that 25% of all trafficking victims in the U.S. end up in Texas.

Rather, they are treated as youthful offenders and consigned to the criminal justice system.

The city is so diverse, the traffickers and victims easily blend into the community.

The TIP Report also contains tier rankings of each country on which it reports, which are used to help protect victims, prevent trafficking and prosecute traffickers.

According to a report published in the Northwestern Journal of International Human Rights, Mexican authorities are working to address the problem of trans-border human trafficking, but the country's "legal framework remains largely untouched and hence limited in its crime-fighting scope and effectiveness."

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.

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.

Such 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 cofounder 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 the crime of 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 arrest and jailed because they are mistaken for criminal. Forgiven immigrants kidnapped and brought to the US are told their families will be harmed 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 MALONEY. This bill will 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, Stevens 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 Stevens' last year as producer 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 a wide cross-section 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, Lily Tomlin, Patricia McBride 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 creating 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 ''one of the ten best films 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 grandmothers 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, A 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 The 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 thirty-six 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 and Abortion 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.

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 public and selfless service. Although he is retiring from the Coroner's role, he will stay on as a physician's assistant at the Touchstone Family Practice and I look forward to seeing him continue his dedicated work as a leader in the Pueblo County community.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PRIORITIZATION 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. 514, ''Human Trafficking Prioritization Act.''

I support this bipartisan legislation which amends the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to change the status of the State Department Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to that of the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

Mr. Speaker, this change in the name of this vital office can be accomplished without an increase in funding or personnel.

H.R. 514, a bipartisan Foreign Affairs Committee bipartisan bill, directs the Secretary of State to report to Congress on each current Assistant Secretary of State position the exact title and length of designation as Assistant Secretary, and whether that designation was legislatively mandated or authorized and, if so, the relevant statutory citation; and

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 such standards.

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 labour (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.

THANKING DIANE ENOS AND WELCOMING PRESIDENT DELBERT RAY, SR.

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the steady leadership of Diane Enos who recently ended her term as 23rd President of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community in my hometown of Scottsdale. Additionally, I would like to share my personal gratitude for Diane's friendship. Diane has spent her lifetime working to make Arizona better, and she has done so with incredible grace. Furthermore, it is with goodwill and faith that I welcome President Delbert Ray, Sr. to his post as the 24th President of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. I look forward to working on the many issues that are of vital importance to our community and the future of Arizona.

PROTECTING THE VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support a number of bills this week that will improve identification of, and services for, children who are victims of sex trafficking, including runaway and homeless kids.

Every year, as many as 300,000 young people become the victims of sex trafficking, while others are forced into a life of virtual slavery in hard labor and the drug trade. In particular, homeless young people are at risk of falling into this tragic life.

Unfortunately, many of our young that fall prey to the dark characters who run these trades have already been involved in the child welfare system at one government level or another. What this screams to us is that the welfare system has failed these children. It seems clear that the evils of trafficking are not something our child welfare workers are sufficiently prepared to deal with.

We must improve the ability of child welfare workers to identify and assess child victims of trafficking—including runaway and homeless youth—and the services they need. We must engage in a coordinated effort at the federal, state, and local levels to collect and share information that will help analyze and identify youth trafficking. We must also identify state efforts that successfully serve youth trafficking victims in order to spread best practices to other states.

These are commonsense solutions to better identify and serve victims of youth trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these important bills.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT (H.R. 37)

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

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 modest 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 Tremendous Community Service and Attainment of her 80th Birthday.

Being publicly involved provides 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, the largest number of people trafficked into the United States come from East Asia and the Pacific and the next highest numbers coming from Latin America and Europe.

Law enforcement reports 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.

Daily Digest

Senate

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: **Pages S497–S537**

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**

Markey 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**

Markey 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 benefitting 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**

Murkowski (for Barrasso) Amendment No. 245 (to Amendment No. 2), to clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect. **Page S536**

Daines Amendment No. 246 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority. **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), Merkley 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), Heitkamp Amendment No. 133 (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: **Page S541**

Measures Referred: **Page S541**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S541**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S542–43**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S543–46**

Additional Statements: **Page S540**

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 Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection: Senators Toomey (Chair), Crapo, Heller, Rounds, Corker, Vitter, Kirk, Scott, Merkley, Reed, Schumer, Menendez, Warner, Warren, 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.

Subcommittee on Economic Policy: Senators Heller (Chair), Toomey, Cotton, Rounds, Sasse, Moran, Warren, Tester, Merkley, and Heitkamp.

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). **Page H637**

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 ⅔ 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 ⅔ 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. **Page H618**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, January 28. **Page H626**

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

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled ''Rebuilding After the Storm: Lessening Impacts and Speeding Recovery''. Testimony was heard from W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Francis X. McCarthy, Analyst in Emergency Management Policy, Congressional Research Service; R. David Paulison, Former Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency; and public witnesses.

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, subcommittee assignments, 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

Senate Chamber

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.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Wednesday, January 28

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 351—LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E125
Brat, Dave, Va., E120
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E121
Carter, John R., Tex., E123
Cicilline, David N., Calif, E119
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E122
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E117
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E124
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E126
Farr, Sam, Calif., E117
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E117
Forbes, J. Randy, Va., E124
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E117
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E117
Hahn, Janice, Calif., E126
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E118, E120, E120, E121, E123, E125, E126
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E119
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E119, E126
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E118
Olson, Pete, Tex., E122
Poe, Ted, Tex., E123
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E118, E121
Schweikert, David, Ariz., E125
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E125
Valadao, David G., Calif., E120
Walden, Greg, Ore., E122
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E122
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E117

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.