United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 2012 No. 70

# House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
*May 16, 2012.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOE BARTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

## MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The Violence Against Women Act has been one of the great legislative successes of the last two decades. Since it was first signed into law by President Clinton, there is no question that it has helped millions of women by funding a variety of community violence protection programs and a variety of victim assistance services from coast to coast while providing a legal framework for protection. Republicans and Democrats alike have supported the legislation in all subsequent reauthorizations because of the recognition for the vital nature of the services that are provided and the impact that it has not just on women, but on the children in these families. That's why it was reauthorized in 2000 and then again in 2005 under a Republican administration with President Bush.

In this Congress, that tradition of bipartisan support continues in the Senate, which has approved a stronger version of the legislation developed in the Senate Judiciary Committee, cosponsored by both Chair LEAHY and Ranking Member CRAPO. Sadly, it's facing a decidedly different fate in the House.

Once again, the Republican majority is advancing legislation by one of their new Members that is designed not to bring people together to solve problems, but to create unnecessary divisions. Their bill would actually roll back, for the first time, these established rights rather than increase them. The House legislation would fail to provide protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transsexual individuals. It would fail Native American victims who are assaulted on tribal lands by nontribal predators. The bill would discourage immigrants from reporting sexual assaults and other crimes by placing unnecessary restrictions on new visa programs and not increase the emergency visas for individuals who immigrate to the United States on a marriage or fiancee visa and are subject to an abusive relationship.

Not only does the House bill miss these opportunities, but it would remove the current confidentiality protections for victims who still had immigrant status. It would inexplicably reduce violence reporting requirements on colleges and universities. These are all tools widely used and supported by law enforcement officials to help keep communities safe by prosecuting criminals and protecting victims.

The House bill would decentralize the Violence Against Women immigration adjudication process, bypassing examiners who are trained in domestic violence and sexual assault, instead, mandating additional interviews on battered immigrants. These are people who usually have very limited options to protect themselves. We should not complicate the lives of some of the most vulnerable people in the United States. These victims of violence—usually women in the most difficult of circumstances—will be burdened, hindered, and discouraged from seeking and getting the help they need.

The House bill would represent the triumph of ideological partisan politics over solid legislation with an opportunity for solid bipartisan support. It should be firmly rejected.

Instead, the House should use this opportunity to build on a record of proven success, bipartisan cooperation, and a commitment to strengthening the protection of society's most vulnerable by using the Senate bill as a template. These victims and potential victims deserve no less. They, their families, and the communities they live in deserve no less.

Domestic violence is an assault on the entire community and should not be tolerated. We should not retreat on the Violence Against Women Act, but strengthen it by using the Senate bill as a point of departure and reject the House version.

## NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, as a foster parent, a father of two adopted children, and a cochairman of the bipartisan Congressional Foster Youth



Printed on recycled paper.

Caucus, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month.

There are currently over 107,000 foster youth eligible and waiting for adoption and more than 400,000 youth in the foster care system. In an effort to raise awareness about the needs and the experience of these youth, I am honored to join my colleagues in a bipartisan manner to acknowledge the importance of this special month.

Through increased understanding and dedicated caregivers, we can and must continue to make important advances in providing more stable and caring environments for all foster youth. We must focus on learning from State and local child welfare providers, advocates, and foster children to better know how we can help. The needs of these youth are urgent and real. And while there are many alarming facts and figures that reflect the challenges these children face, the resiliency of foster youth remains strong; and we must all continue to do our part. Together, we can make National Foster Care Month a success.

## FOSTER CARE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month. The goal of this month is to raise awareness about the experiences and needs of more than 400,000 youth in the foster care system.

Throughout the month, members of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth will share stories of foster youth in their districts. Today I would like to share a story from my constituent Kevin, a young man from Hollywood, California.

□ 1010

His story is unique, yet his resiliency is characteristic of hundreds of thousands of foster youth across our Nation.

Kevin was born into a family addicted to crack cocaine. He was removed from his parents at the age of 2, after a near-death drowning experience. After years in a group home, he was placed with a legal guardian. But this placement was difficult. Kevin was placed back with his biological mother, until she was incarcerated for the third time, leaving Kevin with no place to go.

In the face of all these challenges, Kevin has persevered. He recently transferred from community college with a full-ride scholarship and a 3.8 GPA. He plans to become a professor in the social sciences.

About his time in and out of foster care, Kevin says:

> I am extremely grateful for the opportunities I have had because they allow me to identify and connect with a broad range of people.

Today, in honor of Kevin's courage and tenacity, I join my fellow cochairs of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth and with Representative TOM MARINO, as well as over 90 of our colleagues in the House and the Senate, in introducing a bipartisan, bicameral resolution in recognition of National Foster Care Month. I invite my colleagues to cosponsor the bipartisan resolution as well as join the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth.

## THANKING OUR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. This Memorial Day we will take time to remember those who have given their lives to keep our Nation safe and free. So many brave men and women have given the ultimate sacrifice to ensure that we can enjoy the very freedoms and liberties that we all enjoy today. I want to thank all of those who are currently serving, those who have served, and their families for putting our Nation first. America is a stronger and better Nation because of your sacrifice and service.

Recently, veterans from Illinois came to Washington, D.C., and it was truly an honor and pleasure to meet the Illinois Honor Flight at the World War II Memorial, not only to hear their stories, but to have an opportunity to talk with these true heroes and learn more about their friends, those who made it back and those who didn't. The heroic efforts of the men and women of World War II—and I would argue from all of our conflicts—helped keep our Nation safe and away from harm's way. I cannot thank them enough for all they have done for our country.

Last month, I had the privilege of presenting two veterans from Illinois's 10th Congressional District with their medals that had not been presented. These men served their country with distinction and deserve the medals that they have earned.

George Ott, from Arlington Heights, served as an Air Force staff sergeant in the 6th Aircraft Repair Unit during World War II. He served from 1944 to 1946, serving in the Marshall Islands, the Philippines, and Japan. I was able to present him with the World War II Victory Medal, the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal, and the Army Good Conduct Medal.

Thomas Vana, of Des Plaines, was another veteran I was able to serve and present medals. He served as a sergeant in the 2nd Infantry Division during the Korean War. He served as an Active Duty medic from 1970 to 1974. I was able to present him with the Army Good Conduct Medal and the Korea Defense Service Medal.

Beyond working directly with veterans, Mr. Speaker, to ensure they receive the recognition that they have earned, my office is also working with veterans to document their stories. The Veterans History Project is an ongoing effort by the Library of Congress to collect stories and photos to learn more about those who have served in battle and conflict not only at home, but overseas. My office is open to anyone who would like to document their story and share their experiences with the American public. It's important that we preserve these records, Mr. Speaker, so that future generations know the sacrifices that our men and women in the military have made. I would encourage anyone from the 10th District in Illinois who has served to call the Northbrook office at (847) 272–0404 and share your story so that we can preserve it for years and years to come.

I want to thank all those who have served, those that are serving currently, and those that have given their lives to protect our country. This Memorial Day I believe that we must honor those who have fallen and never forget the sacrifices that they have made to make sure that our country remains safe and free.

## THE MODERN TAX SYSTEM: FAIR TO THE AVERAGE AMERICAN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, in April, the Johnstown-Somerset Central Labor Council announced the winners of its annual scholarship essay contest. This year's first-place winner, Lisa Vatavuk, wrote an essay entitled: ''The Modern Tax System: Fair to the Average American?''

I would like to read Lisa's essay, as it has particular meaning to our current tax and budget debate:

> Dating back to ancient Egypt in the year 3000 BCE, taxes have been a familiar part of society for almost as long as civilizations have existed. So how do taxes affect the current citizens of the United States? Today's tax system affects all three classes in different ways. Unfortunately, in the United States, taxation hits the average middle class family the hardest out of all three demographics.
>
> The United States follows a progressive taxing system. This means that, ideally, families in the lowest income brackets pay the lowest percentage of taxes, while families in the highest income brackets pay the highest percentage. However, this system of taxation is flawed. Because the Bush administration cut taxes for the wealthy, families in the top income brackets pay much lower tax rates than the progressive system calls for. Also, because taxes include sales taxes, property taxes, and other kinds of taxes in addition to income taxes, families in the highest income tax brackets almost always pay lower percentages of their income in their total taxes than low and working class families. In addition, because State and local taxes are typically regressive rather than progressive, low and middle class families are given a higher percentage of taxes than wealthy families. In 2007, out of all the income brackets, families in the middle-income bracket paid the highest percent of their income in their total taxes in Washington, D.C., Maine, Minnesota, New York, South Carolina, and Vermont. In the vast majority of the remaining States, the lowest-income families paid the highest tax percentage, and the highest-income families

paid the lowest. There were no States in 2007 in which the wealthy families paid taxes at a higher rate than the middle and low classes.

The current tax system affects families in high-income brackets much differently than it affects those in the low- and middle-income brackets. First, wealthy families receive many tax deductions. The government, on average, pays for about 35 percent of high-income families' taxes. A second way in which the wealthy are not affected by the tax system as much as lower class families is that they generally do not have to pay as much income tax. The average millionaire does not earn their money from working; they earn money from their investments. Taxes on long-term investments are lower than taxes on income because the government wants to encourage consumers to spend money. However, this means that wealthy families that earn money from investments pay lower taxes than middle- and low-income working families.

Finally, the families in the top income brackets are almost never hurt by the current tax system because some politicians do all they can to protect the wealthy. Some politicians believe that as long as the wealthy families have money to spare, they will make investments that will benefit the economy and the lower classes. While this theory may or may not be true, the higher classes continue to have lower tax rates than the middle and low classes. The United States' current tax system clearly benefits wealthy families.

Wealthy families are not the only ones that benefit from this system of taxation in the United States. Poor families are often given benefits as well. While families in high-income tax brackets receive many breaks on their taxes, they are not the only people that receive these breaks. Families that are considered to be in poverty by the United States Government are many times given breaks on their taxes as well. For example, the Earned Income Tax Credit, or EITC, is given to many low-income families in this country. This tax credit gives families money back to help relieve the burden of taxes. In some cases, the EITC gives families back more money than they originally paid in government taxes. In some cases, poor families also receive benefits from the current tax system because in some cases the members of the family do not work. In families in which no one works, there are no income taxes or payroll taxes. These families instead receive assistance from welfare. There is no tax on money received from welfare, so families receiving this aid that do not earn additional income from a job do not pay any income taxes. Consequently, the tax system in the United States can be beneficial to low-income families.

In the current tax system, there are certain advantages to being in either high-income families or low-income families, but what happens to those families that fall in the middle? The majority of Americans are hardworking citizens that earn a moderate salary. These citizens are the ones that have to pay for the benefits that others receive. For example, when the wealthy receive tax deductions, the government receives less money as revenue, and the people that fall in the middle are the ones that suffer.

The less money the government has, the less it can provide funding to programs that benefit middle-income families, such as education funding, libraries, and government aid for skyrocketing college costs. A second way in which the middle class is hurt by tax deductions is when poor families receive tax credits. As previously mentioned, sometimes when families receive the EITC, they receive more money from the government than they originally paid.

This money comes from money taken straight from taxpayers. Middle-income families are many times forced to pay the highest tax rates out of any of the income brackets, and they receive no special treatment from the United States government.

In conclusion, in the United States today, most of the burdens of taxation are put onto the average middle-income working families. The system of taxation is extremely unfair for working families; they work their entire lives to have a large part of their income taken away from them by the government when people in both high- and low-income brackets receive special treatment from the government. The average American family falls in the middle-income category, and in the current tax system, this family, the heart and soul of America, is the one that ultimately suffers.

□ 1020

## HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the nearly 1 million law enforcement officers who work day and night to protect all of us. All of us sleep more soundly at night knowing that the brave men and women of law enforcement are in our communities patrolling, protecting, and watching over our homes and businesses. They do so bravely and selflessly, and they do not ask for recognition. They put their lives on the line knowing the risks, and they take those risks on with unwavering courage.

I worked for 33 years as a law enforcement officer before I came to Congress. I didn't do that because I wanted to be the sheriff of King County in Seattle. I didn't do it because I wanted to be a Member of Congress. I did it because I wanted to serve my community by protecting it and making a difference. I found that I wasn't alone. Each of my law enforcement colleagues carried in them the heart of a servant.

So this week, National Police Week, is bittersweet for all of us in law enforcement because we remember the tragedy of our fellow officers' loss. Already this year, 40 officers have been killed in the line of duty.

Tuesday was Peace Officer Memorial Day, a day to remember the brave brothers and sisters killed in the line of duty. We've lost them; they're gone, but they're not forgotten.

Why do law enforcement officers come together today during this week in Washington, D.C., and on this memorial event? To share the fellowship and remember, because we made a promise. Everyone in this room has made a promise and everyone across this country has made a promise, Mr. Speaker, to never forget—to never forget the pain, the suffering, the feeling of great loss, the brokenness of families, the sadness that will touch that family for the rest of their lives. We made a promise to never forget not only those sad times, the feelings of brokenness and loneliness, but those good times, the funny stories we hear.

I have two friends killed in the line of duty, one in June of 1982. He was my good friend and partner, Sam Hicks. He was shot and killed. But I remember a night when he and I, together, went to catch a robber. We surrounded the house, just the two of us. It was pitch dark outside, and all of a sudden I heard Sam scream, Run, DAVE, run.

So when Sam said ''run,'' I ran. And I ran. Then I heard a barking dog. I looked and saw that Sam was being chased by a large dog. Sam and I jumped in our police car and I peeled out, headed out of the driveway because the lights were coming on inside the house where the robber was, and I began to smell something a little bit funny. Well, what happened is that Sam decided he was going to mace the dog, but instead he maced himself.

That's one of the stories I remember about my good friend Sam. He also taught me how to tie a tie. I only know one knot. It's the knot that I'm wearing today.

My good friend, Mike Raburn, who went to the academy with me, saved my life one night. I was directing traffic in Federal Way just south of Seattle, and I didn't know it, but someone behind me had run up behind me with a knife with the knife raised in the air. Mike had just driven up, and the guy was running toward me to stick the knife in my back. Mike tackled him and saved my life.

I remember those good times. I remember those bad times. We can never forget the sacrifice of our law enforcement men and women. We are all safe today. You can be in this Hall today, Mr. Speaker. We can all be here today, we can walk on the streets safe knowing that our brothers and sisters in law enforcement are there to protect us.

Now, you can help them. This week we passed the Blue Alert bill. All you need to do is watch for those, like those AMBER Alert, the Blue Alert signals on your freeway signs. If an officer has been shot or killed, you'll see information on those signs. Call in.

We can work together to keep the communities safe, because if they hurt a cop, if they kill a cop, they'll hurt somebody, somebody in the community. So help us by participating in Blue Alert.

And also, I ask of you today, Mr. Speaker, and everyone listening across the great Nation of this United States of America to never forget.

God bless you. Thank you.

## ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and to recognize

the many contributions that Asian and Pacific Americans make to our great Nation.

I commend Congresswoman JUDY CHU, who is the chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and also Congressman MIKE HONDA, the caucus' chair emeritus, for their leadership and for their efforts on behalf of our communities.

Our caucus represents a very large and a diverse community. The cultures that are represented in our caucus highlight many, many unique traditions, languages, and histories. Despite our diverse backgrounds, Asian Pacific Americans are committed to improving our country every single day.

Today, more than 18.5 million Asians and Pacific Islanders call America their home—18.5 million. We have become the fastest growing minority community in the United States, having increased by more than 40 percent in the last 10 years.

Asian Pacific Americans contribute to every aspect of our lives, from business to education, health care to public relations, sports and recreation to the arts, government, and the Armed Services. Our businesses employ more than 2.8 million workers, who generate more than $512 billion in annual revenues to our economy. Two Cabinet Secretaries, Energy Secretary Steven Chu and Veterans Affairs Secretary Eric Shinseki, are of APA descent, and APAs currently represent 13 congressional districts and serve in 15 State legislatures. Further, in the last 3 years, the number of judges serving in the Federal judiciary has more than doubled, its highest level in our country's entire history.

From the very beginning, the Asian Pacific American community has sought better opportunities or to escape persecution in their homeland. These can be seen with each particular group: in the experiences of the first Chinese laborers who came to build the transcontinental railroads, the first Japanese workers who worked on plantations in Hawaii, and the first Vietnamese refugees who arrived because of war, and countless APA groups with similar stories. Asian Pacific American history is the larger American story of valuing freedom, continuously working to make our Nation great and giving our children a better future than the ones we have.

I represent the people of Guam. I represent the U.S. Territory of Guam. The people are an important part of our Asian Pacific American community and are extremely loyal and proud of their citizenship. Case in point, this year will mark the 68th anniversary of the liberation of Guam from a brutal enemy occupation during World War II and the return of freedom to the island as part of the American family. Guam has one of the highest per capita casualties in the more than a decade that our country has been at war, yet our people continue to enter military service as a calling to serve their country. And our island is being called upon to sustain one of the most complex and important force posture realignments in the history of the United States. Today, per capita, we also are number one when it comes to people who serve in the National Guard. Guam is number one per capita.

□ 1030

This May, we once again celebrate Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. Despite the many successes that the APA community has experienced, there is still so very much to be done. APA Heritage Month is a celebration of our diversity, a recognition of the sacrifices and the contributions that Asian Pacific Americans make to our Nation, and an opportunity to educate all Americans of the unique role that our community plays in our country.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, or as we say in Guam, Si Yu'os Ma'ase—thank you, and God be with you.

## PAYING TRIBUTE TO BISHOP BARNETT K. THOROUGHGOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize, to honor, and to pay tribute to the life of Bishop Barnett K. Thoroughgood, founder of New Jerusalem Church of God in Christ in Virginia Beach, who passed away too early from this Earth in February. He was a man of God, an inspiring leader, a tremendous, positive influence in our community, and a truly outstanding American.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to please help me welcome his family here today, his wife of 39 years, Ernestine; son, Jonathan; daughter, Mekia; handsome grandson, Caleb—who was just in my office—and many other distinguished guests who have come with the family today.

I think the measure of a man or a woman is the legacy they leave to their children, and the legacy left by Bishop Thoroughgood is exemplary. The good bishop dedicated his life to serving God, his fellow man, and his community. He was a titan in the field of human rights. He was loved by fellow clergy and the community in which he served. He was a truly gifted speaker, and he used that gift to be a blessing to others. This is what was written about the bishop in the Virginia Pilot:

> Bishop Thoroughgood liked to say he started preaching at the age of five, when he spent many days sharing Jesus with the prison work crews that came to clean ditches in his Seatack neighborhood. At 20 years old, he started the New Jerusalem Church of God in Christ. Across his career, he received many educational honors leading to his doctorate of ministry. He served as the district superintendent to the Virginia Beach district and second administrative assistant to Bishop Samuel L. Greene, Jr.

He was amazingly active in the community and received so many awards that if I read them out today, I think it would fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He also served as a member of the Virginia Beach Clergy Association and Ministerial Alliance. He was the founder and president of the Hampton Roads Ecumenical Council of Bishops. He led mission trips to Haiti and outreach to the poor.

His sermons were literally broadcast around the world. So many were touched by his words, which I think explains why at the wake the night before his funeral 2,500 people were there, and 4,000 folks showed up to the funeral. I was honored to share just a few words with the family.

I just ask that God would bless the family and watch over them, give them peace, and that the message that the bishop had lived his life conveying would be continued. That truly is the way, I believe, we honor the bishop's life is by continuing his work, his compassion for others, his commitment to making sure that all Americans cross the finish line, always centered on family, always centered on God, and always mindful of his obligations as an American.

Bishop Thoroughgood leaves to cherish his memories, again, his lovely wife, Ernestine Thoroughgood; his sons, Bertram, Emmanuel, and Jonathan; daughter, Mekia; four brothers—large family, wonderful family that we had here this morning—five grandchildren, and many children they've adopted and helped through the social services foster care program; the New Jerusalem Church family; and the members of the Church of God in Christ worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I close as I began, just knowing that it's a high honor to pay tribute to his life. I think it embodies the very best of what it means to be an American, to be part of our Hampton Roads community, and to be a Virginian.

So with that, I ask God's continued grace on the family.

## ASIAN PACIFIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, this month is Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. It is a time for us to take pride in our country's diversity and to celebrate the ways in which Asian Pacific Americans have contributed to the vibrancy of our Nation.

Today, Asian Pacific Americans are the fastest growing racial group in the country and now account for nearly 6 percent of the total population. Asian Pacific Americans are an incredibly diverse group comprised of over 45 distinct ethnicities and speaking over 100 different language dialects. We are represented in every arena of American life, from college presidents to public servants and CEOs, and even to an NBA basketball star, Jeremy Lin.

This year marks a number of historic milestones for the Asian Pacific American community, including the 20th year since the formal establishment of APA Heritage Month; the 100th anniversary of the planting of the first cherry blossoms in our Nation's Capital; and the 150th year since the passage of the Pacific Railroad Act, which led to the construction of the transcontinental railroad.

This year also marks the anniversary of several painful events in our history: 130 years since the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, a discriminatory piece of legislation which prevented people of Chinese ancestry from becoming naturalized citizens and from ever having the right to vote; 70 years since the signing of Executive Order 9066, which led to the internment of 120,000 Japanese Americans during World War II; and 30 years since the unpunished murder of Vincent Chin in Detroit by two unemployed autoworkers who blamed him and all Asian Americans for the loss of their jobs.

Although our history has indicated great progress since the days of discrimination, it is important to continue to remember our history in order to protect the civil rights of all Americans and to prevent these atrocities from ever happening again.

As chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, or CAPAC, I have the privilege of advocating for the APA community's needs and priorities on a broad range of issues, including civil rights, health care, economic justice, and immigration reform. This year, our caucus welcomed 12 new Congress Members, bringing our total to a record high of 42 members. This means that CAPAC will be able to serve as an even stronger voice for the Asian Pacific community at all levels.

As the Asian Pacific community continues to grow across the Nation—not just in traditional strongholds like California, Hawaii, or New York, but also in States like Texas, Georgia, and Nevada—my colleagues and I will continue to ensure that the needs of the APA community are included as we push for policies that re-ignite the American Dream for all.

So as we celebrate Asian Pacific Heritage Month this May, I hope you will join me and remember the many contributions that Asian Pacific Americans have made to our great country.

## HIGH-PERFORMANCE BUILDING WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on energy-efficient buildings—we're talking about schools, factories, department stores, shopping centers, any type of a large building or even a small building—and the money they can save and the manufacturing jobs that energy-efficient initiatives can create.

This week, architects, code officials, designers, and others involved in making buildings more energy efficient celebrate High-Performance Building Week. This annual event features briefings, meetings, and other educational outlets designed to showcase and promote the good work being done to provide better buildings and mitigate the impact on the environment.

Building owners and operators continue to find creative ways to minimize the effect that rising energy costs have on their operations and productivity. These owners and operators are beginning to find that better designs of new buildings and smart retrofits of existing buildings free up capital and allow managers to commit more resources to the core operations rather than to utility bills.

The State of Montana decided to make its buildings more energy efficient. They brought in engineers to do the study, and they found that over 7,500 pipes needed to have mechanical insulation. These are pipes that needed to be wrapped.

□ 1040

And so they undertook that project. And what's interesting is that the payback was less than 4 years. But each year the State of Montana saves 5 to 8 percent in energy costs on those buildings. That's a massive savings of energy in this country.

One of the easiest, most cost-effective ways to improve building performance is to ensure the mechanical insulation systems are properly installed. While most of us think that insulation is only for walls and attics, mechanical insulation is a vital component for commercial and industrial and educational applications.

Working with my colleagues, I introduced H.R. 2866, the Mechanical Insulation Incentive Act of 2011, last year to help commercial and industrial facility owners make their facilities more energy efficient and put people back to work.

Improved insulation for piping and mechanical components in commercial and industrial settings will help save businesses more than $4.8 billion a year, according to the National Insulation Association. These improvements will also save resources to the tune of 82 million barrels of oil or 19 million tons of coal each year. And it's probably more than that.

I ask my colleagues to consider supporting H.R. 2866. It's a commonsense bill that will save money, improve facility operations, put people back to work, and help our buildings perform to a higher standard.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saluting the hard work that our Nation's architects, engineers, and building professionals do to improve the condition of our homes, schools, and businesses.

I also want to ask my colleagues to participate in some of the events being held this week in honor of High-Performance Building Week.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## SUPPORT EXTENSION OF THE COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in 45 days, the interest rate on the Stafford Student Loan program is going to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

As millions of American families know, the Stafford Student Loan program is the workhorse for middle class students trying to pay for college. It is a program which has an affordable interest rate. It provides protections for students so that interest doesn't accumulate while you're actually in school. It provides a grace period after you graduate. And it also has a cap in terms of how much of your income has to be devoted to Stafford loan repayments.

In 2007, as a freshman Member of Congress, I was proud to have been a cosponsor of the College Cost Reduction Act, which cut that rate from 6.8 to 3.4 percent. It was a 5-year bill, like many measures that Congress passes; and that expiration, that sunset, will occur on July 1, 45 days from today, when that rate will double back to 6.8 percent.

Last week the Senate made an attempt to try and take up legislation to protect that lower rate. Sadly, the Republican minority used the filibuster rule to block not even just the bill, but even a debate on the bill. I repeat: they didn't even use the filibuster rule as a block of all Republicans to vote against the measure. They actually used the filibuster to even allow consideration of debate.

And, again, the leader in the Senate made it very clear if they had alternatives to the Senate bill which would protect the lower rate, they were more than free to offer their own amendments.

So here we are today, with students trying to plan for next fall's college, with kids getting their acceptance letters for next year, and yet they have no ability to budget or plan in terms of what the interest rate for this workhorse program to pay for college allows.

Now, how did we get to this place?

As I indicated, in 2007 we cut the rate. Back in January, President Obama stood at that very podium and challenged Congress to not allow the rate to double. For three solid months, nothing happened in this Chamber. There was not a single hearing at the Education and Workforce Committee. There was not a bill for markup. The only action was legislation that I proposed. H.R. 3826, which has over 150 cosponsors in this Chamber, on a bipartisan basis, which would lock in that rate permanently, has never been taken up for consideration.

Two-and-a-half weeks ago, Speaker BOEHNER who, by the way, voted

against the College Cost Reduction Act in 2007, rushed to the floor a bill for a 1-year Band-Aid, and used as a pay-for depleting resources and funds from a program that would help folks with heart, cardiac, cervical cancer screening, diabetes screening, early childhood disease screening. They took money out of that fund to help desperate Americans to try and put a 1-year fix on the student loan issue.

President Obama made it very clear that bill is a dead letter. A veto threat was issued even before we voted in this Chamber. So here we are 45 days away waiting for action.

H.R. 3826, a measure which permanently locks in the lower rate, is at least a first step in terms of dealing with the crisis in this country of student loan debt, which now exceeds credit card debt and car loan debt. We have an issue here which threatens the future viability of this country to succeed and compete in the world global economy where we need a cutting-edge workforce if we're ever going to succeed in the future.

Forty-six days from today we are going to be celebrating the 150th anniversary of President Abraham Lincoln signing into law a measure called the Moral Act. The Moral Act set up a national policy establishing land grant colleges in all 50 States in this country. Back then its mission was to establish programs for mechanical engineering and agricultural sciences.

What an amazing act of vision and leadership. In the darkest days of the Civil War, 1862, President Lincoln still had the long view and understood that if, as a Nation, we are going to succeed, we need a national policy for higher education. And in his wake, the Stafford loan program was created, sponsored by a Republican, Robert Stafford of Vermont. The Pell Grant program was established by Claiborne Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island, all to provide the building blocks so that young people have that opportunity and the ability to pursue their dreams and to pursue their skill set, the true key of success in this Nation.

We are a Nation that is blessed with great natural resources. We have the greatest military in the world. We have great financial institutions. But the real success of this country is our broad-based middle class where education provides the foundation for families and students to succeed.

That clock is ticking. I started this running at 110 days, and we're now down to 45 days. It is time for the Senate Republicans to drop the filibuster, allow consideration of the bill to help middle class families as they deal with next year's tuition costs, and pass H.R. 3826 in the House of Representatives.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at noon.

## PRAYER

Reverend Tom Ellsworth, Sherwood Oaks Christian Church, Bloomington, Indiana, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, mere words are inadequate to express our deep gratitude for the privilege of living in such a great land. You have graciously guided this Nation in the past. I pray that You will continue to bless it in the days ahead.

For all who have served in the past, and for all who currently serve within these hallowed walls, we give You our thanks. Bless them and their families.

I pray, Lord, that You will encourage them on the days when they are criticized more than cheered. Give them strength under stress, peace under pressure, and wisdom under the weight of the burdens they carry.

Fill them with Your insight and divine perspective. Give them good judgment in the decisions they make. Guide their thoughts and intentions to reflect Your timeless values. And in the Nation's business of this day, grant them success.

In Christ I pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCINTYRE 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.

## WELCOMING REVEREND TOM ELLSWORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

(Mr. YOUNG of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I want to thank my friend, Tom Ellsworth, and his wife, Elsie, for traveling all the way from Bloomington, Indiana, to deliver this morning's open prayer.

Tom has devoted his life to ministry. He is senior minister to me, my wife, Jenny, our four children, and so many other Hoosiers at Sherwood Oaks Christian Church in Bloomington.

2012 marks the 50th year since Sherwood Oaks was founded. To mark the celebration, Tom has thrown down the gauntlet. Our church will pray, give, and serve like never before. Tom is challenging more of us to become the hands and feet of God, serving our neighbors, our country, and beyond.

Tom understands that our Nation, in fact any nation worthy of the name, was built by selfless servants, people like the 55 members of our church who recently activated their faith to help out tornado victims in southern Indiana. America needs more such servants and more people like Tom to inspire us to service.

Thank you for making a difference, Tom.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## THE STUDY OF THE STUDY OF THE STUDIES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the military spends a lot of money studying, presumably, the effectiveness of military programs. In fact, there are numerous military studies of military programs. So many, the Department of Defense has commissioned a study of those numerous studies to see how much those studies cost.

Stay with me, Mr. Speaker. Now, the Government Accountability Office has done their own study of the military study that is studying the cost of numerous military studies that are studying the cost and effectiveness of military programs.

The GAO has concluded its study that the military study of the studies is incomplete, inconclusive, and inconsistent. So we really don't know how effective or costly those military studies are. Meanwhile, the cost of the GAO study has not been studied yet.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this short study of the government's studies programs let's us all know how effective and efficient government bureaucracy actually operates.

And that's just the way it is.

## CELEBRATING THE 150TH BIRTHDAY OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say happy birthday to the United States Department of Agriculture, which celebrated its 150th birthday on May 15.

In my home State of North Carolina, we have contributed to our Nation's agricultural success, and the Seventh Congressional district is the most productive agricultural district in the State, with over $2.5 billion worth of agricultural products sold each year.

Because our farms and our farmers and our agribusinesses are so critical to our State's economy, it is vital that the USDA partner with us, as it does with States throughout our country, helping farmers manage risk; providing a safety net for producers who experience disasters from weather, pests, or price collapse; giving rural communities the tools they need to be able to make infrastructure improvements; investing in cutting-edge agricultural research at our country's premiere research institutions and land grant universities. These all allow for breakthroughs in crop science and animal agriculture.

Indeed, we say happy birthday to our USDA. We know that the State of North Carolina, and all of our States that benefit from its services, allow our farmers and our rural communities in rural America to enjoy the strong positive relationship to share our future together. Let's keep our farmers and our rural communities strong.

## NDAA PROTECTS TRICARE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today the House will debate the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013. The House Armed Services Committee approved this bipartisan bill last week by a vote of 56–5.

Earlier this year, the administration announced an increase in the TRICARE enrollment fees by up to 345 percent. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, I am pleased the committee refused to authorize a provision to forward the administration's unfair proposal, which would destroy jobs.

Our brave men and women in uniform and their families have devoted their lives to defend our country. Their service to our Nation should be considered a prepayment of health care benefits and retirement.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and give our military families the fairness they deserve so they can work for peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Welcome to Washington, Realtors and CPAs.

## HONORING THE SERVICE OF DETECTIVE WALTER C. MEY, JR.

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

Mr. CICCILINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Detective Walter C. Mey, Jr., who works for the Middletown Police Department in the First Congressional District of Rhode Island.

Detective Mey recently received an honorable mention from the National Association of Police Organizations, which praised his work as part of their Top Cops award of 2012. Detective Mey was recognized for his efforts in apprehending a murder suspect last year.

The Top Cops award recognizes law enforcement officers who have been nominated by their peers for going above and beyond the call of duty. An 18-year veteran of the Middletown Police Department, Detective Mey has been awarded a Meritorious Service Medal from the Department. I congratulate Detective Mey today on his impressive achievements, and thank him for his continuing service on behalf of our community.

This week, as our Nation observes National Police Week, we are mindful that Detective Mey and every retired and every active duty Rhode Island police officer deserves our tremendous gratitude for their commitment to ensuring our safety.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all members of the gallery that they are guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of House rules.

□ 1210

## RALPH CHESHIER

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise today to honor Mr. Ralph Cheshier, a veteran teacher in the Valley View School District of Jonesboro, Arkansas.

For 37 years, Mr. Cheshier has taught his students the principles of agriculture. Mr. Cheshier is also a longtime member of the Partners in an Active Learning Setting, or PALS program. PALS is a mentoring program that matches high school students in the Vocational Agriculture Leadership Class with kindergarten students to develop personal skills and explore interests in plants and animals. The Valley View PALS chapter is one of only 10 in Arkansas.

Mr. Cheshier has a unique style of teaching through storytelling. He loves spending time with his students in the school greenhouse and shop, teaching them valuable skills and making his students become self-sufficient members of society. Mr. Cheshier will be remembered for his contributions to the academic and life development of his students. Many of the lessons he taught will go well beyond the classroom and will stick with those students forever.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent people like Mr. Cheshier, who make Arkansas a great place to live.

Happy retirement.

## USPS REFORM

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last week we learned that the Williams Street mail processing facility in my Buffalo community will remain open despite proposals by the Postal Service to close it.

While this is welcome news, I remain deeply disappointed by the ''decide first and justify later'' approach that the Postal Service has used throughout this process. From failing to notify residents of proposed closures to poor record-keeping at public meetings, the amount of community involvement in this process has been unacceptable, and now postal workers are faced with uncertainty as the status of their place of employment remains unclear.

Mr. Speaker, we must take advantage of this temporary moratorium on closures in order to take a serious look at the facility closure process and to make much-needed reforms.

## OUR NATIONAL DEBT

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

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of receiving a letter from a constituent, a 14-year-old young man of Star Boy Scouts who is seeking to become a an Eagle Scout, and he is concerned about the Federal debt and deficit.

Christopher Woloshyn wrote to me:

> I think that the Federal deficit is too high and overwhelming for Americans, and will affect people like me even more in the future . . . I believe our government must stop spending more money than it takes in. Can you please help our government reduce our national deficit so myself and fellow young Americans will not be burdened by our national debt?

Christopher, I could not agree more with you, and you have the wisdom of someone who can look at this issue with fresh eyes.

We here in the House of Representatives, under the leadership of Speaker BOEHNER, are dedicated to making sure that we do not add to that debt, which

is what we are concentrating on this year. That is why I am so proud to support the Speaker in the Boehner principle: that we will not raise the debt ceiling without at least dollar-for-dollar compensatory cuts.

Christopher, you deserve a better future. We are determined to provide that to you, and I urge our fellow Members of the House to follow the same.

## VAWA—WOMEN'S HEALTH WEDNESDAY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Since 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has strengthened communities and provided critical, lifesaving support to victims of violence.

VAWA reauthorization must continue the fight to protect all victims and their families from the fear of violence, including those victims who are immigrants, Native Americans, members of the LGBT community, and college students. Unfortunately, for the first time in VAWA's history, we will not have a bipartisan reauthorization bill. Even worse, H.R. 4970 is a step backward and is opposed by hundreds of anti-violence groups.

While there are many problems with the bill, I am most distressed by the provisions regarding battered immigrant women. H.R. 4970 destroys years of work of protecting immigrant women. It creates more obstacles for these victims to report crimes, and it limits U visa protections and adds restrictive certification requirements that will only discourage cooperation with law enforcement agencies, which themselves oppose these provisions.

Victim safety is a core principle of VAWA. We must remain firm in our commitment to ensure that all victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and trafficking have meaningful access to protection under the law.

## HOUSE GOP PLAN FOR AMERICA'S JOB CREATORS

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

Ms. FOXX. Fostering job growth for the American people continues to be the number one job for House Republicans. With unemployment above 8 percent for the past 39 months, the Obama economy continues to produce the Nation's worst jobless record since the Great Depression.

By following the House Republican Plan for America's Job Creators, the House has passed more than 30 bipartisan jobs bills on behalf of the American people. Each of these bills is aimed at unleashing the power of our private sector to freely and confidently build, invest, innovate, and expand again—and put millions of Americans back to work. Unfortunately, the vast majority of these bipartisan House-passed jobs bills are being blocked or ignored in the Democrat-controlled Senate.

The American people are tired of waiting. It is time for Democrats in the Senate and White House to put politics aside and to support the House Republican Plan for America's Job Creators.

## REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mr. COSTA. Today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, the partisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Since 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has been a critical tool for protecting women and children who are victims of domestic abuse, and Congress has twice made necessary bipartisan improvements in the law.

As a cochairman of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, I know that we have learned a great deal from law enforcement and victim advocate groups since we last reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act in 2005. Unfortunately, this bill rolls back comprehensive protections for all vulnerable populations rather than reflect on the lessons we've learned.

We should be listening to the victims' rights advocate groups and our local law enforcement agencies, which know and deal daily with the impacts on people's lives who are the victims of crime. Therefore, we ought to pass the bipartisan Senate reauthorization bill and end this partisan charade.

## EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO H.R. 4970—VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, which shifts the power into the hands of the abuser and moves away from longstanding bipartisanship on this issue.

In my view, a vote for H.R. 4970 is clearly an attack on the Violence Against Women Act, and I am deeply concerned that the manager's amendment to H.R. 4970 weakens current law and rolls back protections in the VAWA self-petition process, empowering abusers and harming battered immigrant spouses.

The manager's amendment rolls back U visa protections, denying protection to immigrant victims of serious crime and stripping police and prosecutors of a critical law enforcement tool. The manager's amendment fails to include provisions from the bipartisan Senate-passed bill to protect Native American women and includes language that may lead to further abuse. The manager's amendment fails, again, to include provisions of the bipartisan Senate-passed bill to protect LGBT victims from discrimination, and it weakens nondiscrimination employment protections.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against H.R. 4970 and to work together in a bipartisan manner in order to improve and reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

## STUDENT DEBT

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

Mr. WELCH. In 45 days, the interest rates on some Stafford student loans are going to double. Even though we have a consensus in Congress that low interest rates should be extended, we can't get the job done. Families can't wait. They're sitting around, trying to figure out how they'll put their kids through college.

Take Beth from Westfield, Vermont. She told her children when they were young that college was part of their futures and important if they were going to make it into the middle class. Now she fears she may have steered them wrong. Her family currently holds $150,000 in debt. In a tough job market, Beth's kids are struggling to get a foothold in life with loan repayment costs exceeding $500 a month. Beth would like to help, but she is not really in a strong position to do so. She went back to college later in life, hoping to advance her career, and now she is way down, as are her kids, with this enormous burden.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has 45 days. Congress needs to act. We can't afford to price the middle class out of a college education.

□ 1220

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act has saved lives, reducing domestic violence by half. Our colleagues in the Senate have embraced this fact and passed a bipartisan reauthorization bill that makes sense. Unfortunately, I can't say the same thing about H.R. 4970.

My Republican friends have good intentions. I believe they want to protect victims of domestic violence just as much as I do, but to be effective, however, our legislation has to address the problems as they exist. H.R. 4970 does not. The bill makes reporting abuse more difficult, forces shelters and counselors to spend more of their precious resources on unnecessary paperwork, and fails to extend protection to the LGBT Americans. One of the most striking deficiencies is its failure to protect immigrant victims of abuse.

Because of their status, immigrants are often scared to report crimes of violence. This fear results in more damage to their communities as the violence escalates. But law enforcement has the powerful tool to combat these crimes—the U visa program, which protects immigrants if they report abuse.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT REAUTHORIZATION

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, during my first term in Congress, I proudly voted for the Violence Against Women Act. It saddens me that 20 years later, in my last term, my Republican colleagues are determined to water down and undermine this landmark legislation. Of all things that shouldn't be partisan, this is it—the need to help those who suffer injuries at the hands of someone who supposedly loves them.

As we've seen many times, the majority seems to like playing politics with women's health and safety. And because they rarely miss an opportunity to exclude LGBT Americans from important rights and benefits, they're saying that if you're a woman who is in a relationship with another woman, then you don't deserve the same protection against domestic abuse or sexual assault.

We need to be doing more, not less on this issue. I have a bill that would extend family-leave benefits to victims of domestic violence. It's H.R. 3151. Why don't we take up that bill instead of this divisive measure that rolls back historic progress?

Vote ''no'' on H.R. 4970.

## VOTE ''NO'' ON H.R. 4970, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, this misguided GOP reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Unfortunately, this bill does not do enough to protect the well-being of all women. I say again that it does not do enough to protect the well-being of all women.

This reauthorization jeopardizes the safety of our Native American women and also the safety of many undocumented women. Neither the manager's amendment nor the underlying bill addresses the problems that face Indian country. Instead of empowering tribal police and courts to stop domestic violence, this legislation unfairly places the burden on Native victims. Many of the victims of domestic violence that live on the reservations are unable to hire legal counsel and can't travel hundreds of miles to Federal courts to petition for protection orders.

We must protect sovereignty. We must respect sovereignty. Tribal courts are the best authorities to issue domestic violence orders of protection on reservations.

Let's stop this partisan bill. Let's work together on a new approach that values the safety of Native Americans and undocumented individuals in a bipartisan fashion.

## WE STILL HAVE WORK TO DO

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, it's truly unfortunate that we're here today talking about the possibility of voting against the Violence Against Women Act. This bill was originally passed and has been consistently reauthorized with strong bipartisan support, but it now faces unnecessary hurdles.

There has been a drop in annual rates of domestic violence since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act, but we still have work to do. Alarmingly, one in four women and one in seven men have been victims of domestic violence in their lifetime, but the current bill is not the way to move forward.

Unlike the companion bill that passed in the Senate with strong bipartisan support, this House bill will take us backwards. It eliminates protections for immigrants dependent on and exploited by their spouses, keeping them trapped in violent relationships. It could let perpetrators of sexual violence against Native American women off the hook, and it utterly fails to recognize that anyone can be a victim of domestic abuse, including those in same-sex relationships.

Every time we reauthorize an act of Congress, we have an opportunity to improve. Improvement, not further harming victims, should be our focus with the reauthorization.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4970, the so-called Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I believe that all Americans are entitled to feel safe, and we must strengthen current laws to continue to protect women and children across our country. This bill, however, does not achieve that goal. Immigrants, native tribes, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender groups are some of our most vulnerable communities, and the bill rolls back years of progress improving Federal efforts against domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The bill eliminates important confidentiality protections for self-petitions and would put immigrant women at greater risk for repeat abuses by undermining the intent of U visas. This bill discourages crime victims from cooperating with law enforcement and eliminates any attempt at a stable life by terminating their eligibility for permanent residence.

Women in this country, regardless of their background, should never have to feel trapped or helpless.

## A SHAMEFUL BILL

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I never could have anticipated speaking in opposition to the Violence Against Women Act, and it's unfortunate that we've come to this point, but here we are. This comes after more than a year of bipartisan efforts to put together a comprehensive, effective, and much-needed VAWA draft. But Republicans in the Senate and then in the House decided to ignore the recommendations of the FBI, the Department of Justice, and advocacy groups on the ground and push a version of VAWA that endangers immigrant women and children, ignores the needs of our native communities, and perpetuates discrimination against LGBT victims. That is why hundreds of victim services organizations oppose this bill, and I stand with them today.

At the Women in Distress shelter in my district, there has been a 39 percent increase in requests for services over the last year. Women need us now more than ever, and this is not the time to allow for discrimination or helping only some victims of domestic violence. This is the time to take a stand.

As lawmakers, we speak for the voiceless, and today I speak united with my colleagues in opposition to this shameful bill.

## I STAND WITH VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, today I stand with my Democratic colleagues and victims of domestic violence across our Nation in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the House Republican alternative to the Violence Against Women Reauthorization bill. This bill severely undermines vital protections available to victims of violence and places those victims in danger of continued abuse.

Since its enactment in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act, known as VAWA, has a long history of uniting lawmakers with the common purpose of protecting survivors of domestic violence.

Each year across the Nation, thousands of women, children, and men who fall victim to domestic violence, human trafficking, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking no longer

have to live in fear because of important victim protections under this law.

This Republican alternative bill threatens to dismantle this progress by deliberately placing domestic violence victims from LGBT, immigrant, tribal, and other marginalized communities in harm's way.

□ 1230

## REPUBLICAN BILL ENDANGERS WOMEN

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I rise today to oppose H.R. 4970. Under current law, a woman who is married to a U.S. citizen or a legal permanent resident and is a victim of spousal abuse can file a self-petition for legal permanent residency in order to leave that abusive relationship.

This provision has helped women like Maria, whose husband physically abused her and threatened to kill her two children. Without his knowledge, she started a VAWA self-petition process, meeting with an attorney at the laundromat on her usual laundry day and hiding her paperwork.

What this bill does is exposes women like Maria. It strips confidentiality protections and allows government officials to contact the spouse. Why would we do that? For these women, tipping off abusive spouses is nothing short of putting them in harm's way. It's a shame.

It's a shame that this so-called Violence Against Women bill could actually cause violence to women. Mr. Speaker, this bill is outright dangerous, and I urge my colleagues to say ''no.''

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4970, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4310, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 656 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 656

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4970) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and 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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 656 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order not necessarily out of concern for unfunded mandates, although there are some unfunded mandates in the underlying bill, H.R. 4970; rather, I am here today because this is the only opportunity to voice opposition to this bill, given the strict, closed terms of our debate today.

It is baffling to me, Mr. Speaker, that we would be so shut out of today's debate and that House Republicans would so completely abandon any pretense of bipartisanship on a bill like the Violence Against Women Act. This bill has always been a bipartisan effort, and I would argue that on an issue like this, it is incredibly important to have a well-rounded discussion.

We obviously disagree about the key elements that are critical to include in a Violence Against Women Act reauthorization. Well, why not allow us to have a healthy debate? More importantly, Mr. Speaker, why not allow us our chance to try to improve the legislation before us?

Our allies in the domestic violence and sexual assault advocacy community have literally spent years compiling input and data from service providers, law enforcement, and victims themselves about what we must do to update VAWA in a reauthorization. And I am here to be a voice of protest because their input is invaluable; yet, for the very first time, their input has been cast aside.

Last night I offered a substitute, along with Representative CONYERS and Representative LOFGREN, that would have allowed us to consider the Senate-passed version of the Violence Against Women Act, a version which I proudly introduced in March here in this House of Representatives. This legislation was passed in the Senate with sound bipartisan support and includes the improvements that have been endorsed by a broad array of individuals and organizations, including law enforcement agencies.

But, unfortunately, today we will not be allowed to vote on the Senate bill. We will have to vote on the Adams bill, which is now officially opposed by over 325 organizations. Yes, Mr. Speaker, you heard it right—325 organizations.

I would like to share my time with my colleagues who are here with me today and would like for their voices to be heard. So, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I am going to yield to a number of Members for unanimous consent, the first of whom is Ms. YVETTE CLARKE from Brooklyn, New York.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to a Republican bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in vehement opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012 (VAWA). This egregious bill is another example of this Republican-led Congress waging political warfare on women.

H.R. 4970 would roll back years of progress and bipartisan commitment on the part of Congress to protect vulnerable immigrant victims of domestic violence, stalking, sex crimes, other serious crimes, and trafficking. Choosing one type of victim over the other.

Mr. Speaker, this will greatly impact areas with heavy concentrations of immigrants, which includes my district and other residents of New York City. Historically, NYC has been the beacon of immigration. Many in Congress, including Republicans, can trace their ancestry back to the immigrant population of NYC.

These new punitive measures within H.R. 4970 that hinder abused immigrants' ability to seek justice against their abusers, are a grave set of circumstances that will have future implications on the safety and security of our country.

It will jeopardize community relations with law enforcement, force those on a pathway to permanent residency or citizenship into the shadows, and threaten the moral fabric that binds civil society.

As the majority continues to pride itself as being the defenders of small government, fiscal responsibility, and moral authority, I am appalled at how almost every action taken in this 112th Congress has been to the contrary of their platform.

Mr. Speaker, I feel like I'm in that movie Groundhog Day, every day it is the same attacks over and over again. Are we running out of options? Are we so scared of tackling the real issues in this country like job creation, that we will continue to debate the same egregious legislative measures that curtail the rights and freedoms of women and cut off access to it for immigrants?

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense that a nation of immigrants, built on the backs of immigrants, would not provide protection to immigrants.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to confine their unanimous-consent requests to a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the measure. Further embellishments will result in a deduction of time from the yielding Member.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MOORE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. MOORE. The declarative statement that you referred to, am I not correct, Mr. Speaker, that that could also include a sentence, a complete sentence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will only deduct time for embellishments.

Ms. MOORE. I thank the Chair.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to a Republican bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill that actually protects victims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider a bill entitled the "Violence Against Women Act." This bill, however, does very little to stop violence or protect women.

Instead of continuing the tradition of coming together in a bi-partisan manner to pass this important reauthorization and achieve something we all should be able to agree on, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have turned the Violence Against Women Act into a partisan messaging platform.

VAWA should protect every victim from their abuser, regardless of their immigration status. Instead, this bill endangers immigrants by punishing victims who cooperate with law enforcement.

VAWA should protect every victim, regardless of their sexual orientation or the gender of their abuser. Instead, this bill endangers LGBTQ victims by including "gender-neutral" language that ignores the reality that people are being underserved because of their sexual orientation.

VAWA should protect every victim, regardless of their Tribal affiliation. Instead, this bill endangers Native victims who are abused by non-Native Americans and leaves tribal courts without proper authority to protect victims and create safe communities.

Because the so-called "Violence Against Women Act" does none of these things, I stand in firm opposition to this bill.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to a Republican bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am disappointed by the direction the House Majority has taken with this version of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

VAWA is a landmark piece of legislation that has dramatically reduced violence against women and provided states and local communities with additional resources to address crimes against women.

As such, VAWA reauthorization has in past Congresses gained overwhelming bipartisan support. No matter what side of the aisle we're on, members of Congress have long understood the need to strengthen protections for victims of abuse. Just last month, the Senate passed its own version of VAWA, which garnered a bipartisan vote of 68–31.

And yet here we are today debating a partisan bill that weakens critical protections and fails to protect underserved communities like LGBT victims and Native American women.

A diverse coalition of 164 immigration, faith, labor, civil rights, human rights, and community groups have come together in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, even with the manager's amendments. Their message is clear: H.R. 4970 will set us back years in fighting domestic violence.

At a time when we need to modernize the VAWA to build upon our efforts, this bill would instead roll back existing protections.

This bill would make it much harder for battered immigrant women to leave their abusive relationship by adding unnecessary layers of bureaucracy.

Strong immigrant victim protections have helped countless women, including Maria, who's husband physically abused her and threatened to kill her two children. Without his knowledge, she started a VAWA self-petition process, meeting with an attorney at the Laundromat on her usual laundry day and hiding her paperwork. Repealing immigrant protections and adding red-tape and onerous requirements will endanger the safety of battered immigrants like Maria.

H.R. 4970 would also weaken the U visa program, which has encouraged immigrant victims of crime to report and help prosecute serious criminal activity.

Current law allows U visa recipients to apply to become permanent residents. This bill removes the opportunity of most victims to apply to become permanent residents, thereby discouraging victims from cooperating with local law enforcement as it could lead to deportation.

Strong protections in this area have helped countless immigrant women escape the cycle of domestic abuse and rebuild their lives.

Now, we should have a conversation about how to update VAWA so that MORE women can be served.

We've learned in the past years that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender victims experience domestic violence at the same rate as the general population. Yet, they do not receive the same protections and services they need because of discrimination and lack of training by law enforcement and service providers.

The Senate bill includes important provisions that ensure that services to LGBT victims are explicitly included in VAWA grant problems, as well as bans discrimination against victims based on their sexual orientation.

We have to ask the question as to why these key measures were not included in this regressive bill brought by the House majority.

As a mother and a grandmother, I can not stand by as we roll back decades of progress in protecting women from emotional, physical and sexual abuse.

It is time that we stop playing politics, reject this partisan proposal, and move forward with a bipartisan bill that ensures that all victims of violence are protected.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to a Republican bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to a bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, when the Violence Against Women Act was first passed, it was to prevent and raise awareness of domestic violence, and to create programs that help victims exit dangerous situations. Unfortunately, the bill we are debating today runs counter to these goals. It eliminates critical protections to help immigrant

women and it fails to extend the protections of VAWA to other populations that need them desperately. I support the Senate's bipartisan VAWA reauthorization bill, which builds on past progress by providing battered Native American women with recourse against their abusers and ensures that anyone who experiences domestic abuse has access to VAWA resources, including those in same-sex relationships. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4970 and ensure that the reauthorization of VAWA helps all victims of domestic abuse.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to the Republican bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Today, I stand with my Democratic colleagues and victims of domestic violence across our Nation in strong opposition to the H.R. 4970, the House Republican alternative to Violence Against Women Reauthorization bill. This bill severely undermines vital protections available to victims of violence and places these victims in danger of continued abuse.

Since its enactment in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) has a long history of uniting lawmakers with the common purpose of protecting survivors of domestic violence. Each year across this Nation, thousands of women, children, and men who fall victim to domestic violence, human trafficking, sexual assault, dating violence and stalking no longer have to live in fear because of important victim protections under this law. This Republican alternative bill threatens to dismantle this progress by deliberately placing domestic violence victims from LGBT, immigrant, tribal and other marginalized communities in harm's way.

While my Republican colleagues may think many of these discarded provisions are unnecessary, there is ample proof that they are sadly mistaken. Just last year, cases of LGBT domestic violence had increased by 38 percent. Of those who sought help, 44 percent of LGBT victims were turned away from traditional shelters. As for Tribal victims, Native American women face the highest rate of domestic violence in the U.S.—three and a half times higher than the national average. Proposed changes to current VAWA protections for immigrant survivors create an even larger obstacle for immigrant victims seeking to report crimes and increase the danger to immigrant victims by eliminating important confidentiality protections. These changes threaten to undermine current anti-fraud protections in place while rolling back decades of Congress's progress and commitments towards the protection of vulnerable immigrant victims.

Let's be clear, VAWA should not be used as a vehicle to pass immigration policy measures that are not germane to its purpose. VAWA has always been focused on protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking and trafficking and this should not change. In just one day, over 5,363 victims and their children receive services at domestic violence programs in California. On that same day, however, over 924 requests for services go unmet, largely due to lack of resources. This alone is proof that we need to expand the VAWA's programs and services and not eliminate them.

□ 1240

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I join the United States Conference of Mayors and the Coalition Against Religious Discrimination in opposition to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to submit their letters for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
*Washington, DC, May 15, 2012.*

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Office of the Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Office of the Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the nation's mayors, we strongly urge the House of Representatives to support the protections for victims of domestic violence included in S. 1925, the bipartisan Senate bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

Since 1994, this landmark law has provided a comprehensive, coordinated, and community-based approach toward reducing domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and other forms of violence. VAWA's programs and services have provided lifesaving assistance to hundreds of thousands of victims and significantly strengthened the ability of the criminal justice system to hold violent perpetrators accountable. Over the past two decades, these efforts have helped dramatically reduce the incidence and impact of violence against women, including an over 50 percent decline in the annual rate of domestic violence.

Despite considerable progress in addressing the epidemic of violence against women, we recognize that much more needs to be done and that this reauthorization presents an opportunity for the Congress to strengthen our national commitment to tackling the challenges that remain. Like the 2000 and 2005 reauthorizations, we believe that the bipartisan Senate reauthorization does just that by expanding services and assistance to those communities who experience the highest rates of violence or who have the greatest difficulty accessing services.

We believe that it is essential that VAWA's vital services be provided to all victims regardless of group status and for that reason we strongly support the establishment of a uniform nondiscrimination provision for VAWA grant programs included in S. 1925. By replacing and clarifying the current patchwork of protections, the nondiscrimination provision will help ensure that victims are not denied services on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability. This measure is needed in part to address the significant obstacles that lesbian, gay, and transgendered communities have faced in accessing services in recent years. Despite the fact that they experience domestic violence at the same rate as the general population, 45 percent of lesbian, gay, and transgendered victims are reportedly turned away when they seek help from domestic violence shelters. This type of discrimination is simply unacceptable.

Since its first passage, VAWA has sought to protect immigrant victims whose non-citizen status can make them especially vulnerable to crimes of domestic and sexual violence. We are greatly concerned by a provision included in the VAWA reauthorization proposed by the House of Representatives, H.R. 4970, which would roll back confidentiality protections that enable undocumented women to safely come forward and report violent crimes. Rather than reducing the outlets for these victims, VAWA reauthorization should provide additional ways for law enforcement to work with these victims to investigate and prosecute serious crimes. The Senate version includes a provision that would allow the Department of Homeland Security to draw from a pool of previously authorized but never used U visas so that law enforcement officers have the tools to work with victims and bring violent offenders to justice.

The House bill, unlike the Senate version, also does not address the continuing challenge of violence in tribal communities. A recent study by the Center for Disease Control found that 46 percent of Native American women have experienced rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime. As with immigrant victims, VAWA has aimed to address the terribly high rates of violence against women in tribal communities. Although some progress has been made, we believe the continuing high rates of violence on tribal lands require far greater attention. This reauthorization provides an opportunity to strengthen federal law enforcement tools and to expand the capacity of tribal governments to investigate and prosecute these crimes.

As mayors, we have seen the tremendous impact of the Violence Against Women Act in our communities. The lifesaving programs supported in the legislation should be quickly reauthorized to ensure the continuation and access of vital services for victims. We believe that these Senate provisions will help us better address continuing problems and remaining unmet needs, and strongly urge the House take up and pass the bipartisan Senate bill, S. 1925.

Sincerely,

Antonio R. Villaragosa, Mayor of Los Angeles, CA President; Annise D. Parker, Mayor of Houston, TX Chair, Criminal & Social Justice Committee; Mark Stodola, Mayor of Little Rock, AR; Wayne Powell, Mayor of Manhattan Beach, CA; Jerry Sanders, Mayor of San Diego, CA; Helene Schneider, Mayor of Santa Barbara, CA; Bill Finch, Mayor of Bridgeport, CT; James Baker, Mayor of Wilmington, DE.

Michael A. Nutter, Mayor of Philadelphia, PA, Vice President; Thomas M. Menino, Mayor of Boston, MA, Past President; Patrick Hays, Mayor of North Little Rock, AR; Mary Ann Lutz, Mayor of Monrovia, CA; Ed Lee, Mayor of San Francisco, CA; Christopher Cabaldon, Mayor of West Sacramento, CA; Pedro Segarra, Mayor of Hartford, CT; Susan Whelchel, Mayor of Boca Raton, FL.

Michael R. Bloomberg, Mayor of New York, NY; Tom Cochran, CEO and Executive Director; Greg Stanton, Mayor of Phoenix, AZ; Kevin Johnson, Mayor of Sacramento, CA; Jan Marx, Mayor of San Luis Obispo, CA; Michael Hancock, Mayor of Denver, CO; Vincent C. Gray, Mayor of Washington, DC; Marilyn Gerber, Mayor of Coconut Creek, FL.

Patricia Gerard, Mayor of Largo, FL, Michael Ryan, Mayor of Sunrise, FL, Judy Abruscato, Mayor of Wheeling, IL, Harvey Johnson, Jr., Mayor of Jackson, MS; William Bell, Mayor of Durham, NC; Ken Miyagishima, Mayor of Las Cruces, NM; William Moehle, Mayor of Brighton, NY.

Michael Coleman, Mayor of Columbus, OH; Vaughn Spencer, Mayor of Reading, PA; Angel Taveras, Mayor of Providence, RI; Raul Salinas, Mayor of Laredo, TX; Michael McGinn, Mayor Seattle, WA; Dan Devine, Mayor of West Allis, WI; Lori Mosely, Mayor of Miramar, FL.

Shawn Connors, Pecatonica, IL; Stephanie Rawlings-Blake, Mayor of Baltimore, MD; John Engen, Mayor of Missoula, MT; Antonia Ricigliano, Mayor of Edison, NJ; Gerald Jennings, Mayor of Albany, NY; Paul Dyster, Mayor of Niagara Falls, NY; Sam Adams, Mayor of Portland, OR.

Thomas Leighton, Mayor of Wilkes-Barre, PA; Stephen Wukela, Mayor of Florence, SC; Deloris Prince, Mayor of Port Arthur, TX; Tom Barrett, Mayor of Milwaukee, WI; André Pierre, Mayor of North Miami, FL; Robert Sanonjian, Mayor of Waukegan, IL; William Wild, Mayor of Westland, MI; Anthony Foxx, Mayor of Charlotte, NC.

Susan Cohen, Mayor of Manalapan, NJ; Matthew Ryan, Mayor of Binghamton, NY; Stephanie Miner, Mayor of Syracuse, NY; Ed Pawlowski, Mayor of Allentown, PA; Victor Ortiz, Mayor of Gurabo, PR; AC Wharton, Mayor of Memphis, TN; John Marchione, Mayor of Redmond, WA; John Dickert, Mayor of Racine, WI.

---

THE COALITION AGAINST RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2012.*

Re Vote No on the Adams Amendment (#1). Reject Federally Funded Employment Discrimination.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned religious, education, civil rights, labor, and women's organizations write to voice our opposition to the language of the Adams Amendment (Amendment #1) to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012. We oppose the Adams Amendment insofar as it would alter the nondiscrimination clause in the base bill to remove protections that bar federally funded religious discrimination. We urge you to Vote NO on the Adams Amendment, as government funds should not be used to underwrite employment discrimination within government-funded projects and activities.

We appreciate the important role religiously affiliated institutions historically have played in addressing many of our nation's most pressing social needs, as a complement to government-funded programs. Indeed, many of us are directly involved in this work. We also recognize that the separation of church and state is the linchpin of religious freedom. In our view, effective government collaboration with faith-based groups does not require the sanctioning of federally funded religious discrimination.

In accordance with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, religious organizations may prefer co-religionists in hiring when using their own private funds. The Adams Amendment, however, would permit religious organizations to take VAWA funds and use those funds to discriminate against a qualified individual based on nothing more than his or her religious beliefs. VAWA should protect against taxpayer dollars being used to underwrite jobs where religion is a factor in hiring decisions.

Adopting the language in the Adams Amendment would be inconsistent with the longstanding principle that federal dollars must not be used to discriminate. Accordingly, we urge you to vote No.

Sincerely,

African American Ministers in Action, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC), American Association of University Women (AAUW), American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), American Humanist Association, American Jewish Committee, Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Anti-Defamation League, Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty.

Catholics for Choice, Center for Inquiry, Council for Secular Humanism, Disciples Justice Action Network, Equal Partners in Faith, Family Equality Council, Feminist Majority, Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders, Hindu American Foundation, Human Rights Campaign.

Institute for Science and Human Values, Interfaith Alliance, Japanese American Citizens League, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Jewish Women International, Lambda Legal, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Legal Momentum NAACP.

National Center for Lesbian Rights, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Council of Jewish Women, National Education Association, National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Action Fund, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Organization for Women, Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG) National People For the American Way.

Secular Coalition for America, Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS), The Sikh Coalition, Transgender Law Center, Union for Reform Judaism, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society, Women of Reform Judaism.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to a Republican bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit my remarks in opposition to a Republican bill that weakens protections for violence against women and in support of the bipartisan Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 656, Rule Providing Consideration of H.R. 4970, Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. Reporting a closed rule for the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act is another example of shutting Democrats out of the legislation process by ruling out any opportunity for Democrats to offer much needed Amendments.

The House version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act unfortunately omits improvements contained in the Senate version of the bill. What is worse is that the House version in its current form removes existing protections for immigrant women, and puts them at greater risk of domestic and sexual abuse, and it does not provide adequate and equal protection for tribal women and the LGBT community.

For nearly two decades now, Democrats have firmly supported the Violence Against Women Act and the critical assistance it has provided for women, men, and children, and have worked with Republicans to ensure its reauthorization twice in the past. Unfortunately, since Republicans have taken over the House, bipartisanship and compromise have fallen out of fashion. Republicans have continually played partisan politics and refused to compromise in an effort to move this country forward, and here we are again with another clear example of that.

Reporting a closed rule for consideration of Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act is a full-fledged promotion of the Republican attack against women and approval of legislation that is intended to silence the cries of millions of women around our country.

Violence Against Women Act has never been and should never be a partisan issue. It is astonishing how the Republican majority has lost sight of our purpose as lawmakers. We have been trusted with the responsibility of protecting society and ensuring justice to victims. Democrats and Republicans have always worked together to reauthorize Violence Against Women Act since its original passage in 1994. But that is not the case today.

This rule completely shuts out Democrats and does not allow for the possibility of a bipartisan consensus. I cannot support a rule making in order a bill that strips immigrant women, tribal women and the LGBT community of vital protections as this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stand with me in opposition to this rule.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ladies who are submitting their statements for the RECORD.

The Members who join me today are just a few of the many people who would like to be here to offer their suggestions for improving the bill and to highlight the stories of women, men, and children in their district and communities who have experienced atrocious violence. There are lessons to be learned from their stories, and it is unwise and unkind of us to turn a blind eye.

I'm thinking of Rosalind in Milwaukee, who was killed by her girlfriend, Malika, and her family had concerns about her over-possessiveness. But, of course, this is an LGBT relationship, and an order for protection may have been ignored without these provisions.

I think of another person in my district, Diane's story, 26 years old, married to a non-Indian, beaten. Over a hundred incidences—slapped, kicked, punched, and living in terror. She called for help several times but no one ever came to her rescue. She was living on a tribal land.

The Violence Against Women Act has been a lifeline for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. It has allowed us to hold perpetrators accountable and to pave pathways out of violence for victims—all women. And since VAWA passed in 1994, domestic violence has dropped by more than half. We must not turn back, Mr. Speaker. We must not weaken or repeal some of VAWA's lifesaving protections.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the point of

order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. The question before the House is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 656? Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, or UMRA, excludes from the application of that act any legislative provision that establishes or enforces statutory rights prohibiting discrimination.

The Congressional Budget Office has stated that while they have not reviewed a provision in section 3 of H.R. 4970 for intergovernmental or private-sector mandates, since that provision prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability, other provisions of H.R. 4970 would impose no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.

CBO goes on to say the bill would impose private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA on brokers of international marriage and certain supervisors over persons under official control of the United States. However, CBO estimates that the cost of those mandates would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA: $146 million in 2012, adjusted annually for inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the motion of the gentlewoman is dilatory. In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I do appreciate the woman walking us through the protocols for the unfunded mandates. And I would submit to her that the National Network to End Domestic Violence, who does a point-in-time counting of domestic violence services nationwide, would indicate that it costs not only personal anguish, but there are costs in society, actual fiscal costs, to not protecting women who are suffering in violent situations.

Right in my own State of Wisconsin, 714,000 women have been assaulted, raped, or stalked by an intimate partner. This number actually exceeds the population of the entire city of Milwaukee. Imagine the cost to employers when people don't show up at work. Imagine the cost in emergency rooms when people show up battered and bruised and broken and have no health insurance.

Approximately half a million of these women were fearful or concerned for their safety. Two hundred and eighty thousand Wisconsin women, 12.7 percent of our population, have been stalked in their lifetime. Imagine the cost of additional police work when these women call the police and nothing has been done in terms of making arrests and asking for accountability.

A study of childhood exposure to violence in Milwaukee has found that 16 percent of Wisconsin adults report having experienced recurring violence between adults in their childhood. Imagine the loss of productivity at schools. There's often a lot of talk about kids being inattentive in school and not being able to pass and succeed in school. Next to hunger, imagine the cost of witnessing and experiencing violence in the home as a cost to society.

I would now like to yield to the gentlelady for a question.

There were several amendments that were introduced in the Rules Committee last evening, and I was wondering if you were aware of any amendments that were adopted after we left the Rules Committee last evening. I know there had been a hearing. I was wondering if any of the amendments that Democrats had introduced were adopted.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

None of the amendments were made in order except the manager's amendment, which brings the bill closer to the Senate version of the bill.

Ms. MOORE. The manager's amendment, thankfully, was adopted, because the manager's amendment did have one little piece in there that helps out immigrant women. But there are 325 groups and organizations, everything from national women organizations to evangelical women and the bishops, that oppose even the manager's amendment because they say that not only are there just simply rollbacks to the Violence Against Women Act, but it actually puts immigrant women in danger, as the balance is tipped from current law in favor of these batterers, sexual assaulters, abusers, and killers.

I would like to yield to the gentlelady for one more question.

Will this body ever have an opportunity to vote on the bipartisan bill from the Senate that passed 68–31? Will this body ever have the opportunity? Will that bill ever be before us?

□ 1250

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I cannot assume what this body will do in the future. I am one member of the Rules Committee and the Education Committee. I do not have control over that, and I don't believe anybody can predict the future.

Ms. MOORE. Representative FOXX, just a follow-up, you are a member, a very senior member, of the Rules Committee, and so I was wondering if the rule is structured in a way that will ever allow to have before us, after we vote on this version, the Adams version of the VAWA bill? Will there be a pathway toward voting on the Senate bill as you understand it?

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentlewoman's question is a question for the rule and is not relevant to the point of order which she has raised.

Ms. MOORE. I thank the Speaker and I thank the gentlelady.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it really pains me to see my colleagues across the aisle make the kind of accusations that they make about Republicans being unconcerned about the issue of violence against women. How could they possibly accuse us of not being concerned about that issue? All Republicans are concerned about violence against anyone. Violence, we are very concerned about that. I personally won't even watch any kind of movie that has any kind of violence in it because I can't stand to see violence perpetrated on another human being. So Republican men and women both abhor violence against women.

But what we have done in the legislation that we are proposing is we are asking for increased accountability and to see that more services are directly offered to women who have violence perpetrated against them. In fact, I would say that we are more concerned about violence for women because we want to see those women served better and we want to see the money spent better.

Mr. Speaker, helping victims of abuse and domestic violence is not a Republican or Democrat issue. I have been pleased to work with Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ on H.R. 196, Simplifying the Ambiguous Law Keeping Everyone Reliably Safe, or STALKERS, Act which she has championed for the last two Congresses. The Democrats wouldn't bring this bill up when they were in control of the House.

The STALKERS Act updates the Federal stalking statute to include electronic surveillance and other means of cyber-stalking to ensure that potential stalking victims are protected as technology changes. In addition, the STALKERS Act increases criminal penalties by 5 years for offenders who have violated a protective order or whose victims are under the age of 18 or elderly.

Congresswoman SANCHEZ and I worked together regardless of which party was in charge of the House, and I'm pleased that legislation with the original cosponsor, who's a Democrat, has been included in the VAWA reauthorization bill that the House will vote on today. The VAWA reauthorization bill also adds stalking as an allowable grant purpose to continue the work of protecting these victims.

As we all know, law enforcement and prosecutors must have the resources they need to pursue violent criminals, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in voting for H.R. 4970 after voting for this rule providing for its consideration, or the rule we will consider in just a few minutes.

I'm not going to impugn the character of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We all want to stop violence against women. That's why Republicans have brought forth this bill. Again, the STALKERS Act could have

been brought forward under Democrat control of the House. It was not, and I'm very disappointed. But I'm proud of Republicans, that we're doing it and we're strengthening the Violence Against Women Act, not weakening the act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

YEAS—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—183

Ackerman
Altmire
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews
Burton (IN)
Cassidy
Chandler
Filner
King (IA)
Labrador
Pitts
Slaughter

□ 1318

Messrs. COHEN, CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. RICHMOND changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. MCCAUL, WEBSTER, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 253, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

□ 1320

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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

Ms. FOXX. Madam 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 656 provides for a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, and general debate for H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

As an original cosponsor of the underlying bill, I am proud to stand with my Republican colleagues in support of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, otherwise known as VAWA.

The House Judiciary Committee-passed version of VAWA before us today is a commonsense proposal to ensure that limited taxpayer dollars are used responsibly and efficiently while also improving access to services for victims. With this bill, we have also worked to add accountability requirements to conduct the necessary oversight of VAWA grant recipients and programs. Our goal is to ensure that more money is spent on direct services and less on administrative bureaucracy.

I commend Representative ADAMS on authoring this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills: H.R. 4970, the Cantor-Adams bill, and H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act.

Before we discuss the unprecedented rule for the Cantor-Adams bill, which has really turned what has traditionally been a bipartisan issue into a political football—to the detriment of women across our country—I would like to say a few words about the National Defense Authorization Act, which is also included in this rule.

I am really dismayed that the Defense authorization bill that House Republicans have brought before us undermines the bipartisan agreement which was reached just last summer. The bill funds defense spending at $8 billion over the levels set in the Budget Control Act and $3 billion over the President's budget request—again, more deficit spending in this Republican bill before us under this rule.

As our deficit spirals out of control, we need to tighten our belt and balance our budget. Instead, this bill doubles down on 10 years of ballooning defense budgets, which have played a major role in our deficit. This bill continues to kick the can down the road toward balancing our budget and leaves an only bigger hole that the Republican tax-and-spend policies continue to dig, putting our Nation deeper and deeper into debt.

Additionally, this bill ties the hands of our military and law enforcement by requiring in statute to keep military detainees in Guantanamo, handcuffing any President, Democrat or Republican, and preventing him from coming up with a plan for what to do with these individuals. This bill panders to our fears by insisting that the detainees remain in Guantanamo interminably. It tries to tell generals how to do their jobs and sets a timetable for troop levels in Afghanistan rather than does our normal civilian process.

Finally, I am disappointed by the political posturing included in the bill. The NDAA used to focus solely on setting defense policy and protecting our Nation. Unfortunately, the Republicans have decided to use this bill to also push political wedge issues. There is language in this bill prohibiting the use of military facilities to conduct same-sex marriages even in States that allow same-sex marriages. It even prevents gay and lesbian chaplains from marrying members of the military to other members of the military.

Further, I am deeply disturbed that, in a bill that governs our national security, language was included that would increase our dependence on foreign oil and that would undermine our long-term energy security interest. This bill's exemption of the Department of Defense from complying with section 526 of the 2007 energy bill hurts water and recreational interests in my State and harms research and development and investment in renewable energy.

Now, sadly, as disappointing as it is to see political posturing in the Defense authorization bill under this rule, it is truly horrifying to see the political posturing in the provisions of the Violence Against Women Act, which under this House version would likely lead to more violence against women. The Violence Against Women Act has a long bipartisan history. Both sides have traditionally sought to protect all victims of domestic violence, not just some. Sadly, this bill before us undoes much of the work that previous Congresses have done and accomplished on this issue for no reason when we have a bipartisan Senate version of the bill that protects all women from the abuse of partners.

Why would we exclude certain women in this country? If a woman is in a lesbian relationship, should she not be protected if she is a victim of domestic abuse? If a woman doesn't have the documentation to be in this country and is here illegally, should she not be protected under this law?

VAWA protects women who are actually convicted of other crimes. If a woman stole a car and served time, was convicted of that crime, she is still protected from domestic abuse under VAWA. Yet nonviolent offenders of our civil code, like undocumented immigrants, would no longer be protected because they would effectively face deportation after 4 years for testifying against the perpetrators of their abuse, making it much less likely that they would bring the perpetrators to justice and end the vicious cycle of domestic abuse in their families.

The majority in the House has offered no explanation for their refusal to allow us to take up the Senate bipartisan bill. My colleague VIRGINIA FOXX was noncommittal in her response about whether we would be taking up the Senate bipartisan bill. If she doesn't know the answer—and I certainly take her on her word—I would hope that somebody on the other side would come to the floor and say, Can we take up this Senate bipartisan bill? And if not, why not? And if so, when?

It passed the Senate with 68 votes, Republicans and Democrats. This is the time to stand up and see if our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are serious about responding to the insidious domestic violence crimes that occur every day throughout this country. Frankly, that could start by the defeat of this bill, allowing for an open process in considering this bill on the floor of the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I would now like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The Violence Against Women Act is an important tool for preventing domestic violence and sexual assault and for supporting the victims of these crimes. There is broad bipartisan agreement that this essential legislation must be renewed.

While the House bill protects the victims of domestic violence and improves services and education to prevent and address these crimes on college campuses, our legislation also goes beyond the Senate bill by ensuring that taxpayer resources help victims—not Washington bureaucrats—by limiting administrative expenses, requiring annual audits and combating fraud.

While the House legislation takes enormous strides in protecting the victims of these truly horrific crimes, the legislation also takes great care to ensure the funds allocated by this bill are treated with the responsibility and care the victims and taxpayers deserve:

H.R. 4970 requires VAWA audits be performed by the Department of Justice and that the Attorney General improves the coordination between the grant-making offices to reduce duplication and overlap in funding. H.R. 4970 prohibits the award of grant funds to nonprofit organizations that hold money in offshore accounts in order to avoid paying their Federal taxes, and it limits the use of funds for salaries and administrative expenses to 5 percent of funds authorized under the act.

□ 1330

The Violence Against Women Act has bipartisan support in both the House and Senate, and any attempt to exploit this important law as a partisan political issue is contemptible.

I encourage my colleagues in the House to vote in support of this legislation today to protect the victims of violent crime and support the responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, for nearly two decades, Congress has repeatedly reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act on a near unanimous and bipartisan basis.

Since the act became law, incidents of domestic violence have dropped by more than 60 percent and the reporting rate of domestic violence has risen by 51 percent.

The 2012 reauthorization is a chance for Congress to reaffirm its commitment to the protection of women across this Nation. That is why it's particularly disheartening to see such a vital piece of legislation fall victim to putting politics ahead of people.

What are the facts? Tonight, an American woman will join the one in four women who have been the victims of severe physical domestic violence. To her, this reauthorization is more than just a bill; it's security. The bill is security for the one in six women who have been raped in their lifetime. It's security for the mothers, daughters, and sisters across this Nation, and its security for the selfless individuals who tirelessly work to bring aid.

Now is not the time to take a step back, to abandon these victims. This Congress must expand its efforts and ensure that all victims are assisted, no matter what their race, religion, or sexual orientation. Too many in this body have chosen to fight against these protections. They want to fight efforts to extend LGBT individuals equal protection, even though they're less likely to receive protective orders, more likely to be turned away, and because of this are less likely to report their attack to the police. They deserve equal protection, and there's a bipartisan bill that does just that, but it's falling victim to election-year politics.

In America, we have to combat the abuse of women in our own society—no matter their country of origin—if we're going to continue to have the moral authority to advocate for the rights of people abroad. There is also a bipartisan bill that would continue to protect immigrant survivors by granting them special visas and by preventing retribution from their attackers, yet there are some in this body who would also deny these women protection.

These days, bipartisan compromise is hard to come by, no matter how hard some of us try. We are rarely handed an opportunity where there is such universal agreement. VAWA has a proud history of bipartisan support. Let's continue that tradition, put politics aside, and pass a bipartisan VAWA reauthorization bill that protects all victims.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from North Carolina, Congresswoman ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my colleague from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill and call for the passage of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012. Since its enactment in 1994, VAWA has helped many women escape abuse and enabled them to seek help through its victim services program.

We're here today debating something that is a good policy and common sense and should be supported in the same bipartisan manner that we have seen throughout the two decades since its inception. Violence against women does not occur along party lines, and neither should reauthorization of these programs. We must work together in a bipartisan manner to protect women from domestic violence, rape, and stalking. Partisan posturing should not be placed above the urgent needs of these victims.

The House's reauthorization makes several key improvements to the Senate bill and nearly doubles the resources for eliminating the backlog of unprocessed rape evidence kits, while cracking down on the fraud identified in the immigration program. This bill also brings great accountability to the grant administration by ensuring that funding is spent on the victims, not Washington bureaucrats. The House's reauthorization of VAWA is and always will be about the victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

I am proud to support this bill and will continue to fight and protect women and victims of abuse through commonsense legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and urge a ''no'' vote on the flawed Violence Against Women Act that my Republican colleagues will bring to the floor.

They had an opportunity to bring the bipartisan Senate bill to the floor, but chose not to do so. That's a shame, because the Violence Against Women Act has been a bipartisan and noncontroversial effort for almost 20 years now. The update passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis just last month.

Why does everything have to be a partisan fight here on the floor of the House? Over the past year, my Republican colleagues here in the House have blocked an important jobs package; they have stalled the adoption of the national transportation and infrastructure bill; they've dragged their feet on help for students and the impending increase to the student loan rate; and now they have turned what has been a bipartisan effort to protect the victims of domestic violence into a senseless political fight. Republicans would not even allow debate on amendments so that we could improve their flawed bill. And this is serious, because in my home State of Florida, there were over 113,000 crimes of domestic violence reported in 2010. If the Republican bill were to pass, more domestic violence crimes would go unreported, more abusers would be free, and more victims would be harmed.

This bill works in opposition to the very purpose of the legislation to protect all victims of domestic violence. Not just some victims, but all victims. Advocates across the country who are on the front lines in aiding women and victims every day have announced their opposition.

Please defeat this rule so we can call up the bipartisan and improved version from the Senate.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her leadership on the rule.

I also want to thank Congresswoman SANDY ADAMS from Florida for her leadership on the issue. I think it is so instructive to all of us as women of the House that we have had a female law enforcement officer who has been a leader in domestic violence policy in addressing this issue to help walk us through what works, what doesn't, and where we need to tweak this.

Many Members of this House, and many women are like me. They've worked on establishing domestic violence and child advocacy centers. And to hear from Congresswoman ADAMS the specifics—to bring more accountability to bear and to make certain that funding gets to the victims has been her priority, and a job well-done on that.

Some of the stats indeed tell us why we need to do this. In Tennessee, where I'm from, 52.1 percent of all crimes against persons are domestic violence.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill that will actually roll back protections for women across this Nation.

The Violence Against Women Act is a vital piece of legislation to be sure. It established a comprehensive response to prevent relationship violence, sexual assault, and stalking; to support survivors; and to hold perpetrators accountable. It is also a symbol that relationship violence and sexual assault is real and that it is unacceptable.

For the past 20 years, this law has been a shining symbol that Congress can put aside its petty differences and we can come together to do what is right for violence victims and survivors.

□ 1340

Now the bill before us tarnishes that symbol.

H.R. 4970 marks a backsliding in violence protections, leaving more women out in the cold without legal resources or social supports, just when they need it most.

And the issues are not just for immigrants or the LGBT community—although the way the bill before us ignores their pain is shameful—but also for women on college campuses, those in need of safe housing, tribal women. And that is why hundreds of groups across the country—service providers, law enforcement, health care workers—have come out against this bill.

Now we could address the problems in this bill if we were allowed an opportunity to vote on the Moore-Conyers amendment, which I cosponsored. The Moore-Conyers amendment mirrors the recently passed bipartisan Senate bill. But the House leadership unilaterally decided to block it from even coming to a vote. The majority has, once again, put rigid ideology over commonsense compromise, and this time at the expense of violence survivors and their families.

Reauthorization is critical for the Violence Against Women Act, but it needs to be done right. I urge the majority to drop the partisan politics, join a bipartisan coalition, and support these survivors.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 5 minutes to Mr. NUGENT from Florida, my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my fellow Rules Committee member, Dr. FOXX, for allowing me to speak on this issue not only for women but for all Americans. I also want to thank my Florida colleague SANDY ADAMS for her leadership shown on this issue.

I spent my entire career as a law enforcement officer, 36 years, and the last 10 years as a sheriff. When you are a cop, you usually don't get to see people in the best light. Getting called to somebody's house or somebody coming to your office isn't typically something that is a highlight of their day. It's because they are in need of help.

Throughout my entire career, I saw some of the worst that man has to

offer, and no small part of that was domestic violence. During my four decades as a cop and sheriff, I saw the results of domestic violence: battered partners, both men and women; children either physically or emotionally hurt in the crossfire between their fighting parents; victims who were suffering, scared, intimidated, and didn't know where to go for justice.

If you will look at the State of Florida and what it did with regards to domestic violence, it's clear that it was not just about a husband and wife. It's about those folks that live within a home. It's about their relationship within that home as it affects their children, as it affects each other. It doesn't specifically say that it has to be a man or a woman. It doesn't identify that. It talks about a relationship—not a casual relationship, but a relationship where they're intimate with each other, they spend time with each other, they're sexually active with each other. It doesn't say that it has to be a man and a woman. It says, these individuals have certain rights under domestic violence law and also the ability to get an injunction for protection.

I have seen abusers on both sides. I have seen those who were married, those who were boyfriend and girlfriend, and those who were boyfriend and boyfriend or girlfriend and girlfriend commit atrocious crimes on each other. It had nothing to do with marriage. It had everything to do with the relationships that they had within their homes.

So as we move forward, those on the other side of the aisle want to add something to this piece of legislation that's already covered. It already covers those relationships. If you start defining a particular relationship, what if you leave one out? In here, it is very broad and allows us, in law enforcement, to be very protective of those that need protection. Whether it's stalking, intimidation, voyeurism, it doesn't matter. And oftentimes, women are the victims of domestic violence, but a man can just as easily be a victim of domestic violence, and I have seen that, too.

The Violence Against Women Act protects and prevents all types of intimate partner crime regardless of the gender of either the criminal or the victim. This legislation funds the programs that not only help men and women who have been hurt, but it also helps law enforcement prevent these crimes from ever happening.

I have heard a number of my colleagues talk about what isn't in the bill. They say, for example, it doesn't include ''sexual orientation'' as one of the protected classes. The Violence Against Women Act is and always has been gender-neutral. That's the beauty of this piece of legislation. It's gender-neutral.

Under the ''real'' VAWA, as some people call it, domestic violence is interpreted as intimate partner violence. It legally includes felony or misdemeanor crimes committed by spouses or ex-spouses, boyfriends or girlfriends, and ex-boyfriends or ex-girlfriends.

Now I'm not going to say this House legislation is perfect, but it makes significant improvements to streamline our Nation's domestic violence programs. In fact, the exact same funding authorization levels in the Senate bill is included in this bill, $680 million in funding per year for the next 5 years. Moreover, the manager's amendment brings the House even more in line with the Senate's authorization.

Madam Speaker, as you probably know, this week is National Police Week, and we certainly know about domestic violence. The men and women that worked for me, as a sheriff, knew about it. SANDY ADAMS, a former cop, introduced this legislation. And we've seen firsthand what domestic violence does to our families.

By passing this legislation, we get a step closer to making sure these victims receive the services they need. That's why I am encouraging my colleagues to support the rule, support this legislation, and let it get to conference with the Senate so we can bring these services to the men and women who need it the most.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. When one out of four women will experience domestic violence in their lifetimes, it is unconscionable that the majority would try to roll back the protections in the Violence Against Women Act.

Since the act first passed in 1994, it has changed the landscape for American women. Domestic violence has dropped by over 50 percent. And in a historical bipartisan fashion, the Senate passed a bill that modernizes the act for our times. It consolidates programs, takes additional steps to reach victims of domestic violence.

Madam Speaker, 200 national organizations, 500 State and local organizations, including the National District Attorneys Association, the National Sheriffs' Association—my colleague who just spoke is a former sheriff, but his association is supporting the Senate bill and not this House bill—and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association all support the Senate bill. And our colleague from Wisconsin, Congresswoman MOORE, has put forward legislation that mirrors that bipartisan approach. But instead of moving that bipartisan bill forward, the majority has put forward an alternative bill that, in fact, risks the lives and the health of women.

The Department of Justice estimates that one out of every three Native American women will be raped and two out of five will be victims of domestic violence. The majority's bill removes the provisions that are essential to ensuring that Indian women have access to the act. The Senate bill and Congresswoman MOORE's bill strengthen protections in the act for immigrant women; yet the majority's bill would endanger the safety of immigrants.

In 2010, nearly half of lesbian and gay survivors were turned away from domestic violence shelters or denied services because of their sexual orientation. The majority's bill would continue to deny those individuals the community protections afforded by the act.

We are talking about women's lives. This is no place for partisan games. The rule before us would roll back the central protections that have made a difference for so many women in this Nation.

I urge the majority to bring Congresswoman MOORE's bill to the floor. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

□ 1350

Domestic violence is an all-too-common reality, occurring most everywhere here in the United States, and one that deeply impacts all involved. In Ohio alone, there were reportedly 70,717 calls in 2010 for domestic violence incidents. While not all of these resulted in criminal charges, it is vitally important that law enforcement have the knowledge and resources necessary to appropriately respond and investigate domestic violence calls. It is also crucial that all victims of domestic violence have access to the help they need to get out of a harmful situation and overcome not only physical abuse but the emotional scars that deeply impact the lives of victims.

I am confident that H.R. 4970 would play an integral role in alleviating domestic violence in our communities by providing more than $680 million for funding per year to help prevent domestic violence and protect victims of abuse. This legislation would also increase resources for sexual assault investigations, prosecutions, and victim services, in addition to strengthening penalties for abusers. Importantly, this legislation also seeks to promote awareness for the prevention of violence by funding State prevention education programs and enhancements for campus programs.

As a son, a husband, a brother to two sisters, a father of two grown women, and a grandfather of four little girls, I understand the importance of preventing domestic violence against women and also ensuring that all women have the necessary resources and protection should they ever be in need.

The number of occurrences of domestic violence, physical violence, and stalking within the United States is

staggering and simply unacceptable. It is my hope that this reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act will have an immediate impact on reducing domestic violence and improving services for its victims.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I urge a ''no'' vote. This bill is but one more assault on what has become, sadly but surely, known as the war against women.

A government has no greater responsibility than to keep its citizens safe, but in its current form, this bill says there are some we will not help. We will not protect Native Americans, LGBT people, and immigrant people.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would not extend the protections of this bill to tribal residents. Why? Do they not suffer when they are assaulted? This bill, in its current form, would not protect people from discrimination in the LGBT community. Why? Do they not bleed when they are struck? And this bill, in its current form, eliminates the path to citizenship for some visa holders who have been victims of sex trafficking, torture, and rape. Why? Do they not bruise and bleed when they are beaten and battered?

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you.

There is an indifference to the suffering of some—just some—in this bill that is as chilling and callous as anything I have ever seen in this Chamber in modern times.

I urge a strong ''no'' vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. BUERKLE).

Ms. BUERKLE. I rise this afternoon in support of the rule and the underlying bill in H.R. 4970. I am so pleased to stand here with my colleagues in support of this rule.

This is a particularly meaningful bill for me because, in 1994, when I graduated from law school, I became aware of a program that the Women's Bar Association had. That was 1994, and that's when the original VAWA was enacted. The program was that we could do pro bono work and work in our domestic violence shelter. For all of these many years, I have been involved in domestic violence. So it's particularly meaningful to me that the time when I first got involved in this—and it was thanks to a very courageous law school professor I had—that we now are reauthorizing VAWA that was originally from 1994.

Madam Speaker, I just become so distressed when I hear the allegations that there is a war on women. When we sat down and we began discussing VAWA, we sat down with the understanding that Americans deserve equal protection under the law. We are not going to single out. We are not going to distinguish one victim from another. Any person who is a victim of domestic violence is a victim of domestic violence. Beyond that, it should be of no concern.

However, I will say this—and my colleague SANDY ADAMS has done such a magnificent job with this—when we began to have concerns after we dropped this bill last week, we went back to the table. We heard from Members who have large Native American populations in their districts and Members who are Native Americans with regard to the issue. We heard with regard to the illegal alien issue. We went back to the table and came forth with a manager's amendment to begin to address those issues. That's the right thing to do. That's what domestic violence victims should expect from this House—sit down, figure this out, and make sure we go forward with what is in the best interest of the victims. And that's what the House of Representatives did.

I strongly support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Let me give one example of how important this legislation is and how this bill before us would eliminate important provisions to protect women from abuse.

Several years ago, a teenage girl from Trenton came to my office for help. She'd been abused by her parents and abandoned by them. When she came to my office, she was living in a shelter participating in a transitional living program that required part-time employment. She had come to the United States legally, but she needed help. Because of VAWA, I was able to show her how she could secure her permanent resident status and work authorization. After I helped her get work authorization and permanent resident status, she got her life back on track. VAWA made that possible.

This bill would remove essential provisions of VAWA that allow victims of abuse to petition for permanent residency by themselves; and by removing those provisions, this bill would leave this girl and countless other victims of domestic abuse with no help, no support, and potentially at the mercy of their abusers.

Vote ''no'' on this rule. Vote ''no'' on the bill.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in strong support of the underlying bill, the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, for several years, I had the great honor to serve on the board of my local domestic violence safe house. And I call it a safe house. We didn't call it a shelter. We called it a safe house. So I have personally seen women and children who so desperately needed that safe haven to escape from a cycle of violence. Throughout my service here in Congress, I consistently fought to make certain that support is there for all of the safe houses across my district.

Those women and all those victims of domestic violence, who far too often suffer in silence, need to know that they are not alone and that there are people who care. Today, this House is doing what we need to do, by taking a stand in defense of those who face the danger of domestic violence, by passing this reauthorization.

I certainly applaud the author of the bill, SANDY ADAMS from Florida. She's kept politics away from crafting this bill. Instead, she's really focused squarely on protecting the victims of domestic violence.

The bill that we are debating here today produces funding at the same level as what was passed by the Senate, but I think it allocates that funding in a way that better supports the victims of domestic violence. For instance, this bill doesn't make any special carveouts for any particular victim group, because it protects everybody equally. It also includes outstanding revisions developed by listening to those involved in protecting victims from across the Nation.

It strengthens penalties for sexual assault and abuse. It improves Federal stalking laws. It helps young women in college by working to prevent violence on our campuses through improved education programs. And it dramatically improves emergency and transitional housing services.

As well, the Senate bill mirrors current law, which only mandates 40 percent of the funding in the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to address a backlog of rape testing kits which are required, quite frankly, to successfully prosecute rape cases. Our bill mandates that 75 percent of the funding be used for that purpose so that we can eliminate the backlog that exists and put rapists where they belong, and that's in prison.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me today in standing up for women in need and all victims of violence by supporting this outstanding legislation.

□ 1400

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, we need to work together to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act; but, unfortunately, H.R. 4970 is seriously flawed and should not pass.

Among its many flaws, it harms immigrant women and fails to protect the LGBT community. It also creates new

mandatory minimum sentences. Mandatory minimums have been studied extensively, and they've been found to be ineffective in addressing crime, while at the same time they distort the rational sentencing systems, they discriminate against minorities, and they often violate common sense.

Mandatory minimums can be particularly harmful in domestic relations cases, domestic violence cases where the victim and the abuser have a prior relationship, and where the victim of abuse may be less likely to report the abuse knowing that, if convicted, the abuser is certain to go to prison for 5 or 10 years without parole. That's why many organizations dedicated to ending domestic violence and working hard for the reauthorization of VAWA are opposed to the mandatory minimum provisions in the rule.

On top of these problems in the reported bill, the Rules Committee adopted a manager's amendment that, among other problems, deletes protections against discrimination in hiring by religious organizations using VAWA funds.

Since the 1960s, we have had, as a Federal policy, a prohibition against discrimination based on religion when using Federal funds. The 1964 Civil Rights Act had an exemption for churches and other religious organizations using their own funds to be able to consider religion in hiring. However, the manager's amendment specifically allows those groups to discriminate based on religion with Federal funds. We should not pass a bill that allows a person applying for a job paid for with Federal funds to be discriminated against based on religion.

Madam Speaker, we must work hard to reauthorize VAWA; but, unfortunately, H.R. 4970 in its current form is not the version of VAWA we should pass, and the rule does not allow amendments to improve the bill. So I urge defeat of this rule.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, I rise also to support the rule and to support the Violence Against Women Act. This bill will support programs and organizations that help assist the victims of domestic abuse, stalking, and sexual assault. And it does so in a way that includes much-needed accountability measures so we can be sure that more of the funds go to the victims who need it rather than to Washington bureaucrats.

When I was practicing law, I represented some victims of domestic violence, including men, women, and children, when I was doing guardian ad litem work. And I, further, had a law office bookkeeper who was murdered by her husband while she was working for us. It was traumatic for the entire office.

On Indian reservations in my State and in communities where there is a hidden element of domestic abuse that you see every Friday morning in the courtroom when they have stacked settings for these types of cases, you see things you wouldn't even believe are going on in your own communities. That's why it's so important we have a bill that is efficient and gets the money to those victims, not to bureaucrats in Washington. That's why I support this rule. That's why I support the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill that rolls back protections for domestic violence victims and survivors, and I include three letters representing hundreds of organizations—law enforcement organizations, advocacy organizations around the country—in opposition to the rule.

Before coming to Congress, I founded and was the first executive director of the National Network to End Domestic Violence. I've trained thousands of police officers and judges, held victims' hands in courts. I've done intake in shelters and held their children in emergency rooms and answered calls on hotlines.

This bill, the underlying bill and the rule, do great damage to the work that we've done across the aisle as advocates and leaders of good will to protect the interests of battered women of domestic violence, victims and survivors.

Since the passage in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has been a bipartisan piece of legislation. It has revolutionized the way violent crimes against women are prosecuted and prevented. Never would I have imagined that, when working on this 18 years ago, that we'd be in this Congress rolling back the protections that have been expanded to protect women, victims, survivors across this country and their children. It really is a sad day in this Congress. We should be ashamed of what we're doing.

We should make sure that we expand protections for women, for immigrant women, for lesbian and gay men and women, and to make sure that we pass a rule that truly is bipartisan in this Congress that reflects the values and the needs and the spirit of the 1994 law.

MAY 15, 2012.

Re: Update—Manager's amendments to VAWA (H.R. 4970) do not fix critical problems. H.R. 4970 eliminates protections for battered immigrants; harms victims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As a diverse coalition of immigration, faith, labor, civil rights, human rights and community organizations serving and advocating on behalf of immigrant victims of domestic violence, human trafficking, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking, we urge you to oppose H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012 (VAWA) (Adams, R–FL) when it comes to the House floor.

The amendments offered by Representative Adams (''manager's package'') that will be considered by the Rules Committee today are inadequate and do not correct the major problems with H.R. 4970. With the manager's package. H.R. 4970 will still roll back existing protections for battered immigrants that were created with bi-partisan congressional support.

Enacted in 1994 and reauthorized twice in 2000 and 2005, VAWA has a long history of uniting lawmakers with the common purpose of protecting survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. When VAWA was conceived, Congress recognized that the noncitizen status of battered immigrants can make them particularly vulnerable. Abusers often exploit their victims' undocumented status, leaving the victim afraid to report the abuse to law enforcement and making them fearful of assisting with the prosecution of these crimes.

As modified, H.R. 4970 effectively eradicates protections created by VAWA that have been available for almost twenty years to immigrant victims of violence. The bill establishes an extremely onerous adjudication process for victims to receive protection that is not required in other areas of the law. Finally, it wastes government resources when allegations of fraud have not been substantiated.

H.R. 4970 eliminates protections for crime victims offered by the U visa.

Deters immigrant victims from reporting crimes by denying nearly all U visa recipients the protections offered by lawful permanent resident status. By offering only temporary relief, H.R. 4970 will eliminate an important incentive for victims to report crimes and silence victims who fear deportation. A victim could be deported and be forced to leave her children behind with an abuser if he has legal status but she does not.

Endangers crime victims by making it extremely difficult for them to obtain U visa protection. H.R. 4970 needlessly requires that an investigation or prosecution is being actively pursued. Current law already requires that law enforcement certify that the victim has been or is likely to be helpful to an investigation or prosecution.

H.R. 4970 requires that the victim help identify the perpetrator. Many sexual assault victims never get a good look at the perpetrator.

H.R. 4970 denies battered immigrants the protections of ''self-petitioning.''

Gives perpetrators tools to interfere with a victim's immigration case.

Forces every VAWA self-petitioner to participate in two face-to-face interviews with DHS officials, subjecting them to unnecessary additional screening that can be dangerous for victims who may have to account for their every movement to the abuser.

Requires untrained local field office staff conduct in-person interviews with victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Long delays to secure initial interviews at local offices will put victims trying to leave abusive relationship at greater risk.

Endangers the safety of battered immigrants by suspending adjudication of their case if there is an open criminal investigation or prosecution of the perpetrator.

H.R. 4970 requires DHS officials to conduct expensive and time consuming reviews of the victims' cases that are not required in other areas of law. These wasteful reviews are motivated by unsubstantiated claims of fraud and abuse within VAWA programs.

H.R. 4970 endangers victims, and undoes years of bipartisan progress made in previous VAWA bills by taking us to a time before 1994 when abusers were allowed to use immigration status as a tool for further abuse. When H.R. 4970 is brought to the floor of the

House of Representatives, we urge you to vote NO. This bill goes against the core of VAWA by eliminating protections for victims and placing victims in danger.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Mony Ruiz-Velasco, National Immigrant Justice Center, or Grace Huang, Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

Sincerely,

America's Voice Education Fund; American Civil Liberties Union; American Immigration Lawyers Association; American Jewish Committee; Americans for Immigrant Justice; Asian American Justice Center, Member of Asian American Center for Advancing Justice; Asian Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence; ASISTA; Benjamin N. Cardozo Human Rights and Genocide Law Clinic; Break the Cycle; California Partnership to End Domestic Violence; Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities; Centro Legal de la Raza; Church World Service, Immigration and Refugee Program; Disciples Home Missions of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; Human Rights Defense Center; Hutto Visitation Program.

Immigrant Rights Clinic at Rutgers School of Law; Immigration Equality; Immigration Law Center of Minnesota; Institute on Domestic Violence in the African-American Community; International Institute of Buffalo; International Organization for Adolescents; Jesuit Social Research Institute/Loyola University New Orleans; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish Women International; Kids in Need of Defense; Legal Aid Justice Center; Legal Services of New Jersey; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition.

National Center for Victims of Crime; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP); National Council of Jewish Women; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Forum; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild; National Organization for Women; National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault; National Network to End Domestic Violence; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project; Physicians for Human Rights; Political Asylum/Immigration Representation Project; Rabbis for Human Rights-North America; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network; South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT).

Texans United for Families; Tahirih Justice Center; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The Reformed Church of Highland Park, NJ; The Young Center for Immigrant Children's Rights at the University of Chicago; Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates; VIDA Legal Assistance, Inc.; Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action Alliance; Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence; Women of Color Network; Women's Refugee Commission; Who Is My Neighbor? Inc.

MAY 14, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
*Majority Leader, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. STENY HOYER,
*Minority Whip, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER CANTOR, AND MINORITY WHIP HOYER: We, the undersigned organizations, represent millions of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and the professionals who serve them, throughout the United States and territories. We would like to express our strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the bill introduced by Rep. Sandy Adams (R–FL) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

As you know, Congress has recognized the severity of violence against women and our need for a national strategy since the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994. Over the last 18 years, this landmark federal law's comprehensive approach to violence against women has had dramatic results. VAWA funds are used to:

Train over 500,000 law enforcement personnel every year,

Support sexual assault services in every state; when victims receive advocate-assisted services following assaults, rape survivors are 59 percent more likely to have police reports taken than survivors without advocates whose reports are only taken 41 percent of the time, and

Support programs that reduce domestic violence homicides; as an example, between 1993 and 2007, the rate of intimate partner homicides of females decreased by 35 percent and the rate of intimate partner homicides of males decreased 46 percent.

We all support a strong, bipartisan VAWA reauthorization bill similar to what the Senate passed last month, which would continue the life-saving protections and services needed by victims and their families. Again, H.R. 4970, which recently passed out of the House Judiciary Committee by a near party-line vote, would be a rollback of years of progress and likely increase the number of women and children who could be hurt. While we respect Congresswoman Adams' personal commitment to the issue of violence against women and girls, we must oppose her harmful bill. H.R. 4970 is genuinely dangerous for immigrant women and their families. It includes damaging provisions that create obstacles for immigrant victims to report crimes, increases danger for immigrant victims by eliminating important confidentiality protections, and undermines effective anti-fraud protections that exist in current law.

While embracing many elements of the bipartisan reauthorization that recently passed the Senate, the bill excludes key improvements that were included in the Senate reauthorization. It expressly rejects protections for men and women who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender and eliminates strong protections and justice for women and children who are beaten or abused on Tribal lands by perpetrators who are not members of a particular tribe. And it removes a key requirement that would more easily allow victims to move from one subsidized housing program to another in order to avoid an abuser and drops an important provision that would tackle the violence that occurs on our nation's college campuses.

We respectfully request that you reconsider advancing this legislation and instead focus on developing a bipartisan bill modeled after H.R. 4271, the companion bill to the Senate-passed version of VAWA.

Thank you for your past efforts to prevent and respond to violence against women and children. We look forward to working with you to craft a bill that works to protect all victims and directs resources to this urgent task in the most effective way possible.

Sincerely,

9to5, National Association of Working Women; A New Hope Center, Inc.; Advocates for Youth; African Services Committee; Akiak Native Community; Alianza—National Latino Alliance for the Elimination of Domestic Violence; AAUW; American Federation of Teachers; American Red Cross Rape Crisis Services; Americans for Immigrant Justice; Amnesty International USA; Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence; ASISTA Immigration Assistance; Association of Jewish Family & Children's Agencies; Association of Reproductive Health Professionals (ARHP); Battered Women's Legal Advocacy Project; Black Women's Health Imperative; Break the Cycle; Business and Professional Women's Foundation.

Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities; Center for Legal and Social Justice; Charging Buffalo Society; Children's Civil Rights Union; Coalition of Labor Union Women; Coalition on Human Needs; Compass Rape Crisis & Counseling Center; Covenant House International; Cumbee Center to Assist Abused Persons; Domestic Violence Alternatives/Sexual Assault Center; Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project; End Violence Against Women International; Enlace Comunitario; Farmworker Justice; Feminist Majority Foundation; Forensic Healthcare Consulting; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Futures Without Violence, formerly Family Violence Prevention Fund; Global Workers Justice Alliance.

Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS); Holistic Living Project; Human Rights Campaign; Immigrant Ability; INCourage, Advocacy Beyond Purpose; Indian Law Resource Center; Indigenous Women's Justice Institute; International Institute of Buffalo; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Jewish Federations of North America; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish Women International; Joint Action Committee for Political Affairs (JACPAC); Justice & Mercy Legal Aid Clinic.

L.U.N.A; La Casa de las Madres; La Esperanza; La Mariposa Enterprises; Latin American Association; Latinas Unidas Por Un Nuevo Amanecer; Legal Momentum; Manavi; Media Equity Collaborative; Mennonite Central Committee U.S. Washington Office; Mental Health America of Licking County; MESA; Mosaic Family Services; National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF); National Association of Human Rights Workers; National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Center for Victims of Crime; National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence.

National Clearinghouse on Abuse in Later Life; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Inc.; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; National Congress of American Indians; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Women's Organizations; National Domestic Violence Hotline; National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Health Care for the Homeless Council; National Immigration Project of the National

Lawyers Guild; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty; National Legal Aid & Defender Association; National Low Income Housing Coalition; National Network to End Domestic Violence; National Organization for Men Against Sexism (NOMAS); National Organization for Women.

National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; National Women's Conference Committee; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; Native Women's Coalition; NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; Paso Del Norte Civil Rights Project; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Rape Victim Advocates; Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association; Redwood Justice Fund; Refugio del Rio Grande, Inc.; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Rural Women's Health Project; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Share Time Wisely Consulting Services; Sisters of Mercy Institute Justice Team; Stop Abuse Campaign.

Tahirih Justice Center; The Domestic Violence Action Center; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The Legal Project; The NAACP; Time To Tell; Tiyospaye Winyan Maka; Turning Anger into Change; UNANIMA International; UnidosNow; Union for Reform Judaism; Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations; United Church of Christ; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church & Society; United South and Eastern Tribes; Uniting Three Fires Against Violence; UNO Immigration Ministry; Urban Justice Center.

Vera House, Inc.; Victim Rights Law Center; Victims Services of Behavioral Connections; VOICE MALE Magazine; Volunteer Legal Services Hawaii; Wider Opportunities for Women; Women Against Abuse; Women for Genuine Security; Women in Federal Law Enforcement, Inc.; Women of Color Network; Women of Reform Judaism; Women's Law Project; YWCA USA.

ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS OPPOSED TO H.R. 4970 OR TO KEY PROVISIONS IN THE BILL

Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Advocates for Human Rights; African Services Committee; Alachua County Victim Services and Rape Crisis Center; Alaska Federation of Natives; American Bar Association; American Civil Liberties Union; American Federation of Labor; American Immigration Lawyers Association; Americans for Immigrant Justice; America's Voice Education Fund; Anindita Dasgupta, MA. Doctoral Candidate at the University of California, San Diego; Anita Raj, Ph.D. Professor of Medicine and Global Public Health at the University of California, San Diego; Artemis Justice Center; ASHA for Women; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence.

Boston University Civil Litigation Program; Break the Cycle; Campaign for Community Change; Canal Alliance; Captain Maria Alvarenga Watkins, (Retired) Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D.C.; Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities Casa Esperanza; Central American Resource Center; Chief Brian Kyes, Chelsea Police Department, Massachusetts; Chief Pete Helein, Appleton Wisconsin Police Department; Christian Community Development Association; Church World Service; Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice; Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault; Community Action and Human Services Department; Community Immigration Law Center; Connecticut Legal Services Inc.; Cris M. Sullivan, Ph.D., Professor, Ecological/Community Psychology, Associate Chair, Psychology Department.

Detective Sergeant Robert Mahoney, Peabody Police Department, Massachusetts; Detective Shelli Sonnenberg, Boise Police Department, Idaho; Detective Stacey Ivie, Alexandria Police Department, Virginia; Domestic Violence in the African American Community; DREAM Activist Virginia; Education Not Deportation Project of the United We Dream Network; El Rescate Legal Services, Inc.; Empire Justice Center; Enlace Comunitario; Esperanza; Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Evan Stark, Ph.D., MA, MSW, Professor and Director of Public Health, School of Public Affairs and Administration, Rutgers University-Newark & Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration, UMDNJ—School of Public Health; FaithAction International House; Families for Freedom; Families Against Mandatory Minimums; Feminist Majority; Florida Coastal Immigrant Rights Clinic; Franciscan Action Network; Fuerza Latina; Futures Without Violence.

Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights; Giselle Hass, PsyD, Adjunct Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, Center for Applied Legal Studies; Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; Helene Berman, RN, Ph.D., President of the Nursing Network on Violence Against Women International; Human Rights Campaign; Human Rights Initiative of North Texas; Human Rights Watch; Immigrant Defense Project; Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota; Immigration Equality; inMotion, Inc.; InterCultural Advocacy Institute; Inter Tribal Council of Arizona; International Institute of the Bay Area; Intimate Partner Violence Assistance Clinic University of Florida, Levin College of Law.

Jacquelyn Campbell, Ph.D., RN, FAAN, Anna D. Wolf Chair, The Johns Hopkins; University School of Nursing and National Director, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Nurse Faculty Scholars; Jay G. Silverman, Ph.D. Professor of Medicine and Global Health; Division of Global Public Health Senior Fellow, Center on Global Justice University of California at San Diego, School of Medicine Adjunct Associate; Professor of Society, Human Development and Health Harvard School of Public Health; Jewish Women International; Just Neighbors; Justice For Our Neighbors-Southeastern Michigan; Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; La Fe Multi-Ethnic Ministries, Intervarsity Christian Fellowship/USA; La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians; Latin American Coalition; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; Leadership Conference of Women Religious; Legal Aid Society of the Orange County Bar Association, Inc.; Legal Momentum; Leslye E. Orloff, J.D. Director, National Immigrant Women's Advocacy Project, American University Washington College of Law; Lieutenant Carole Germano, Danvers Police Department, Massachusetts; Lutheran immigration and Refugee Service.

Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Mary Ann Dutton, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Georgetown University; Medical Center Mennonite Central Committee U.S.; Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women; Mountain Crisis Services; Muslim Public Affairs Council; Nassau County Coalition Against Domestic Violence; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum; National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers; National Association of Evangelicals; National Association of Federal Defenders; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; National Coalition on Black Civic Participation; National Congress of American Indians; National Congress of American Indians Task Force on Violence Against Women; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

National Council of La Raza; National Council of Negro Women, Inc.; National Employment Law Project; National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Forum; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Latino Evangelical Coalition; National Legal Aid & Defender Association; National Network to End Domestic Violence; National Organization for Women Foundation; National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and the Women of Color Network; National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women; Nawal Ammar, PhD, Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology; NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; New Sanctuary Coalition of NYC; NewBridges Immigrant Resource Center; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project.

Officer Michael LaRiviere, Salem Police Department, Massachusetts; Paso del Norte Civil Rights Project; Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center; Political Asylum Immigration Representation Project; Public Justice Center; Rachael Rodriguez, Ph.D., Associate Professor in the School of Nursing at Edgewood College; Rainbow Services, Ltd.; Refiigio del Rio Grande; Rhonda Giger, Prosecutor—City of Bothell, WA; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network; Ross Silverman LLP; Rural Women's Health Project; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Sergeant Inspector Antonio Flores, San Francisco Police Department, California; Service Employees International Union; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas; Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia; Sojourners; South Asian Americans Leading Together; Stephanie J. Nawyn, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, Michigan State University; Supervising Deputy Sheriff Marcus Bruning, St. Louis County Sheriff's Office, Missouri.

Tahirih Justice Center; Tapestri, Inc; The Bridge to Hope; The Episcopal Church; The Immigrant Legal Resource Center; The Kansas/Missouri Dream Alliance; The Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights; The Sentencing Project; The Violence Intervention Program; The William Kellibrew Foundation; TN Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence; UC Davis Immigration Law Clinic; Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations; United Methodist Church; United Migrant Opportunity Services; UnitedWomen.org; U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.

VIDA Legal Assistance, Inc.; Virginia Organizing; Virginia Sexual & Domestic Violence Action Alliance; Voces Unidas for Justice; Voices of Men; Washington Immigration Defense Group; Washington State Coalition Against; Willow Creek Community Church; Women of Color Network; Women's Refugee Commission; Worker Justice Center of New York; World Evangelical Alliance; World Relief; YWCA USA.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Congresswoman BIGGERT.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am disappointed in this closed rule for VAWA. I am concerned that the bill, even with the changes made in the manager's amendment, doesn't reflect everything that we've learned over the past 5 years in terms of what works best for victims or prosecutors.

Over the past several months, I sat down with advocates in my district to go section by section through the Senate reauthorization and discussed what works and what doesn't work. They strongly support provisions that would clarify equal treatment for LGBT individuals, bolster enforcement on Native American reservations, and ensure that victims aren't deported simply for reporting domestic abuse. I see no reason to exclude these provisions from a House bill. Our victim service providers on the front lines really just want to know who they can help and that they can help everyone who comes through the front door.

Last night, I offered an amendment that would have modernized the bill's definitions to reflect the input of victim service providers, including special protections for immigrant victims, and clarified that LGBT individuals can be served by VAWA.

I previously worked on the authorization of VAWA, which incorporated good ideas. That authorization was never a partisan issue, and it shouldn't be now.

Madam Speaker, I am disappointed in this closed rule for H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Act of 2012 (VAWA).

I am concerned that the bill, even with changes made in the manager's amendment, doesn't reflect everything we've learned over the last 5 years in terms of what works best for victims or prosecutors.

Over the past several months, I've sat down with advocates in my district to go section-by-section through the Senate reauthorization and discuss what works and what doesn't. They strongly support provisions that would clarify equal treatment for LGBT individuals, bolster enforcement on Native American reservations, and ensure that victims aren't deported simply for reporting domestic abuse. I see no reason to exclude those provisions from a House bill.

Last night, I offered an amendment that would have modernized the bill's definitions to reflect the input of victim service providers, including specific protections for immigrant victims, and clarified that LGBT individuals can be served by VAWA programs in all States. This amendment was rejected.

Let me be clear—no one is suggesting any special class of treatment. This reauthorization should simply clarify the law to reflect what everyone knows about modern society—that anyone can be a victim of domestic violence. It can happen in a same-sex household, on a college campus, or a Native American reservation, and our victim service providers on the front lines just want to know that they can help anyone who comes through the door.

Madam Speaker, we don't need a perfect bill. We need a bill that can provide a solid foundation on which to begin conference negotiations with the Senate. H.R. 4970 fails on this count.

I worked on the previous reauthorizations of VAWA, in 2000 and 2005, which incorporated good ideas from both sides of the aisle. That reauthorization was never a partisan issue then, and it shouldn't be now.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. For so many, this Violence Against Women Act vote is literally a matter of life and death.

One immigrant was abused by her husband, who was a special agent for the Homeland Security Department. He threatened her that she would be deported and separated from her daughter. She sought help anyway at the excellent San Antonio Family Violence Prevention Services, through which she was provided a special visa allowing her to remain here safely.

Another woman in Austin found death. So fearful of being deported, she was eventually killed in broad daylight in front of her two little children.

We have a 2-year backlog for this visa. It is a visa that could help many. It is a visa that was approved almost unanimously in a previous Congress.

Instead of focusing on a victim's visa status, we should be focused on the fight against domestic violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Instead of focusing on discriminating against some in our community, we should be focused on ensuring that all victims of violence everywhere receive the care and services they need. Let's move forward in that struggle, not take another giant Republican step backward.

Ms. FOXX. I would like to now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri, Congresswoman HARTZLER.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, H.R. 4970 reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act for another 5 years, providing important funding for fighting domestic violence and abuse.

When Congress reauthorizes any bill, we must make sure that the bill directs resources towards those it is intended to help and makes the best possible use of taxpayer money. That's what we've done in H.R. 4970 by strengthening accountability and transparency in grant administration to ensure that these dollars go to help the victims, not entrenched government bureaucrats.

I've been a long supporter of the domestic violence shelter in my own hometown. Hope Haven plays an essential role in aiding victims and providing tools for recovery. I've seen the vital work that they do and know that dozens of other organizations like it will benefit from the bill's passage.

This is a bipartisan bill. It's a reauthorization of long-standing provisions that aid women, and I'm hopeful that my colleagues will join me in supporting its worthwhile efforts.

□ 1410

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Madam Speaker, as a point of parliamentary inquiry, I want to make sure that the time is not begun until the gentlelady begins.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you.

I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Colorado, and I sadly rise in opposition to the rule.

I really cry out to ask the question: Who should refuse to help a victim of domestic violence? Who has the right to deny a victim—Native American, immigrant, LGBT community; who has that right?

It is obvious that this legislation is not bipartisan, and it is obvious that there is still a divide. It is obvious that the groups who obviously work with these victims—many whom I have the opportunity of seeing through the eyes of the Houston Area Women's Center—realize that no provider wants to pick and choose.

It is clear that the underlying bill does not work. The Senate bill is what answers the question of these victims who now have been harmed, because what you're saying to an immigrant who is here on a visa, you are saying to them that they have no relief.

I believe this bill will not work.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It really is a question as to whether or not the new included funding for rape kits will actually be able to go to providers and solve the problems of rape kits in places around the Nation.

We need to do this in a bipartisan way. Who will say ''no'' to a victim because they are Native American, they are immigrant, or they are LGBT. Who will say ''no?''

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, this bill takes steps backwards from offering full protections for women and children who suffer unspeakable abuse.

I'm not questioning the intentions, Madam Speaker, of those on the other side; that's not my purpose here. But who are we excluding today? You're either a unifier on the floor or you are a divider. Instead of passing the bipartisan Senate bill that provides protections for women who are victims of abuse, the majority has decided instead to turn women's safety and security into a political fight. It shouldn't be.

According to the 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, an average of 24 people per minute

are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner.

The Violence Against Women Act makes great strides. It shouldn't matter if a woman is an immigrant or a member of the LGBT community. I'm against this rule. I'm against the bill. I hope we can come together on a final resolution of this.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. This bill also authorizes a total of $642 billion for defense programs, including $88.5 billion to continue the Afghanistan war, on top of the more than $1.3 trillion we've spent thus far.

It contains dangerous language that would pave the path for a war with Iran. H.R. 4310 says the U.S. should take all necessary measures, including military action, to prevent Iran from having nuclear technology—this, despite the fact that Secretary of Defense Panetta and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have spoken out against a strike in Iran. What's Congress spoiling for another war for?

Now, we've spent trillions of dollars for war to wage violence thousands of miles away, and we've become anesthetized to the violence of war against millions of innocent women, children, and men abroad. It's no wonder that we're grappling with how best to deal with domestic violence.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. KUCINICH. Imagine if we took a fraction of the trillions of dollars we've spent for war and used it to deal directly with the root causes of domestic violence—spousal abuse, child abuse, violence in the schools, gang violence, gun violence, racial violence, violence against immigrants, violence against gays. If we did that and looked at the root causes, we wouldn't even be arguing about spending money for war. We need to look at the issue of violence in America and do it in a consistent, comprehensive way.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio says, the second bill that's made in order under this rule is H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act, otherwise known as the NDAA.

As we debate this very important bill, let's keep in mind the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families, and in particular those who have given the ultimate sacrifice in defense of American freedom, which includes this deliberative process of freely debating our laws and ideas about the role of government. We could not be here today without the sacrifices of those who've served in the military and helped protect us as a free people.

As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers:

> The operations of the Federal Government will be most extensive and important in terms of war and danger.

Our Founding Fathers had a clear view that the primary and central job of the Federal Government was ''to provide for the common defense,'' which is a constitutional mandate. It is not an issue that should divide us or devolve into partisan rancor but unite us as a country that supports our military and provides them with the resources necessary to complete their critically important mission.

Madam Speaker, in a few days, we will be in our districts participating in Memorial Day events. I approach Memorial Day with mixed emotions, as a part of me celebrates the joy and pride of living in this great country where we're all free to participate in a robust public policy debate. I am proud that I live in a meritocracy, where anyone can choose which path to follow and succeed. But Memorial Day also elicits somber thoughts of those who have given their lives in defense of the greatest country in the history of humankind.

While many of our fellow Americans will be celebrating with cookouts and family, I ask that we all pause and think about those families who will have an empty place at their dinner table, those families who still mourn the loss of a loved one and, rather than cooking out, will be visiting our fallen heroes in hallowed grounds across these United States. That's the true purpose of Memorial Day—to pause, remember, and honor those who have given the ultimate sacrifice to preserve all that is great in our country.

So as we return home to our districts, I ask all of my colleagues to keep in mind the spouses, children, and families of the fallen. As President Lincoln stated in his second inaugural address:

> With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I'd like to inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I rise today to speak against this flawed Violence Against Women Act that the House is presenting, let me point out this picture. This picture is a picture of Marissa Alexander, a 31-year-old mother of three with a master's degree and no prior convictions, who received a 20-year sentence for firing a warning shot in the air to warn off an attack by her husband. At the time that it occurred, there was a restraining act. Let me point out that this shot did not injure anyone, yet she will be in jail until 2032.

The imbalance in the system is obvious. Just minutes before she fired the shot Marissa's husband told her, ''If I can't have you, no one is going to.'' Sadly, millions of abused women have heard these exact words and not lived to tell about it.

□ 1420

Battered women like Marissa need support and counseling.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Battered women like Marissa need support and counseling so that they don't find themselves in these situations. Jailing them for 30 years is unacceptable.

This is the beginning, not the end. Along with the NAACP and other groups, we will fight to make sure we turn over this horrible ruling and stand up to the legal system that persecutes women who defend themselves. Those women need help, not prison.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama, Congresswoman ROBY.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in favor of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and just want to say, even after VAWA's enactment roughly 8 years ago, one in four women still experience domestic violence during their lifetime. Moreover, more than 2 million adults and 15 million children are exposed to such violence annually.

According to the Alabama Coalition against Domestic Violence and the Alabama National Census Summary, in Alabama there are 834 victims served in one day, 187 hotline calls answered in one day, and 76 unmet requests for services. These numbers are astounding, and something must change.

Organizations have reported that they have been unable to provide services for a variety of reasons: the top three being, there's not enough staff, there's not enough specialized services, and there's not enough available beds or hotel vouchers to provide safe havens for victims and their children.

As an original cosponsor of the Violence Against Women Act, today I stand here supporting the Republican reauthorization. This bill brings greater accountability to the grant administration by ensuring that funding will support and assist victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, and will not be kept in the pockets of Washington bureaucrats.

Individuals, whether women, men or children, should be able to feel safe in

their homes; and when they are not, should be able to have access to services that allow them to be removed from their abuser.

Congress must put Washington politics aside and take action. I fully support this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to join me.

Mr. POLIS. I would inquire if the gentlewoman has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, we do have other speakers.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington, a member of our leadership, Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this important issue.

I rise today on behalf of my mother, my daughter, and every woman in America in strong support of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization of 2012.

Each year there are over 200,000 victims of sexual assaults; and while these numbers are devastating, since the enactment of the first Violence Against Women Act almost 20 years ago, the annual number of incidents has dramatically fallen, while the reporting rate has risen by 50 percent.

The programs in the legislation are critical to continue the fight for equality and women's rights. The bill we will vote on today makes commonsense reforms to ensure that more money actually benefits victims and is dedicated to eliminating the astounding backlog in rape kit tests.

Additionally, today we have the chance to support vital funding for rape prevention educational programs, youth victim services, and improvements to emergency and transitional housing services for victims.

Since its enactment, the Violence Against Women Act has enjoyed broad bipartisan support. This is not a Republican or Democrat, conservative or liberal issue. Together we are uniformly standing against violence against anyone, particularly women; and I urge all of my colleagues to support their mothers, wives, daughters, neighbors and friends by supporting H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, a victim-centered bill that will extend vital programs that protect against and prevent both physical and mental violence.

Mr. POLIS. I'd like to inquire if the gentlewoman has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Yes, Madam Speaker, we have one more.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I'd like to yield now 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding to me, and I rise to support the Violence Against Women Act. I did so when it was reauthorized in 2005, I believe it was, and we're here today in this debate on the rule, not so much the bill.

I come to the floor to raise a point that constantly in the debate in the Judiciary Committee there was an effort to divert the subject matter over to other things, sexual orientation, gender identity, immigration, a lot of focus on immigration. And one of the things that's happened to the bill since it left the committee was to change the language, through this manager's amendment, that's essentially deemed passed by the Rules Committee that changes the value of evidence of abuse of, say, a female immigrant who can get a U visa if she has determined as having been victimized, especially sexually victimized. That was a clear and convincing evidence standard.

This rule that's written in by the Rules Committee changes it to the preponderance of the evidence. I support the decision of the Judiciary Committee. It also changes the investigative component of this from USCIS, which are trained investigators. They'll only see the evidence that's offered to them by Federal prosecutors. So I am going to oppose the rule and support the bill.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. Though we disagree on the bill, we can both agree that this is a terrible rule. And I encourage my colleagues to follow the leadership of the gentleman from Iowa in opposing this rule.

I'd like to inquire of the gentlelady if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this closed rule to make in order the bipartisan Violence Against Women bill that passed the United States Senate with 68 votes as an amendment offered by Representative CONYERS, Representative MOORE, and Representative LOFGREN. If the House passes that, it will proceed to President Obama's desk.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question and allow the Senate bill that has passed with a bipartisan majority, that actually expands protections for all women, to be considered by this body.

Here, Madam Speaker, is the face of somebody affected by the Violence Against Women Act from Colorado. Her name is Sara. Sara came to our country illegally. She was brought illegally, unbeknownst to her, by her American husband. Once in the United States, she was abused. She was isolated. She was effectively kept a prisoner in her own house by her husband.

The first time she was violently beaten by her husband was when she went on a walk because her husband claimed that she had disobeyed him. She was trapped in a relationship where she was abused, sexually as well as verbally, for 14 years.

She finally escaped with her son to safe transitional housing called Alternatives to Violence in Loveland, Colorado. Once there, she learned English and obtained temporary legal status through a U visa provided under the Violence Against Women Act.

Today, I'm proud to say, Madam Speaker, she's a United States citizen and works as an advocate for other immigrant victims of domestic abuse.

Stories like Sara are inspiring and reinforce the reason that so many of us feel passionately to join across party lines to ensure that no domestic victim is left unserved.

This Cantor-Adams bill offers us a false choice between weakening and undermining protections in the Violence Against Women Act or maintaining the status quo. The American people understand that a vote for the Cantor-Adams bill is a vote to roll back protections for all domestic and sexual violence victims and puts the safety of our most vulnerable domestic violence victims at risk.

Immigrants, Native Americans, lesbian, gay, and bisexual victims all have historically faced many barriers to reporting sexual violence. But instead of removing those barriers, this bill, under this closed rule, creates new ones.

□ 1430

Lesbian and gay survivors face particular obstacles in accessing the criminal justice system. Lesbian and gay survivors are often reluctant to report abuse, and when they do finally seek assistance, they frequently don't receive the support they need across lifesaving services and resources. Studies tell us that gay and lesbian couples experience domestic violence at roughly the same rates as the general population. It is no surprise that less than one in five gay and lesbian victims of intimate partner violence receives help through a service provider.

This bill fails to provide the same vital protections for gay and lesbian families that have been overwhelmingly approved in the Senate bill. During the Judiciary markup, I offered an amendment to restore these protections, but unfortunately, it was voted down. This closed process prevents the ability of Members of the House to even consider or vote on adding these protections back in. Had the House Republicans allowed amendments on the

floor today, I would have offered two amendments that I offered—along with my colleagues Representative JACKSON LEE, Representative LOFGREN, Representatives DEUTCH and CHU, all who were leaders in the Judiciary markup—which would have eliminated these atrocious provisions from the bill.

Some of the most egregious anti-immigrant provisions would destroy incentives to cooperate with law enforcement. People like Sara, who bravely came forward to report domestic violence, would face deportation after 4 years. Why would somebody come forward and report something if it would ultimately lead to her own deportation?

All women deserve to be protected from domestic violence—even women who have committed crimes, even women who have had civil violations, like violating our immigration laws, even women who are lesbians. All women deserve to be protected by the Violence Against Women Act, and that is what this bill is about. The Senate bill, which passed on a bipartisan basis and included a report from well over a dozen Republican Senators, included these provisions.

Abuse is abuse, whether it occurs against immigrants, whether it occurs against gay and lesbian Americans, or whether it occurs against Native Americans. Yet, under this bill before us, a Native American woman who is living on a reservation and who is raped and abused by a nontribal member lacks protection and remains at risk of serious sexual and physical violence by her abuser. Under this underlying bill, gay and lesbian survivors and victims will struggle to get protective orders or will be turned away from service providers just because of their sexual orientation or gender identities.

Just as alarming, this bill removes protections that currently exist for some of our Nation's most vulnerable populations: battered immigrant spouses, restricting the ability of U visa holders to apply for permanent resident status and forcing them to face deportation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the bills and to defeat the previous question, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I agree with my colleague from Colorado. Abuse is abuse, no matter against which person it is, and nothing in this Violence Against Women reauthorization bill prohibits grant recipients from serving all victims of domestic violence, and I am glad to hear my colleague say that.

Madam Speaker, House Republicans want to help women, particularly those who have been victims of violence and abuse, while also being good stewards of limited taxpayer resources. The 2012 Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act accomplishes these goals. In addition, the FY13 National Defense Authorization Act ensures that the men and women in our military have the resources they need while protecting taxpayer investments.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of improved congressional oversight and against special interests by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 656 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Strike the first section and insert the following:

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4970) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of S. 1925 as passed by the Senate if offered by Representative Conyers of Michigan, Representative Moore of Wisconsin, or Representative Lofgren of California. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.''

---

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4119.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 187, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

YEAS—235

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Akin
Burton (IN)
Cassidy
Filner
Labrador
Luetkemeyer
Perlmutter
Slaughter
Young (FL)

□ 1459

Ms. WILSON of Florida, Messrs. TONKO, MURPHY of Connecticut, McINTYRE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. RICHMOND changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 254, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REICHERT was allowed to speak out of order.)

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY AND POLICE WEEK

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, yesterday was National Law Enforcement Memorial Day. This entire week is National Law Enforcement Week.

Last year, we lost 163 police officers killed in the line of duty. So far this year, there have been 40 killed in the line of duty protecting each one of the communities that we represent in this great body, people like Tony Radulescu, a trooper in Washington State, a person who left his home that day with a hug and a kiss from his family expecting him back home again that evening for dinner, men and women in uniform leaving every day to go to work to protect our communities, expecting to return home. Some never do.

It is right; it is proper; it is our duty, Madam Speaker, to, today, pause in this great body and pay tribute to those men and women who have sacrificed their lives for us so that we can all live safely.

I ask for a moment of silence.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise, and the House will observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 186, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson

Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—186

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Altmire
Burton (IN)
Cassidy
Filner
Gerlach
Labrador
Perlmutter
Slaughter
Yarmuth

□ 1510

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.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 255, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

## BORDER TUNNEL PREVENTION ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4119) to reduce the trafficking of drugs and to prevent human smuggling across the Southwest Border by deterring the construction and use of border tunnels, as amended, 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 Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 4, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

YEAS—416

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—4

Amash
Broun (GA)
Paul
Scott (VA)

NOT VOTING—11

Altmire
Boren
Burton (IN)
Cassidy
Filner
Gerlach
Labrador
Perlmutter
Slaughter
Turner (OH)
Yarmuth

□ 1518

Ms. BASS of California and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 256, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained earlier today on personal business and therefore unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 253, 254, 255, and 256. Had I been present I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall vote 253; "yea" on rollcall vote 254; "yea" on rollcall vote 255; and "yea" on rollcall vote 256.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast the record votes for rollcalls 250, 251, 252, 255 and 256. Had I been present I would have voted as follows for these measures: H.R. 365, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, No. 250, "yes"; H.R. 3874, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, No. 251, "yes"; H.R. 205, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, No. 252, "yes"; H.R. 656, on Agreeing to the Resolution, No. 255, "no"; and H.R. 4119, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, No. 256, "yes."

□ 1520

## PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until 6 p.m. on May 25, 2012 to file four privileged reports on the following:

a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and other purposes;

a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes;

a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes;

and a bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

## NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to Rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my attention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4348.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rahall moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to agree to sections 1528, 20017 (to the extent that such section amends section 5323 of title 49, United States Code, to provide subsection (k) relating to Buy America), 33007, 33008, and 35210 of the Senate amendment.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 107

Mr. JONES (during consideration of H. Res. 656). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Mr. GRIJALVA as a cosponsor from H. Con. Res. 107.

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

There was no objection.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4103

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman DAN BENISHEK be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4103.

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

There was no objection.

## AMENDMENT TO THE MESQUITE LANDS ACT OF 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2745) to amend the Mesquite Lands Act of 1986 to facilitate implementation of a multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River in Clark County, Nevada, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, 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.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 656, I call up the bill (H.R. 4970) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 112–481 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

*H.R. 4970*

*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 ''Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012''.*

***SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.***

*The table of contents for this Act is as follows:*

*Sec. 1. Short title.*
*Sec. 2. Table of contents.*
*Sec. 3. VAWA definitions and grant conditions.*
*Sec. 4. Accountability provisions.*
*Sec. 5. Effective date.*

*TITLE I—ENHANCING JUDICIAL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN*

*Sec. 101. STOP grants.*
*Sec. 102. Grants to encourage arrest policies and enforcement of protection orders.*
*Sec. 103. Legal assistance for victims.*
*Sec. 104. Consolidation of grants to support families in the justice system.*
*Sec. 105. Court-appointed special advocate program.*
*Sec. 106. Outreach and services to underserved populations grant.*
*Sec. 107. Culturally specific services grant.*
*Sec. 108. Reduction in rape kit backlog.*

*TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING*

*Sec. 201. Sexual assault services program.*
*Sec. 202. Rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and child abuse enforcement assistance.*
*Sec. 203. Training and services to end violence against women with disabilities grants.*
*Sec. 204. Grant for training and services to end violence against women in later life.*

*TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE*

*Sec. 301. Rape prevention and education grant.*
*Sec. 302. Creating hope through outreach, options, services, and education for children and youth.*
*Sec. 303. Grants to combat violent crimes on campuses.*
*Sec. 304. National Center for Campus Public Safety.*

*TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES*

*Sec. 401. Study conducted by the centers for disease control and prevention.*
*Sec. 402. Saving money and reducing tragedies through prevention grants.*

*TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING*

*Sec. 501. Consolidation of grants to strengthen the health care system's response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*

*TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING*

*Sec. 601. Housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*
*Sec. 602. Transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*
*Sec. 603. Addressing the housing needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*

*TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE*

*Sec. 701. National Resource Center on Workplace Responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence.*

*TITLE VIII—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS*

*Sec. 801. Fraud prevention initiatives.*
*Sec. 802. Clarification of the requirements applicable to U visas.*
*Sec. 803. Protections for a fiancée or fiancé of a citizen.*
*Sec. 804. Regulation of international marriage brokers.*
*Sec. 805. GAO report.*
*Sec. 806. Temporary Nature of U Visa Status.*
*Sec. 807. Annual report on immigration applications made by victims of abuse.*
*Sec. 808. Protection for children of VAWA self-petitioners.*
*Sec. 809. Public charge.*
*Sec. 810. Age-Out Protection for U Visa Applicants.*
*Sec. 811. Hardship waivers.*
*Sec. 812. Disclosure of Information for National Security Purpose.*
*Sec. 813. GAO report on requirements to cooperate with law enforcement officials.*
*Sec. 814. Consideration of other evidence.*

*TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN*

*Sec. 901. Grants to Indian tribal governments.*
*Sec. 902. Grants to Indian tribal coalitions.*
*Sec. 903. Consultation.*
*Sec. 904. Analysis and research on violence against Indian women.*
*Sec. 905. Assistant United States attorney domestic violence tribal liaisons.*

*TITLE X—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS*

*Sec. 1001. Criminal provisions relating to sexual abuse.*
*Sec. 1002. Sexual abuse in custodial settings.*
*Sec. 1003. Criminal provision relating to stalking, including cyberstalking.*
*Sec. 1004. Amendments to the Federal assault statute.*
*Sec. 1005. Mandatory minimum sentence.*

***SEC. 3. VAWA DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.***

*(a) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (a) of section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''to an unemancipated minor'' after ''serious harm'';*

*(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''an organization'' and inserting ''a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization that serves a specific geographic community'';*

*(3) in paragraph (6) by inserting ''or intimate partner'' after ''former spouse'' and after ''as a spouse'';*

*(4) by amending paragraph (16) to read as follows:*

*''(16) LEGAL ASSISTANCE.—The term 'legal assistance'—*

*''(A) includes assistance to adult and youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in—*

*''(i) family, tribal, territorial, immigration, employment, administrative agency, housing matters, campus administrative or protection or stay away order proceedings, and other similar matters; and*

*''(ii) criminal justice investigations, prosecutions and post-trial matters (including sentencing, parole, and probation) that impact the victim's safety and privacy; and*

*''(B) may include services and assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are also victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons as defined by section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);*

*except that intake or referral, without other action, does not constitute legal assistance.''.*

*(5) by amending paragraph (18) to read as follows:*

*''(18) PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION OR PERSONAL INFORMATION.—The term 'personally identifying information' or 'personal information' means individually identifying information for or about an individual, including information likely to disclose the location of a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, regardless of whether the information is encoded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected, including—*

*''(A) a first and last name;*

*''(B) a home or other physical address;*

*''(C) contact information (including a postal, e-mail or Internet protocol address, or telephone or facsimile number);*

*''(D) a social security number, driver license number, passport number, or student identification number; and*

*''(E) any other information, including date of birth, racial or ethnic background, or religious affiliation, that would serve to identify any individual.'';*

*(6) in paragraph (19), by striking ''services'' and inserting ''assistance'';*

*(7) in paragraph (21)—*

*(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;*

*(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and*

*(C) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(C) any federally recognized Indian tribe.'';*

*(8) in paragraph (22)—*

*(A) by striking ''52'' and inserting ''57''; and*

*(B) by striking ''150,000'' and inserting ''250,000'';*

*(9) by amending paragraph (23) to read as follows:*

*''(23) SEXUAL ASSAULT.—The term 'sexual assault' means any nonconsensual sexual act proscribed by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.'';*

*(10) by amending paragraph (33) to read as follows:*

*''(33) UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.—The term 'underserved populations' means populations who face barriers to accessing and using victim services, and includes populations underserved because of geographic location or religion, underserved racial and ethnic populations, populations underserved because of special needs (such as language barriers, disabilities, alienage status, or age), and any other population determined to be underserved by the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as appropriate.'';*

*(11) by amending paragraph (37) to read as follows:*

*''(37) YOUTH.—The term 'youth' means a person who is 11 to 24 years of age.'';*

*(12) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:*

*''(38) ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGE.—The term 'Alaska Native village' has the same meaning given such term in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).*

*''(39) CHILD.—The term 'child' means a person who is under 11 years of age.*

*''(40) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC.—The term 'culturally specific' (except when used as part of the term 'culturally specific services') means primarily composed of racial and ethnic minority groups (as defined in section 1707(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–6(g))).*

*''(41) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term 'culturally specific services' means community-based services and resources that are culturally relevant and linguistically specific to culturally specific communities.*

*''(42) HOMELESS, HOMELESS INDIVIDUAL, HOMELESS PERSON.—The terms 'homeless', 'homeless individual', and 'homeless person'—*

*''(A) mean an individual who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; and*

*''(B) includes—*

*''(i) an individual who—*

*''(I) is sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason;*

*''(II) is living in a motel, hotel, trailer park, or campground due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations;*

*''(III) is living in an emergency or transitional shelter;*

*''(IV) is abandoned in a hospital; or*

*''(V) is awaiting foster care placement;*

*''(ii) an individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings; or*

*''(iii) migratory children (as defined in section 1309 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; 20 U.S.C. 6399) who qualify as homeless under this section because the children are living in circumstances described in this paragraph.*

*''(43) POPULATION SPECIFIC ORGANIZATION.—The term 'population specific organization' means a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that primarily serves members of a specific underserved population and has demonstrated experience and expertise providing targeted services to members of that specific underserved population.*

*''(44) POPULATION SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term 'population specific services' means victim services that—*

*''(A) address the safety, health, economic, legal, housing, workplace, immigration, confidentiality, or other needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and*

*''(B) are designed primarily for, and are targeted to, a specific underserved population.*

*''(45) RAPE CRISIS CENTER.—The term 'rape crisis center' means—*

*''(A) a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization that provides intervention and related assistance, as specified in section 41601(b)(2)(C), to victims of sexual assault without regard to the age of the victims; or*

*''(B) a governmental entity that—*

*''(i) is located in a State other than a Territory;*

*''(ii) provides intervention and related assistance, as specified in section 41601(b)(2)(C), to victims of sexual assault without regard to the age of the victims;*

*''(iii) is not a law enforcement agency or other entity that is part of the criminal justice system; and*

*''(iv) offers a level of confidentiality to victims that is comparable to a nonprofit entity that provides similar victim services.*

*''(46) SEX TRAFFICKING.—The term 'sex trafficking' means any conduct proscribed by section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, whether or not the conduct occurs in interstate or foreign commerce or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.*

*''(47) TRIBAL COALITION.—The term 'tribal coalition' means an established nonprofit, nongovernmental Indian organization, Alaska Native organization, or a Native Hawaiian organization that—*

*''(A) provides education, support, and technical assistance to member Indian service providers in a manner that enables those member providers to establish and maintain culturally appropriate services, including shelter and rape*

*crisis services, designed to assist Indian women and the dependents of those women who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and*

*''(B) is comprised of board and general members that are representative of—*

*''(i) the member service providers described in subparagraph (A); and*

*''(ii) the tribal communities in which the services are being provided.*

*''(48) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'unit of local government' means any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.*

*''(49) VICTIM SERVICES.—The term 'victim services'—*

*''(A) means services provided to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including telephonic or web-based hotlines, legal advocacy, economic advocacy, emergency and transitional shelter, accompaniment and advocacy through medical, civil or criminal justice, immigration, and social support systems, crisis intervention, short-term individual and group support services, information and referrals, culturally specific services, population specific services, and other related supportive services; and*

*''(B) may include services and assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are also victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons as defined by section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).*

*''(50) VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'victim service provider' means a nonprofit, nongovernmental or tribal organization or rape crisis center, including a State sexual assault coalition or tribal coalition, that—*

*''(A) assists domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victims, including domestic violence shelters, faith-based organizations, and other organizations; and*

*''(B) has a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.''; and*

*(13) by striking paragraphs (17), (29), and (36), and then reordering the remaining paragraphs of such subsection (including the paragraphs added by paragraph (12) of this subsection) in alphabetical order based on the headings of such paragraphs, and renumbering such paragraphs as so reordered.*

*(b) GRANTS CONDITIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2)—*

*(A) in subparagraph (B), by amending clauses (i) and (ii) to read as follows:*

*''(i) disclose, reveal, or release any personally identifying information or individual information collected in connection with services requested, utilized, or denied through grantees' and subgrantees' programs, regardless of whether the information has been encoded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected; or*

*''(ii) disclose, reveal, or release individual client information without the informed, written, reasonably time-limited consent of the person (or in the case of an unemancipated minor, the minor and the parent or guardian or in the case of legal incapacity, a court-appointed guardian) about whom information is sought, whether for this program or any other Federal, State, tribal, or territorial grant program, except that—*

*''(I) consent for release may not be given by the abuser of the minor, incapacitated person, or the abuser of the other parent of the minor; and*

*''(II) if a minor or a person with a legally appointed guardian is permitted by law to receive services without the parent's or guardian's consent, such minor or person with a guardian may release information without additional consent.'';*

*(B) by amending subparagraph (D), to read as follows:*

*''(D) INFORMATION SHARING.—*

*''(i) IN GENERAL.—Grantees and subgrantees may share—*

*''(I) nonpersonally identifying data in the aggregate regarding services to their clients and nonpersonally identifying demographic information in order to comply with Federal, State, tribal, or territorial reporting, evaluation, or data collection requirements;*

*''(II) court-generated information and law enforcement-generated information contained in secure, governmental registries for protection order enforcement purposes; and*

*''(III) law enforcement-generated and prosecution-generated information necessary for law enforcement, intelligence, national security, or prosecution purposes.*

*''(ii) LIMITATIONS.—Grantees and subgrantees may not—*

*''(I) require an adult, youth, or child victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to provide a consent to release his or her personally identifying information as a condition of eligibility for the services provided by the grantee or subgrantee; or*

*''(II) share any personally identifying information in order to comply with Federal reporting, evaluation, or data collection requirements, whether for this program or any other Federal grant program.'';*

*(C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F);*

*(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:*

*''(E) STATUTORILY MANDATED REPORTS OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT.—Nothing in this paragraph prohibits a grantee or subgrantee from reporting suspected abuse or neglect, as those terms are defined by law, when specifically mandated by the State or tribe involved.''; and*

*(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:*

*''(G) CONFIDENTIALITY ASSESSMENT AND ASSURANCES.—Grantees and subgrantees shall certify their compliance with the confidentiality and privacy provisions required under this section.'';*

*(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:*

*''(3) APPROVED ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the activities under this title, grantees and subgrantees may collaborate with and provide information to Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial public officials and agencies to develop and implement policies, and develop and promote State, local, or tribal legislation or model codes, designed to reduce or eliminate domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.'';*

*(3) in paragraph (7), by inserting at the end the following:*

*''Final reports of such evaluations shall be made publically available on the website of the disbursing agency.''; and*

*(4) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:*

*''(12) DELIVERY OF LEGAL ASSISTANCE.—Any grantee or subgrantee providing legal assistance with funds awarded under this title shall comply with the eligibility requirements in section 1201(d) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–6(d)).*

*''(13) CIVIL RIGHTS.—*

*''(A) NONDISCRIMINATION.—No person in any State shall on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability be denied the assistance of, or excluded from receiving services from, a grantee under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322; 108 Stat. 1902), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women.*

*''(B) REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent consideration of an individual's gender for purposes of a program or activity described in subparagraph (A) if the grantee involved determines that gender segregation or gender-specific programming is necessary to the essential operation of such program or activity. In such a case, alternative reasonable accommodations are sufficient to meet the requirements of this paragraph.*

*''(C) APPLICATION.—The provisions of paragraphs (2) through (4) of section 809(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3789d(c)) shall apply to violations of subparagraph (A).*

*''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed, interpreted, or applied to supplant, displace, preempt, or otherwise diminish the responsibilities and liabilities of grantees under other Federal or State civil rights law, whether statutory or common.''.*

*(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 41403(6) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (14043e–2(6)) is amended to read as follows:*

*''(6) the terms 'homeless', 'homeless individual', and 'homeless person' have the meanings given such terms in section 40002(a);''.*

***SEC. 4. ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISIONS.***

*(a) REQUIREMENT FOR DOJ GRANT APPLICANTS TO INCLUDE CERTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT FEDERAL GRANTS IN DOJ GRANT APPLICATIONS.—Each applicant for a grant from the Department of Justice shall submit, as part of the application for the grant, the following information:*

*(1) A list of each Federal grant the applicant applied for during the one-year period preceding the date of submission of the application.*

*(2) A list of each Federal grant the applicant received during the five-year period preceding the date of submission of the application.*

*(b) ENHANCING GRANT EFFICIENCY AND COORDINATION.—*

*(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall, to the greatest extent practicable, take actions to further the coordination of the administration of grants within the Department of Justice to increase the efficiency of such administration.*

*(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the actions taken by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) and the progress of such actions in achieving coordination described in such paragraph.*

*(c) REQUIRING OFFICE OF AUDIT, ASSESSMENT, AND MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS TO APPLY TO VAWA GRANTS.—*

*(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 109(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended—*

*(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and*

*(B) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following new paragraph:*

*''(3) Any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322; 108 Stat. 1902), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women.''.*

*(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to grant periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

*(d) VAWA GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(c) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded under this title shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:*

*''(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2013, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall conduct an audit of not fewer than 10 percent of all grantees under this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by such grantees.*

*''(2) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A grantee described in paragraph (1) that is found by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, to have an unresolved audit finding (as defined in paragraph (5)) shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in such paragraph.*

*''(3) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this title during any period in which the entity is prohibited from receiving funds under paragraph (2), the head of the Federal agency administering a grant program under this title shall—*

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

*''(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the Fund from the entity that was erroneously awarded such grant funds.*

*''(4) UNRESOLVED AUDIT FINDING DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means, with respect to a grantee described in paragraph (1), an audit report finding, statement, or recommendation by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Service, as applicable, that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date of an initial notification of the finding, statement, or recommendation.*

*''(5) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—*

*''(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'nonprofit 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.*

*''(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program under this title to 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.*

*''(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 5.0 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Office on Violence Against Women.*

*''(7) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—*

*''(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice or Department of Health and Human Services under this title may be used by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or by any individual or organization awarded funds under this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences, unless in the case of the Department of Justice, the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, or in the case of the Department of Health and Human Services the Deputy Secretary, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host or support any expenditure for such a conference.*

*''(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written authorization under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.*

*''(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General and Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved and denied during the fiscal year for which the report is submitted.*

*''(8) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may not be utilized by any grantee or subgrantee to lobby any representative of the Federal Government (including the Department of Justice) or a State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.*

*''(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable determines that any grantee or subgrantee receiving funds under this title has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall—*

*''(i) require the grantee or subgrantee to repay such funds in full; and*

*''(ii) prohibit the grantee or subgrantee from receiving any funds under this title for not less than 5 years.*

*''(9) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women, and the Deputy Secretary for Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a certification for such year that—*

*''(A) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs;*

*''(B) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (2) have been issued;*

*''(C) all reimbursements required under paragraph (3) have been made; and*

*''(D) includes a list of any grantees and subgrantees excluded during the previous year under paragraph (2).''.*

*(e) TRAINING AND RESOURCES FOR VAWA GRANTEES.—Section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act 0f 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) is further amended—*

*(1) in the heading, by striking ''**AND GRANT PROVISIONS''** and inserting ''**, GRANT PROVISIONS, AND TRAINING AND RESOURCES FOR VAWA GRANTEES**''; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:*

*''(d) TRAINING AND RESOURCES FOR VAWA GRANTEES.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall—*

*''(A) develop standards, protocols, and sample tools and forms to provide guidance to grantees and subgrantees under any program or activity described in paragraph (2) regarding financial recordkeeping and accounting practices required of such grantees and subgrantees as recipients of funds from the disbursing agency;*

*''(B) provide training to such grantees and subgrantees regarding such standards, protocols, and sample tools and forms; and*

*''(C) publish on the public Internet website of the Office of Violence Against Women information to assist such grantees and subgrantees with compliance with such standards, protocols, and sample tools and forms.*

*''(2) VAWA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a program or activity described in this paragraph is any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this title, the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women.''.*

***SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.***

*Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the provisions of titles I, II, III, IV, VII, and sections 3, 602, 901, and 902 of this Act shall not take effect until the first day of the fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act.*

## *TITLE I—ENHANCING JUDICIAL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN*

***SEC. 101. STOP GRANTS.***

*(a) STOP GRANTS.—Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—*

*(1) in section 2001(b) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(b)), as amended by paragraph (2)—*

*(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—*

*(i) by striking ''equipment'' and inserting ''resources''; and*

*(ii) by inserting ''for the protection and safety of victims,'' before ''and specifically,'';*

*(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''sexual assault'' and all that follows through ''dating violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking'';*

*(C) in paragraph (2), by striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking'';*

*(D) in paragraph (3), by striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, as well as the appropriate treatment of victims'';*

*(E) in paragraph (4)—*

*(i) by inserting '', classifying,'' after ''identifying''; and*

*(ii) by striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking'';*

*(F) in paragraph (5)—*

*(i) by inserting ''and legal assistance'' after ''victim services'';*

*(ii) by striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking''; and*

*(iii) by striking ''including crimes'' and all that follows and inserting ''including crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;'';*

*(G) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (6) through (13), respectively;*

*(H) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking'';*

*(I) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking ''and dating violence'' and inserting ''dating violence, and stalking'';*

*(J) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)—*

*(i) by striking ''domestic violence or sexual assault'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking''; and*

*(ii) by striking ''such violence or assault'' and inserting ''such violence, assault, or stalking'';*

*(K) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)—*

*(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''triage protocols to ensure that dangerous or potentially lethal cases are identified and prioritized'' and inserting ''the use of evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of domestic and dating violence homicide and prioritize dangerous or potentially lethal cases''; and*

*(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;*

*(L) in paragraph (13), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)—*

*(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—*

*(I) by striking ''to provide'' and inserting ''providing'';*

*(II) by striking ''nonprofit nongovernmental''; and*

*(III) by striking the comma after ''local governments'';*

*(ii) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon in subparagraph (B); and*

*(iii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a semicolon;*

*(M) by inserting after paragraph (13), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), the following:*

*''(14) developing and promoting State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;*

*''(15) developing, implementing, or enhancing Sexual Assault Response Teams, or other similar coordinated community responses to sexual assault;*

*''(16) developing and strengthening policies, protocols, best practices, and training for law enforcement agencies and prosecutors relating to the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases and the appropriate treatment of victims;*

*''(17) developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing sexual assault against men, women, and youth in correctional and detention settings;*

*''(18) identifying and conducting inventories of backlogs of sexual assault evidence collection kits and developing protocols and policies for responding to and addressing such backlogs, including protocols and policies for notifying and involving victims; and*

*''(19) with not more than 5 percent of the total amount allocated to a State for this part, developing, enhancing, or strengthening prevention and educational programming to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.''; and*

*(N) in the flush text at the end, by striking ''paragraph (14)'' and inserting ''paragraph (13)'';*

*(2) in section 2007 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–1)—*

*(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''nonprofit nongovernmental victim services programs'' and inserting ''victim service providers'';*

*(B) in subsection (b)(6), by striking ''(not including populations of Indian tribes)'';*

*(C) in subsection (c)—*

*(i) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:*

*''(2) grantees and subgrantees shall develop a plan for implementation and may consult and coordinate with—*

*''(A) the State sexual assault coalition;*

*''(B) the State domestic violence coalition;*

*''(C) the law enforcement entities within the State;*

*''(D) prosecution offices;*

*''(E) State and local courts;*

*''(F) tribal governments or tribal coalitions in those States with State or federally recognized Indian tribes;*

*''(G) representatives from underserved populations;*

*''(H) victim service providers;*

*''(I) population specific organizations; and*

*''(J) other entities that the State or the Attorney General identifies as necessary for the planning process;'';*

*(ii) by redesignating paragraph (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively;*

*(iii) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:*

*''(3) grantees shall coordinate the State implementation plan described in paragraph (2) with the State plans described in section 307 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10407) and the plans described in the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601 et seq.) and section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1b); and''; and*

*(iv) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—*

*(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and not less than 25 percent shall be allocated for prosecutors'';*

*(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (D) and (E);*

*(III) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following:*

*''(B) not less than 25 percent shall be allocated for prosecutors;*

*''(C) for each fiscal year beginning on or after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, not less than 20 percent shall be allocated for programs or projects that meaningfully address sexual assault, including stranger rape, acquaintance rape, alcohol or drug-facilitated rape, and rape within the context of an intimate partner relationship;''; and*

*(IV) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated by subclause (II), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;*

*(D) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:*

*''(d) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—An application for a grant under this part shall include—*

*''(1) the certifications of qualification required under subsection (c);*

*''(2) proof of compliance with the requirements for the payment of forensic medical exams and judicial notification, described in section 2010;*

*''(3) proof of compliance with the requirements for paying fees and costs relating to domestic violence and protection order cases described in section 2011;*

*''(4) proof of compliance with the requirements prohibiting polygraph examinations of victims of sexual assault described in section 2013;*

*''(5) an implementation plan required under subsection (i); and*

*''(6) any other documentation that the Attorney General may require.'';*

*(E) in subsection (e)—*

*(i) in paragraph (2)—*

*(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''domestic violence and sexual assault'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking''; and*

*(II) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''linguistically and''; and*

*(ii) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(3) CONDITIONS.—In disbursing grants under this part, the Attorney General may impose reasonable conditions on grant awards disbursed after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012 to ensure that the States meet statutory, regulatory, and other programs requirements.'';*

*(F) in subsection (f), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', except that, for purposes of this subsection, the costs of the projects for victim services or tribes for which there is an exemption under section 40002(b)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)(1)) shall not count toward the total costs of the projects.''; and*

*(G) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(i) IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.—A State applying for a grant under this part shall—*

*''(1) develop an implementation plan in consultation with representatives of the entities listed in subsection (c)(2), that identifies how the State will use the funds awarded under this part; and*

*''(2) submit to the Attorney General as part of the application submitted in accordance with subsection (d)—*

*''(A) the implementation plan developed under paragraph (1);*

*''(B) documentation from each member of the planning committee with respect to the member's participation in the planning process;*

*''(C) documentation from the prosecution, law enforcement, court, and victim services programs to be assisted, describing—*

*''(i) the need for the grant funds;*

*''(ii) the intended use of the grant funds;*

*''(iii) the expected result of the grant funds; and*

*''(iv) the demographic characteristics of the populations to be served, including age, disability, race, ethnicity, and language background;*

*''(D) a description of how the State will ensure that any subgrantees will consult with victim service providers during the course of developing their grant applications to ensure that the proposed activities are designed to promote the safety, confidentiality, and economic independence of victims;*

*''(E) demographic data on the distribution of underserved populations within the State and a description of how the State will meet the needs of underserved populations, including the minimum allocation for population specific services required under subsection (c)(4)(C);*

*''(F) a description of how the State plans to meet the requirements pursuant to regulations issued under subsection (e)(2);*

*''(G) goals and objectives for reducing domestic and dating violence-related homicides within the State; and*

*''(H) any other information requested by the Attorney General.*

*''(j) REALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—A State may use any returned or remaining funds for any authorized purpose under this part if—*

*''(1) funds from a subgrant awarded under this part are returned to the State; or*

*''(2) the State does not receive sufficient eligible applications to award the full funding within the allocations under subsection (c)(4).'';*

*(3) in section 2010 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–4)—*

*(A) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government shall not be entitled to funds under this subchapter unless the State, Indian tribal government, unit of local government, or another governmental entity—*

*''(A) incurs the full out-of-pocket cost of forensic medical exams described in subsection (b) for victims of sexual assault; and*

*''(B) coordinates with health care providers in the region to notify victims of sexual assault of the availability of rape exams at no cost to the victims.'';*

*(B) in subsection (b)—*

*(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;*

*(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and*

*(iii) by striking paragraph (3);*

*(C) in subsection (c), by striking '', except that such funds'' and all that follows and inserting a period; and*

*(D) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:*

*''(d) NONCOOPERATION.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be in compliance with this section, a State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government shall comply with subsection (b) without regard to whether the*

*victim participates in the criminal justice system or cooperates with law enforcement.*

*''(2) COMPLIANCE PERIOD.—States, territories, and Indian tribal governments shall have 3 years from the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012 to come into compliance with this subsection.''; and*

*(4) in section 2011(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–5(a)(1))—*

*(A) by inserting ''modification, enforcement, dismissal,'' after ''registration,'' each place it appears; and*

*(B) by striking ''domestic violence, stalking, or sexual assault'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking''.*

*(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(18) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(18)), is amended by striking ''$225,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$222,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.*

***SEC. 102. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION ORDERS.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh et seq.) is amended—*

*(1) in section 2101 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh)—*

*(A) in subsection (b)—*

*(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''States,'' and all that follows through ''units of local government'' and inserting ''grantees'';*

*(ii) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and enforcement of protection orders across State and tribal lines'' before the period;*

*(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and training in police departments to improve tracking of cases'' and inserting ''data collection systems, and training in police departments to improve tracking of cases and classification of complaints'';*

*(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''and provide the appropriate training and education about domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking'' after ''computer tracking systems'';*

*(v) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and other victim services'' after ''legal advocacy service programs'';*

*(vi) in paragraph (6), by striking ''judges'' and inserting ''Federal, State, tribal, territorial, and local judges, and court-based and court-related personnel'';*

*(vii) in paragraph (8), by striking ''and sexual assault'' and inserting '', dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking'';*

*(viii) in paragraph (10), by striking ''non-profit, non-governmental victim services organizations,'' and inserting ''victim service providers, population specific organizations,''; and*

*(ix) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(14) To develop and implement training programs for prosecutors and other prosecution-related personnel regarding best practices to ensure offender accountability, victim safety, and victim consultation in cases involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*

*''(15) To develop or strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and the judiciary in recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*

*''(16) To develop and promote State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including the appropriate treatment of victims.*

*''(17) To develop, implement, or enhance sexual assault nurse examiner programs or sexual assault forensic examiner programs, including the hiring and training of such examiners.*

*''(18) To develop, implement, or enhance Sexual Assault Response Teams or similar coordinated community responses to sexual assault.*

*''(19) To develop and strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers and prosecutors regarding the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases and the appropriate treatment of victims of sexual assault.*

*''(20) To provide the following human immunodeficiency virus services for victims of sexual assault:*

*''(A) Testing.*

*''(B) Counseling.*

*''(C) Prophylaxis.*

*''(21) To identify and inventory backlogs of sexual assault evidence collection kits and to develop protocols for responding to and addressing such backlogs, including policies and protocols for notifying and involving victims.*

*''(22) To develop multidisciplinary high-risk teams focusing on reducing domestic violence and dating violence homicides by—*

*''(A) using evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of homicide and link high-risk victims to immediate crisis intervention services;*

*''(B) identifying and managing high-risk offenders; and*

*''(C) providing ongoing victim advocacy and referrals to comprehensive services including legal, housing, health care, and economic assistance.'';*

*(B) in subsection (c)—*

*(i) in paragraph (1)—*

*(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''except for a court,'' before ''certify''; and*

*(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;*

*(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''except for a court,'' before ''demonstrate'';*

*(iii) in paragraph (4)—*

*(I) by inserting ''modification, enforcement, dismissal,'' after ''registration,'' each place it appears;*

*(II) by inserting ''dating violence,'' after ''domestic violence,''; and*

*(III) by striking ''and'' at the end;*

*(iv) in paragraph (5)—*

*(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking '', not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section,'';*

*(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;*

*(III) in clause (ii), as redesignated by subclause (II) of this clause, by striking ''subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''clause (i)''; and*

*(IV) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';*

*(v) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5), as amended by this subparagraph, as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;*

*(vi) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as redesignated by clause (v) of this subparagraph—*

*(I) by striking the second comma; and*

*(II) by striking ''grantees are States'' and inserting the following: ''grantees are—*

*''(1) States''; and*

*(vii) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(2) a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition or a victim service provider that partners with a State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government that certifies that the State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government meets the requirements under paragraph (1).'';*

*(C) in subsection (d)—*

*(i) in paragraph (1)—*

*(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', policy,'' after ''law''; and*

*(II) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and the defendant is in custody or has been served with the information or indictment'' before the semicolon; and*

*(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''it'' and inserting ''its''; and*

*(D) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(f) ALLOCATION FOR TRIBAL COALITIONS.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 5 percent shall be available for grants under section 2001(d) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(d)).*

*''(g) ALLOCATION FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 25 percent shall be available for projects that address sexual assault, including stranger rape, acquaintance rape, alcohol or drug-facilitated rape, and rape within the context of an intimate partner relationship.''; and*

*(2) in section 2102(a) (42 U.S.C. 3796hh–1(a))—*

*(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''court,'' after ''tribal government,''; and*

*(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''nonprofit, private sexual assault and domestic violence programs'' and inserting ''victim service providers and, as appropriate, population specific organizations''.*

*(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(19) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(19)) is amended—*

*(1) by striking ''$75,000,000'' and all that follows through ''2011'' and inserting ''$73,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''; and*

*(2) by striking the second period.*

***SEC. 103. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS.***

*Section 1201 of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–6) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)—*

*(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''arising as a consequence of'' and inserting ''relating to or arising out of''; and*

*(B) in the second sentence, by inserting ''or arising out of'' after ''relating to'';*

*(2) in subsection (b)—*

*(A) in the heading, by inserting ''AND GRANT CONDITIONS'' after ''DEFINITIONS''; and*

*(B) by inserting ''and grant conditions'' after ''definitions'';*

*(3) in subsection (c)—*

*(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''victim services organizations'' and inserting ''victim service providers''; and*

*(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:*

*''(3) to implement, expand, and establish efforts and projects to provide competent, supervised pro bono legal assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.'';*

*(4) in subsection (d)—*

*(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (c) has completed'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''this section—''*

*''(A) has demonstrated expertise in providing legal assistance or advocacy to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the targeted population; or*

*''(B)(i) is partnered with an entity or person that has demonstrated expertise described in subparagraph (A); and*

*''(ii) has completed, or will complete, training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault and related legal issues, including training on evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide;''; and*

*(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''stalking organization'' and inserting ''stalking victim service provider''; and*

*(5) in subsection (f)—*

*(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''this section'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''this section $57,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''; and*

*(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:*

*''(D) Of the amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year, not more than 10 percent may be used for purposes described in subsection (c)(3).''.*

**SEC. 104. CONSOLIDATION OF GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.**

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386; 114 Stat. 1509) is amended by striking the section preceding section 1302 (42 U.S.C. 10420), as amended by section 306 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3016), and inserting the following:*

**"SEC. 1301. COURT TRAINING AND SUPERVISED VISITATION IMPROVEMENTS.**

*''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, courts (including juvenile courts), Indian tribal governments, nonprofit organizations, legal services providers, and victim services providers to improve the response of all aspects of the civil and criminal justice system to families with a history of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or in cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse.*

*''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A grant under this section may be used to—*

*''(1) provide supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange of children and youth by and between parents in situations involving domestic violence, dating violence, child sexual abuse, sexual assault, or stalking;*

*''(2) develop and promote State, local, and tribal legislation, policies, and best practices for improving civil and criminal court functions, responses, practices, and procedures in cases involving a history of domestic violence or sexual assault, or in cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse, including cases in which the victim proceeds pro se;*

*''(3) educate court-based and court-related personnel (including custody evaluators and guardians ad litem) and child protective services workers on the dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including information on perpetrator behavior, evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide, and on issues relating to the needs of victims, including safety, security, privacy, and confidentiality, including cases in which the victim proceeds pro se;*

*''(4) provide adequate resources in juvenile court matters to respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault (including child sexual abuse), and stalking and ensure necessary services dealing with the physical health and mental health of victims are available;*

*''(5) enable courts or court-based or court-related programs to develop or enhance—*

*''(A) court infrastructure (such as specialized courts, consolidated courts, dockets, intake centers, or interpreter services);*

*''(B) community-based initiatives within the court system (such as court watch programs, victim assistants, pro se victim assistance programs, or community-based supplementary services);*

*''(C) offender management, monitoring, and accountability programs;*

*''(D) safe and confidential information-storage and information-sharing databases within and between court systems;*

*''(E) education and outreach programs to improve community access, including enhanced access for underserved populations; and*

*''(F) other projects likely to improve court responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;*

*''(6) collect data and provide training and technical assistance, including developing State, local, and tribal model codes and policies, to improve the capacity of grantees and communities to address the civil justice needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking who have legal representation, who are proceeding pro se, or who are proceeding with the assistance of a legal advocate; and*

*''(7) improve training and education to assist judges, judicial personnel, attorneys, child welfare personnel, and legal advocates in the civil justice system regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or child abuse.*

*''(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—In making grants for purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (b), the Attorney General shall consider—*

*''(A) the number of families to be served by the proposed programs and services;*

*''(B) the extent to which the proposed programs and services serve underserved populations;*

*''(C) the extent to which the applicant demonstrates cooperation and collaboration with nonprofit, nongovernmental entities in the local community with demonstrated histories of effective work on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including State or tribal domestic violence coalitions, State or tribal sexual assault coalitions, local shelters, and programs for domestic violence and sexual assault victims; and*

*''(D) the extent to which the applicant demonstrates coordination and collaboration with State, tribal, and local court systems, including mechanisms for communication and referral.*

*''(2) OTHER GRANTS.—In making grants under subsection (b)(8) the Attorney General shall take into account the extent to which the grantee has expertise addressing the judicial system's handling of family violence, child custody, child abuse and neglect, adoption, foster care, supervised visitation, divorce, and parentage.*

*''(d) APPLICANT REQUIREMENTS.—The Attorney General may make a grant under this section to an applicant that—*

*''(1) demonstrates expertise in the areas of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or child sexual abuse, as appropriate;*

*''(2) ensures that any fees charged to individuals for use of supervised visitation programs and services are based on the income of those individuals, unless otherwise provided by court order;*

*''(3) if the applicant proposes to operate supervised visitation programs and services or safe visitation exchange, demonstrates that adequate security measures, including adequate facilities, procedures, and personnel capable of preventing violence, and adequate standards are, or will be, in place (including the development of protocols or policies to ensure that confidential information is not shared with courts, law enforcement agencies, or child welfare agencies unless necessary to ensure the safety of any child or adult using the services of a program funded under this section);*

*''(4) certifies that the organizational policies of the applicant do not require mediation or counseling involving offenders and victims being physically present in the same place, in cases where domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking is alleged;*

*''(5) certifies that any person providing legal assistance through a program funded under this section has completed or will complete training on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including child sexual abuse, and related legal issues; and*

*''(6) certifies that any person providing custody evaluation or guardian ad litem services through a program funded under this section has completed or will complete training, developed with input from and in collaboration with a tribal, State, territorial, or local domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victim service provider or coalition, on the dynamics of domestic violence and sexual assault, including child sexual abuse, that includes training on how to review evidence of past abuse and the use of evidenced-based theories to make recommendations on custody and visitation.*

*''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $22,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended.*

*''(f) ALLOTMENT FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amount available under this section for each fiscal year shall be available for grants under the program authorized by section 2015 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–10).*

*''(2) APPLICABILITY OF PART.—The requirements of this section shall not apply to funds allocated for the program described in paragraph (1).''.*

*(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subtitle J of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043 et seq.) is repealed.*

**SEC. 105. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM.**

*Subtitle B of title II of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13011 et seq.) is amended—*

*(1) in section 216 (42 U.S.C. 13012), by striking ''January 1, 2010'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015'';*

*(2) in section 217 (42 U.S.C. 13013)—*

*(A) in subsection (c)(2)(A), by striking ''Code of Ethics'' and inserting ''Standards for Programs''; and*

*(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:*

*''(e) REPORTING.—An organization that receives a grant under this section for a fiscal year shall submit to the Administrator a report regarding the use of the grant for the fiscal year, including a discussion of outcome performance measures (which shall be established by the Administrator) to determine the effectiveness of the programs of the organization in meeting the needs of children in the child welfare system.''; and*

*(3) in section 219(a) (42 U.S.C. 13014(a)), by striking ''fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.*

**SEC. 106. OUTREACH AND SERVICES TO UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS GRANT.**

*Section 120 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045) is amended to read as follows:*

**"SEC. 120. GRANTS FOR OUTREACH AND SERVICES TO UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.**

*''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts appropriated under the grant programs identified in paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall take 2 percent of such appropriated amounts and combine them to award grants to eligible entities described in subsection (b) of this section to develop and implement outreach strategies targeted at adult or youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations and to provide victim services to meet the needs of adult and youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in underserved populations. The requirements of the grant programs identified in paragraph (2) shall not apply to this grant program.*

*''(2) PROGRAMS COVERED.—The programs identified in this paragraph are the programs carried out under the following provisions:*

*''(A) Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (STOP grants).*

*''(B) Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Grants to encourage arrest policies).*

*''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Eligible entities under this section are—*

*''(1) population specific organizations that have demonstrated experience and expertise in providing population specific services in the relevant underserved communities, or population specific organizations working in partnership with a victim service provider or domestic violence or sexual assault coalition;*

''(2) victim service providers offering population specific services for a specific underserved population; or

''(3) victim service providers working in partnership with a national, State, or local organization that has demonstrated experience and expertise in providing population specific services in the relevant underserved population.

''(c) PLANNING GRANTS.—The Attorney General may use up to 20 percent of funds available under this section to make one-time planning grants to eligible entities to support the planning and development of specially designed and targeted programs for adult and youth victims in one or more underserved populations, including—

''(1) identifying, building, and strengthening partnerships with potential collaborators within underserved populations, Federal, State, tribal, territorial or local government entities, and public and private organizations;

''(2) conducting a needs assessment of the community and the targeted underserved population or populations to determine what the barriers are to service access and what factors contribute to those barriers, using input from the targeted underserved population or populations;

''(3) identifying promising prevention, outreach, and intervention strategies for victims from a targeted underserved population or populations; and

''(4) developing a plan, with the input of the targeted underserved population or populations, for—

''(A) implementing prevention, outreach, and intervention strategies to address the barriers to accessing services;

''(B) promoting community engagement in the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the targeted underserved populations; and

''(C) evaluating the program.

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The Attorney General shall make grants to eligible entities for the purpose of providing or enhancing population specific outreach and victim services to adult and youth victims in one or more underserved populations, including—

''(1) working with Federal, State, tribal, territorial and local governments, agencies, and organizations to develop or enhance population specific victim services;

''(2) strengthening the capacity of underserved populations to provide population specific services;

''(3) strengthening the capacity of traditional victim service providers to provide population specific services;

''(4) strengthening the effectiveness of criminal and civil justice interventions by providing training for law enforcement, prosecutors, judges and other court personnel on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations; or

''(5) working in cooperation with an underserved population to develop and implement outreach, education, prevention, and intervention strategies that highlight available resources and the specific issues faced by victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking from underserved populations.

''(e) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women at such time, in such form, and in such manner as the Director may prescribe.

''(f) REPORTS.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall annually submit to the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women a report that describes the activities carried out with grant funds during the preceding fiscal year.

''(g) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section the definitions and grant conditions in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) shall apply.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the funds identified in subsection (a)(1), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''.

**SEC. 107. CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES GRANT.**

Section 121 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045a) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**and linguistically**'';

(2) by striking ''and linguistically'' each place it appears;

(3) by striking ''and linguistic'' each place it appears;

(4) by amending paragraph (2) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(2) PROGRAMS COVERED.—The programs identified in this paragraph are the programs carried out under the following provisions:

''(A) Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh) (Grants to encourage arrest policies).

''(B) Section 1201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–6) (Legal assistance for victims).

''(C) Section 40295 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13971) (Rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and child abuse enforcement assistance).

''(D) Section 40802 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041a) (Enhanced training and services to end violence against women later in life).

''(E) Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–7) (Education, training, and enhanced services to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities).''; and

(5) in subsection (g), by striking ''linguistic and''.

**SEC. 108. REDUCTION IN RAPE KIT BACKLOG.**

Section 2(c)(3) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(c)(3)), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2012''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) For each of the fiscal years 2013 and 2014, not less than 75 percent of the grant amounts shall be awarded for purposes under subsection (a)(2).''.

**SEC. 109. ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT TRAINING PROGRAMS.**

Section 40152(c) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13941(c)) is amended by striking ''to carry out this section'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''.

**SEC. 110. CHILD ABUSE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR JUDICIAL PERSONNEL AND PRACTITIONERS.**

Section 224(a) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13024(a)) is amended by striking ''$2,300,000'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$2,300,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''.

## TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

**SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.**

(a) GRANTS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES.—Section 41601(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043g(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''other programs'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''other nongovernmental or tribal programs and projects to assist individuals who have been victimized by sexual assault, without regard to the age of the individual.'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations for programs and activities'' and inserting ''nongovernmental or tribal programs and activities''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(v), by striking ''linguistically and''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by inserting ''and territory'' after ''each State'';

(ii) by striking ''1.50 percent'' and inserting ''0.75 percent''; and

(iii) by striking '', except that'' and all that follows through ''of the total appropriations''; and

(B) in the last sentence, by striking ''the preceding formula'' and inserting ''this paragraph''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043g(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$40,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.

**SEC. 202. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.**

Section 40295 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13971) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(H), by inserting '', including sexual assault forensic examiners'' before the semicolon;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''victim advocacy groups'' and inserting ''victim service providers''; and

(ii) by inserting '', including developing multidisciplinary teams focusing on high-risk cases with the goal of preventing domestic and dating violence homicides'' before the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''and other long- and short-term assistance'' and inserting ''legal assistance, and other long-term and short-term victim services and population specific services''; and

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) to develop, expand, or strengthen programs addressing sexual assault, including sexual assault forensic examiner programs, Sexual Assault Response Teams, law enforcement training, and programs addressing rape kit backlogs.''; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''$55,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.

**SEC. 203. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN WITH DISABILITIES GRANTS.**

Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–7) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''(including using evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of domestic and dating violence homicide)'' after ''risk reduction'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''victim service organizations'' and inserting ''victim service providers''; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''victim services organizations'' and inserting ''victim service providers'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(D), by striking ''nonprofit and nongovernmental victim services organization, such as a State'' and inserting ''victim service provider, such as a State or tribal''; and

(3) in subsection (e), by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011''

*and inserting ''$9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.*

**SEC. 204. GRANT FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN LATER LIFE.**

*Section 40802 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041a) is amended to read as follows:*

**''SEC. 40802. GRANT FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN LATER LIFE.**

*''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:*

*''(1) The term 'eligible entity' means an entity that—*

*''(A) is—*

*''(i) a State;*

*''(ii) a unit of local government;*

*''(iii) a tribal government or tribal organization;*

*''(iv) a population specific organization with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals in later life;*

*''(v) a victim service provider; or*

*''(vi) a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition; and*

*''(B) is partnered with—*

*''(i) a law enforcement agency;*

*''(ii) an office of a prosecutor;*

*''(iii) a victim service provider; or*

*''(iv) a nonprofit program or government agency with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals in later life.*

*''(2) The term 'elder abuse' means domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking committed against individuals in later life.*

*''(3) The term 'individual in later life' means an individual who is 60 years of age or older.*

*''(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—*

*''(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in paragraph (2). In awarding such grants, the Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that the activities funded under this section are not duplicative with the activities funded under the elder abuse prevention programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.*

*''(2) MANDATORY AND PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—*

*''(A) MANDATORY ACTIVITIES.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use the funds received under the grant to—*

*''(i) provide training programs to assist law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, population specific organizations, victim service providers, victim advocates, and relevant officers in Federal, tribal, State, territorial, and local courts in recognizing and addressing instances of elder abuse;*

*''(ii) provide or enhance services for victims of elder abuse;*

*''(iii) establish or support multidisciplinary collaborative community responses to victims of elder abuse; and*

*''(iv) conduct cross-training for law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, attorneys, health care providers, population specific organizations, faith-based advocates, victim service providers, and courts to better serve victims of elder abuse.*

*''(B) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section may use not more than 10 percent of the funds received under the grant to—*

*''(i) provide training programs to assist attorneys, health care providers, faith-based leaders, or other community-based organizations in recognizing and addressing instances of elder abuse; or*

*''(ii) conduct outreach activities and awareness campaigns to ensure that victims of elder abuse receive appropriate assistance.*

*''(3) UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to proposals providing culturally specific or population specific services.*

*''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''.*

***TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE***

**SEC. 301. RAPE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION GRANT.**

*Section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1b) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)—*

*(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', territorial, or tribal'' after ''crisis centers, State''; and*

*(B) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''and alcohol'' after ''about drugs'';*

*(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''$80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''; and*

*(3) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*''(3) FUNDING FORMULA.—Amounts provided under this section shall be allotted to each State, territory, and the District of Columbia based on population. If the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) exceed $48,000,000 in any fiscal year, a minimum allocation of $150,000 shall be awarded to each State and territory and the District of Columbia. Any remaining funds shall be allotted to each State and territory and the District of Columbia based on population.''.*

**SEC. 302. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.**

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle L of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043c et seq.) is amended by striking sections 41201 through 41204 and inserting the following:*

**''SEC. 41201. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH (CHOOSE CHILDREN AND YOUTH).**

*''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General, working in collaboration with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, shall award grants to enhance the safety of youth and children who are victims of, or exposed to, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and to prevent future violence.*

*''(b) PROGRAM PURPOSES.—Funds provided under this section may be used for the following program purpose areas:*

*''(1) SERVICES TO ADVOCATE FOR AND RESPOND TO YOUTH.—To develop, expand, and strengthen victim interventions and services that target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Services may include victim services, counseling, advocacy, mentoring, educational support, transportation, legal assistance in civil, criminal and administrative matters, such as family law cases, housing cases, child welfare proceedings, campus administrative proceedings, and civil protection order proceedings, services to address sex trafficking, population specific services, and other activities that support youth in finding safety, stability, and justice and in addressing the emotional, cognitive, and physical effects of trauma on youth. Funds may be used to—*

*''(A) assess and analyze available services for youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, determining relevant barriers to such services in a particular locality, and developing a community protocol to address such problems collaboratively;*

*''(B) develop and implement policies, practices, and procedures to effectively respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against youth; or*

*''(C) provide technical assistance and training to enhance the ability of school personnel, victim service providers, child protective service workers, staff of law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, court personnel, individuals who work in after school programs, medical personnel, social workers, mental health personnel, and workers in other programs that serve children and youth to improve their ability to appropriately respond to the needs of children and youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, as well as homeless youth, and to properly refer such children, youth, and their families to appropriate services.*

*''(2) SUPPORTING YOUTH THROUGH EDUCATION AND PROTECTION.—To enable secondary or elementary schools that serve students in any of grades five through twelve and institutions of higher education to—*

*''(A) provide training to school personnel, including health care providers and security personnel, on the needs of students who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;*

*''(B) develop and implement age-appropriate prevention and intervention policies in accordance with State law in secondary or elementary schools that serve students in any of grades five through twelve, including appropriate responses to, and identification and referral procedures for, students who are experiencing or perpetrating domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and procedures for handling the requirements of court protective orders issued to or against students;*

*''(C) provide support services for student victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, such as a resource person who is either on-site or on-call;*

*''(D) provide evidence-based educational programs for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; or*

*''(E) develop strategies to increase identification, support, referrals, and prevention programs for youth who are at high risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.*

*''(c) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—*

*''(A) a victim service provider, tribal nonprofit organization, population specific organization, or community-based organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth, including runaway or homeless youth, who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or*

*''(B) a victim service provider that is partnered with an entity that has a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth.*

*''(2) PARTNERSHIPS.—*

*''(A) EDUCATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2), an entity described in paragraph (1) shall be partnered with an elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), charter school (as defined in section 5210 of such Act), a school that is operated or supported by the Bureau of Indian Education, or a legally operating private school, a school administered by the Department of Defense under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, or section 1402 of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978, a group of such schools, a local educational agency (as defined in section 9101(26) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), or an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965).*

*''(B) OTHER PARTNERSHIPS.—All applicants under this section are encouraged to work in partnership with organizations and agencies that work with the relevant youth population. Such entities may include—*

*''(i) a State, tribe, unit of local government, or territory;*

*''(ii) a population specific or community-based organization;*

''(iii) batterer intervention programs or sex offender treatment programs with specialized knowledge and experience working with youth offenders; or

''(iv) any other agencies or nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with the capacity to provide effective assistance to the adult, youth, and child victims served by the partnership.

''(d) GRANTEE REQUIREMENTS.—Applicants for grants under this section shall establish and implement policies, practices, and procedures that—

''(1) require and include appropriate referral systems for child and youth victims;

''(2) protect the confidentiality and privacy of child and youth victim information, particularly in the context of parental or third-party involvement and consent, mandatory reporting duties, and working with other service providers with priority on victim safety and autonomy;

''(3) ensure that all individuals providing intervention or prevention programs to children or youth through a program funded under this section have completed, or will complete, sufficient training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

''(4) ensure that parents are informed of the programs funded under this program that are being offered at their child's school.

''(e) PRIORITY.—The Attorney General shall prioritize grant applications under this section that coordinate with prevention programs in the community.

''(f) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section, the definitions and grant conditions provided for in section 40002 shall apply.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017.

''(h) ALLOTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 50 percent of the total amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be used for the purposes described in subsection (b)(1).

''(2) INDIAN TRIBES.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be made available for grants under the program authorized by section 2015 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–10).''.

(b) VAWA GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 40002(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)), as amended by section 3(b)(4), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(14) REQUIREMENT FOR EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMS.—Any educational programming, training, or public awareness communications regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are funded under this title must be evidence-based.''.

**SEC. 303. GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIMES ON CAMPUSES.**

Section 304 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''and'' after ''stalking on campuses,'';

(ii) by striking ''crimes against women on'' and inserting ''crimes on''; and

(iii) by inserting '', and to develop and strengthen prevention education and awareness programs'' before the period; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$300,000'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting '', strengthen,'' after ''To develop''; and

(ii) by striking ''assault and stalking,'' and inserting ''assault, and stalking, including the use of technology to commit these crimes,'';

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting ''and population specific services'' after ''strengthen victim services programs'';

(ii) by striking ''entities carrying out'' and all that follows through ''stalking victim services programs'' and inserting ''victim service providers''; and

(iii) by inserting '', regardless of whether the services provided by such program are provided by the institution or in coordination with community victim service providers'' before the period at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

''(10) To develop or adapt population specific strategies and projects for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''any non-profit'' and all that follows through the first occurrence of ''victim services programs'' and inserting ''victim service providers'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

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

''(D) describe how underserved populations in the campus community will be adequately served, including the provision of relevant population specific services;''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2013 through 2017'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following:

''(3) GRANTEE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each grantee shall comply with the following minimum requirements during the grant period:

''(A) The grantee shall create a coordinated community response including both organizations external to the institution and relevant divisions of the institution.

''(B) The grantee shall establish a mandatory prevention and education program on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking for all incoming students.

''(C) The grantee shall train all campus law enforcement to respond effectively to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

''(D) The grantee shall train all members of campus disciplinary boards to respond effectively to situations involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.''; and

(5) in subsection (e), by striking ''$12,000,000'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''$12,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''.

**SEC. 304. NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

**''PART LL—NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY**

**''SEC. 3021. NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.**

''(a) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE CENTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services is authorized to establish and operate a National Center for Campus Public Safety (referred to in this section as the 'Center').

''(2) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services is authorized to award grants to institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations to assist in carrying out the functions of the Center required under subsection (b).

''(b) FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTER.—The center shall—

''(1) provide quality education and training for campus public safety agencies of institutions of higher education and the agencies' collaborative partners, including campus mental health agencies;

''(2) foster quality research to strengthen the safety and security of institutions of higher education;

''(3) serve as a clearinghouse for the identification and dissemination of information, policies, procedures, and best practices relevant to campus public safety, including off-campus housing safety, the prevention of violence against persons and property, and emergency response and evacuation procedures;

''(4) develop protocols, in conjunction with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Education, State, local, and tribal governments and law enforcement agencies, private and nonprofit organizations and associations, and other stakeholders, to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from, natural and man-made emergencies or dangerous situations involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of the campus community;

''(5) promote the development and dissemination of effective behavioral threat assessment and management models to prevent campus violence;

''(6) coordinate campus safety information (including ways to increase off-campus housing safety) and resources available from the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education, State, local, and tribal governments and law enforcement agencies, and private and nonprofit organizations and associations;

''(7) increase cooperation, collaboration, and consistency in prevention, response, and problem-solving methods among law enforcement, mental health, and other agencies and jurisdictions serving institutions of higher education;

''(8) develop standardized formats and models for mutual aid agreements and memoranda of understanding between campus security agencies and other public safety organizations and mental health agencies; and

''(9) report annually to Congress and the Attorney General on activities performed by the Center during the previous 12 months.

''(c) COORDINATION WITH AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—In establishing the Center, the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services shall—

''(1) consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Education, and the Attorney General of each State; and

''(2) coordinate the establishment and operation of the Center with campus public safety resources that may be available within the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Education.

''(d) DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—In this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).''.

(b) JUSTICE PROGRAM CONSOLIDATIONS.—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Office of Dispute Resolution of the Department of Justice and the jurisdiction and employees of such office shall be—

(1) transferred to the Office of Legal Policy of the Department of Justice; and

(2) funded through the general administration appropriation of the Office of Legal Policy.

**TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES**

**SEC. 401. STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.**

Section 402(c) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b–4(c)) is amended by striking ''$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007

*through 2011'' and inserting ''$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.*

**SEC. 402. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION GRANTS.**

*(a) SMART PREVENTION.—Section 41303 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043d–2) is amended to read as follows:*

**"SEC. 41303. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION (SMART PREVENTION).**

*''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, is authorized to award grants for the purpose of preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by taking a comprehensive approach that focuses on youth, children exposed to violence, and men as leaders and influencers of social norms.*

*''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided under this section may be used for the following purposes:*

*''(1) TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION.—To develop, maintain, or enhance programs that change attitudes and behaviors around the acceptability of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and provide education and skills training to young individuals and individuals who influence young individuals. The prevention program may use evidence-based, evidence-informed, or innovative strategies and practices focused on youth. Such a program should include—*

*''(A) evidence-based age education on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sexual coercion, as well as healthy relationship skills, in school, in the community, or in health care settings;*

*''(B) community-based collaboration and training for those with influence on youth, such as parents, teachers, coaches, health care providers, faith-leaders, older teens, and mentors;*

*''(C) education and outreach to change environmental factors contributing to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and*

*''(D) policy development targeted to prevention, including school-based policies and protocols.*

*''(2) CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE AND ABUSE.—To develop, maintain or enhance programs designed to prevent future incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by preventing, reducing and responding to children's exposure to violence in the home. Such programs may include—*

*''(A) providing services for children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, including direct counseling or advocacy, and support for the non-abusing parent; and*

*''(B) training and coordination for educational, after-school, and childcare programs on how to safely and confidentially identify children and families experiencing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and properly refer children exposed and their families to services and violence prevention programs.*

*''(3) ENGAGING MEN AS LEADERS AND ROLE MODELS.—To develop, maintain or enhance programs that work with men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by helping men to serve as role models and social influencers of other men and youth at the individual, school, community or statewide levels.*

*''(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—*

*''(1) a victim service provider, community-based organization, tribe or tribal organization, or other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and expertise in the specific area for which they are applying for funds; or*

*''(2) a partnership between a victim service provider, community-based organization, tribe or tribal organization, or other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and at least one of the following that has expertise in serving children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, youth domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking prevention, or engaging men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking:*

*''(A) A public, charter, tribal, or nationally accredited private middle or high school, a school administered by the Department of Defense under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code or section 1402 of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978, a group of schools, or a school district.*

*''(B) A local community-based organization, population-specific organization, or faith-based organization that has established expertise in providing services to youth.*

*''(C) A community-based organization, population-specific organization, university or health care clinic, faith-based organization, or other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization.*

*''(D) A nonprofit, nongovernmental entity providing services for runaway or homeless youth affected by domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.*

*''(E) Health care entities eligible for reimbursement under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, including providers that target the special needs of children and youth.*

*''(F) Any other agencies, population-specific organizations, or nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with the capacity to provide necessary expertise to meet the goals of the program.*

*''(d) GRANTEE REQUIREMENTS.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Applicants for grants under this section shall prepare and submit to the Director an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require that demonstrates the capacity of the applicant and partnering organizations to undertake the project.*

*''(2) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Applicants under this section shall establish and implement policies, practices, and procedures that are consistent with the best practices developed under section 402 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b–4) and—*

*''(A) include appropriate referral systems to direct any victim identified during program activities to highly qualified follow-up care;*

*''(B) protect the confidentiality and privacy of adult and youth victim information, particularly in the context of parental or third-party involvement and consent, mandatory reporting duties, and working with other service providers;*

*''(C) ensure that all individuals providing prevention programming through a program funded under this section have completed or will complete sufficient training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking; and*

*''(D) document how prevention programs are coordinated with service programs in the community.*

*''(3) PREFERENCE.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to applicants that—*

*''(A) include outcome-based evaluation; and*

*''(B) identify any other community, school, or State-based efforts that are working on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking prevention and explain how the grantee or partnership will add value, coordinate with other programs, and not duplicate existing efforts.*

*''(e) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section, the definitions and grant conditions provided for in section 40002 shall apply.*

*''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.*

*''(g) ALLOTMENT.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 25 percent of the total amounts appropriated under this section in each fiscal year shall be used for each set of purposes described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b).*

*''(2) INDIAN TRIBES.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amounts appropriated under this section in each fiscal year shall be made available for grants to Indian tribes or tribal organizations.''.*

*(b) REPEALS.—The following provisions are repealed:*

*(1) Sections 41304 and 41305 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043d–3 and 14043d–4).*

*(2) Section 403 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045c).*

## TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

**SEC. 501. CONSOLIDATION OF GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.**

*(a) GRANTS.—Section 399P of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–4) is amended to read as follows:*

**"SEC. 399P. GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.**

*''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants for—*

*''(1) the development or enhancement and implementation of interdisciplinary training for health professionals, public health staff, and allied health professionals;*

*''(2) the development or enhancement and implementation of education programs for medical, nursing, dental, and other health profession students and residents to prevent and respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and*

*''(3) the development or enhancement and implementation of comprehensive statewide strategies to improve the response of clinics, public health facilities, hospitals, and other health settings (including behavioral and mental health programs) to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*

*''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—*

*''(1) REQUIRED USES.—Amounts provided under a grant under this section shall be used to—*

*''(A) fund interdisciplinary training and education programs under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) that—*

*''(i) are designed to train medical, psychology, dental, social work, nursing, and other health profession students, interns, residents, fellows, or current health care providers to identify and provide health care services (including mental or behavioral health care services and referrals to appropriate community services) to individuals who are or who have been victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and*

*''(ii) plan and develop clinical training components for integration into approved internship, residency, and fellowship training or continuing medical or other health education training that address physical, mental, and behavioral health issues, including protective factors, related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and other forms of violence and abuse, focus on reducing health disparities and preventing violence and abuse, and include the primacy of victim safety and confidentiality; and*

''(B) design and implement comprehensive strategies to improve the response of the health care system to domestic or sexual violence in clinical and public health settings, hospitals, clinics, and other health settings (including behavioral and mental health), under subsection (a)(3) through—

''(i) the implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of policies and procedures to guide health professionals and public health staff in identifying and responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including strategies to ensure that health information is maintained in a manner that protects the patient's privacy and safety, and safely uses health information technology to improve documentation, identification, assessment, treatment, and follow-up care;

''(ii) the development of on-site access to services to address the safety, medical, and mental health needs of patients by increasing the capacity of existing health care professionals and public health staff to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, or by contracting with or hiring domestic or sexual assault advocates to provide such services or to model other services appropriate to the geographic and cultural needs of a site;

''(iii) the development of measures and methods for the evaluation of the practice of identification, intervention, and documentation regarding victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including the development and testing of quality improvement measurements; and

''(iv) the provision of training and followup technical assistance to health care professionals, and public health staff, and allied health professionals to identify, assess, treat, and refer clients who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including using tools and training materials already developed.

''(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—

''(A) CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE.—To the extent consistent with the purpose of this section, a grantee may use amounts received under this section to address, as part of a comprehensive programmatic approach implemented under the grant, issues relating to child or elder abuse.

''(B) RURAL AREAS.—Grants funded under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) may be used to offer to rural areas community-based training opportunities (which may include the use of distance learning networks and other available technologies needed to reach isolated rural areas) for medical, nursing, and other health profession students and residents on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and, as appropriate, other forms of violence and abuse.

''(C) OTHER USES.—Grants funded under subsection (a)(3) may be used for—

''(i) the development of training modules and policies that address the overlap of child abuse, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and elder abuse, as well as childhood exposure to domestic and sexual violence;

''(ii) the development, expansion, and implementation of sexual assault forensic medical examination or sexual assault nurse examiner programs;

''(iii) the inclusion of the health effects of lifetime exposure to violence and abuse as well as related protective factors and behavioral risk factors in health professional training schools, including medical, dental, nursing, social work, and mental and behavioral health curricula, and allied health service training courses; or

''(iv) the integration of knowledge of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking into health care accreditation and professional licensing examinations, such as medical, dental, social work, and nursing boards, and where appropriate, other allied health exams.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTEES.—

''(1) CONFIDENTIALITY AND SAFETY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Grantees under this section shall ensure that all programs developed with grant funds address issues of confidentiality and patient safety and comply with applicable confidentiality and nondisclosure requirements under section 40002(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and that faculty and staff associated with delivering educational components are fully trained in procedures that will protect the immediate and ongoing security and confidentiality of the patients, patient records, and staff. Such grantees shall consult entities with demonstrated expertise in the confidentiality and safety needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking on the development and adequacy of confidentially and security procedures, and provide documentation of such consultation.

''(B) ADVANCE NOTICE OF INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.—Grantees under this section shall provide to patients advance notice about any circumstances under which information may be disclosed, such as mandatory reporting laws, and shall give patients the option to receive information and referrals without affirmatively disclosing abuse.

''(2) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A grantee shall use not more than 10 percent of the amounts received under a grant under this section for administrative expenses.

''(3) PREFERENCE.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to applicants based on the strength of their evaluation strategies, with priority given to outcome-based evaluations.

''(4) APPLICATION.—

''(A) SUBSECTION (a) (1) AND (2) GRANTEES.—An entity desiring a grant under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

''(i) documentation that the applicant represents a team of entities working collaboratively to strengthen the response of the health care system to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and which includes at least one of each of—

''(I) an accredited school of allopathic or osteopathic medicine, psychology, nursing, dentistry, social work, or other health field;

''(II) a health care facility or system; or

''(III) a government or nonprofit entity with a history of effective work in the fields of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

''(ii) strategies for the dissemination and sharing of curricula and other educational materials developed under the grant, if any, with other interested health professions schools and national resource repositories for materials on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

''(B) SUBSECTION (a)(3) GRANTEES.—An entity desiring a grant under subsection (a)(3) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

''(i) documentation that all training, education, screening, assessment, services, treatment, and any other approach to patient care will be informed by an understanding of violence and abuse victimization and trauma-specific approaches that will be integrated into prevention, intervention, and treatment activities;

''(ii) strategies for the development and implementation of policies to prevent and address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking over the lifespan in health care settings;

''(iii) a plan for consulting with State and tribal domestic violence or sexual assault coalitions, national nonprofit victim advocacy organizations, State or tribal law enforcement task forces (where appropriate), and population-specific organizations with demonstrated expertise in addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

''(iv) with respect to an application for a grant under which the grantee will have contact with patients, a plan, developed in collaboration with local victim service providers, to respond appropriately to and make correct referrals for individuals who disclose that they are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other types of violence, and documentation provided by the grantee of an ongoing collaborative relationship with a local victim service provider; and

''(v) with respect to an application for a grant proposing to fund a program described in subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii), a certification that any sexual assault forensic medical examination and sexual assault nurse examiner programs supported with such grant funds will adhere to the guidelines set forth by the Attorney General.

''(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive funding under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), an entity shall be—

''(A) a nonprofit organization with a history of effective work in the field of training health professionals with an understanding of, and clinical skills pertinent to, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and lifetime exposure to violence and abuse;

''(B) an accredited school of allopathic or osteopathic medicine, psychology, nursing, dentistry, social work, or allied health;

''(C) a health care provider membership or professional organization, or a health care system; or

''(D) a State, tribal, territorial, or local entity.

''(2) SUBSECTION (a)(3) GRANTEES.—To be eligible to receive funding under subsection (a)(3), an entity shall be—

''(A) a State department (or other division) of health, a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition or victim service provider, or any other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization with a history of effective work in the fields of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and health care, including physical or mental health care; or

''(B) a local victim service provider, a local department (or other division) of health, a local health clinic, hospital, or health system, or any other community-based organization with a history of effective work in the field of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and health care, including physical or mental health care.

''(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants or enter into contracts to provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program, activity or service carried out pursuant to this section. Not more than 8 percent of the funds appropriated under this section in each fiscal year may be used to fund technical assistance under this subsection.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall make publicly available materials developed by grantees under this section, including materials on training, best practices, and research and evaluation.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall publish a biennial report on—

''(A) the distribution of funds under this section; and

''(B) the programs and activities supported by such funds.

''(f) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may use not more than 20 percent to make a grant or enter into a contract for research and evaluation of—

''(A) grants awarded under this section; and

''(B) other training for health professionals and effective interventions in the health care setting that prevent domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault across the lifespan, prevent the health effects of such violence, and improve the safety and health of individuals who are currently being victimized.

''(2) RESEARCH.—Research authorized in paragraph (1) may include—

''(A) research on the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and childhood exposure to domestic violence, dating violence, or sexual assault on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, families, and populations, including underserved populations;

''(B) research to determine effective health care interventions to respond to and prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

''(C) research on the impact of domestic, dating, and sexual violence, childhood exposure to such violence, and stalking on the health care system, health care utilization, health care costs, and health status; and

''(D) research on the impact of adverse childhood experiences on adult experience with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and adult health outcomes, including how to reduce or prevent the impact of adverse childhood experiences through the health care setting.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the definitions in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 apply to this section.''.

(b) REPEALS.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (relating to research on effective interventions to address violence; 42 U.S.C. 13973; as added by section 505 of Public Law 109—162 (119 Stat. 3028)).

(2) Section 758 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294h).

## TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

### SEC. 601. HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the subtitle heading the following:

**"CHAPTER 1—GRANT PROGRAMS";**

(2) in section 41402 (42 U.S.C. 14043e–1), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''subtitle'' and inserting ''chapter'';

(3) in section 41403 (42 U.S.C. 14043e–2), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''subtitle'' and inserting ''chapter''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

**"CHAPTER 2—HOUSING RIGHTS**

**"SEC. 41411. HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.**

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this chapter:

''(1) AFFILIATED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'affiliated individual' means, with respect to an individual—

''(A) a spouse, parent, brother, sister, or child of that individual, or an individual to whom that individual stands in loco parentis; or

''(B) any individual, tenant, or lawful occupant living in the household of that individual.

''(2) APPROPRIATE AGENCY.—The term 'appropriate agency' means, with respect to a covered housing program, the Executive department (as defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code) that carries out the covered housing program.

''(3) COVERED HOUSING PROGRAM.—The term 'covered housing program' means—

''(A) the program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q);

''(B) the program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

''(C) the program under subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.);

''(D) each of the programs under title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.);

''(E) the program under subtitle A of title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12741 et seq.);

''(F) the program under paragraph (3) of section 221(d) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715l(d)) for insurance of mortgages that bear interest at a rate determined under the proviso under paragraph (5) of such section 221(d);

''(G) the program under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1);

''(H) the programs under sections 6 and 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d and 1437f);

''(I) rural housing assistance provided under sections 514, 515, 516, 533, and 538 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, and 1490p–2); and

''(J) the low-income housing tax credit program under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(b) PROHIBITED BASIS FOR DENIAL OR TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE OR EVICTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An applicant for or tenant of housing assisted under a covered housing program may not be denied admission to, denied assistance under, terminated from participation in, or evicted from the housing program or housing on the basis that the applicant or tenant is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the applicant or tenant otherwise qualifies for admission, assistance, participation, or occupancy.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION OF LEASE TERMS.—An incident of actual or threatened domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking shall not be construed as—

''(A) a serious or repeated violation of a lease for housing assisted under a covered housing program by the victim or threatened victim of such incident; or

''(B) good cause for terminating the assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program of the victim or threatened victim of such incident.

''(3) TERMINATION ON THE BASIS OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.—

''(A) DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE, TENANCY, AND OCCUPANCY RIGHTS PROHIBITED.—No person may deny assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program to a tenant solely on the basis of criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is engaged in by a member of the household of the tenant or any guest or other person under the control of the tenant, if the tenant or an affiliated individual of the tenant is the victim or threatened victim of such domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

''(B) BIFURCATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program may bifurcate a lease for the housing in order to evict, remove, or terminate assistance to any individual who is a tenant or lawful occupant of the housing and who engages in criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against an affiliated individual or other individual, without evicting, removing, terminating assistance to, or otherwise penalizing a victim of such criminal activity who is also a tenant or lawful occupant of the housing.

''(ii) EFFECT OF EVICTION ON OTHER TENANTS.—If a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program evicts, removes, or terminates assistance to an individual under clause (i), and the individual is the sole tenant eligible to receive assistance under a covered housing program, the public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under the covered housing program shall provide any remaining tenant an opportunity to establish eligibility for the covered housing program. If a tenant described in the preceding sentence cannot establish eligibility, the public housing agency or owner or manager of the housing shall provide the tenant a reasonable time, as determined by the appropriate agency, to find new housing or to establish eligibility for housing under another covered housing program.

''(C) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed—

''(i) to limit the authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program, when notified of a court order, to comply with a court order with respect to—

''(I) the rights of access to or control of property, including civil protection orders issued to protect a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or

''(II) the distribution or possession of property among members of a household in a case;

''(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in question against the tenant or an affiliated person of the tenant, if the public housing agency or owner or manager does not subject an individual who is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to a more demanding standard than other tenants in determining whether to evict or terminate;

''(iii) to limit the authority to terminate assistance to a tenant or evict a tenant from housing assisted under a covered housing program if a public housing agency or owner or manager of the housing can demonstrate that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted; or

''(iv) to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

''(c) DOCUMENTATION.—

''(1) REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTATION.—If an applicant for, or tenant of, housing assisted under a covered housing program represents to a public housing agency or owner or manager of the housing that the individual is entitled to protection under subsection (b), the public housing agency or owner or manager may request, in writing, that the applicant or tenant submit to the public housing agency or owner or manager a form of documentation described in paragraph (3).

''(2) FAILURE TO PROVIDE CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If an applicant or tenant does not provide the documentation requested under paragraph (1) within 14 business days after the tenant receives a request in writing for such certification from a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program, nothing in this chapter may be construed to limit the authority of the public housing agency or owner or manager to—

''(i) deny admission by the applicant or tenant to the covered program;

''(ii) deny assistance under the covered program to the applicant or tenant;

''(iii) terminate the participation of the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or

''(iv) evict the applicant, the tenant, or a lawful occupant that commits violations of a lease.

''(B) EXTENSION.—A public housing agency or owner or manager of housing may extend the 14-day deadline under subparagraph (A) at its discretion.

''(3) FORM OF DOCUMENTATION.—A form of documentation described in this paragraph is—

''(A) a certification form approved by the appropriate agency that—

''(i) states that an applicant or tenant is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

''(ii) states that the incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is the ground for protection under subsection (b) meets the requirements under subsection (b); and

''(iii) includes the name of the individual who committed the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the name is known and safe to provide;

''(B) a document that—

''(i) is signed by—

''(I) an employee, agent, or volunteer of a victim service provider, an attorney, a medical professional, or a mental health professional from whom an applicant or tenant has sought assistance relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or the effects of the abuse; and

''(II) the applicant or tenant; and

''(ii) states under penalty of perjury that the individual described in clause (i)(I) believes that the incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is the ground for protection under subsection (b) meets the requirements under subsection (b);

''(C) a record of a Federal, State, tribal, territorial, or local law enforcement agency, court, or administrative agency; or

''(D) at the discretion of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program, a statement or other evidence provided by an applicant or tenant.

''(4) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Any information submitted to a public housing agency or owner or manager under this subsection, including the fact that an individual is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking shall be maintained in confidence by the public housing agency or owner or manager and may not be entered into any shared database or disclosed to any other entity or individual, except to the extent that the disclosure is—

''(A) requested or consented to by the individual in writing;

''(B) required for use in an eviction proceeding under subsection (b); or

''(C) otherwise required by applicable law.

''(5) DOCUMENTATION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to request that an individual submit documentation of the status of the individual as a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

''(6) COMPLIANCE NOT SUFFICIENT TO CONSTITUTE EVIDENCE OF UNREASONABLE ACT.—Compliance with subsection (b) by a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program based on documentation received under this subsection, shall not be sufficient to constitute evidence of an unreasonable act or omission by the public housing agency or owner or manager or an employee or agent of the public housing agency or owner or manager. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the liability of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program for failure to comply with subsection (b).

''(7) RESPONSE TO CONFLICTING CERTIFICATION.—If a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program receives documentation under this subsection that contains conflicting information, the public housing agency or owner or manager may require an applicant or tenant to submit third-party documentation, as described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (3).

''(8) PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law that provides greater protection than this subsection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

''(d) NOTIFICATION.—

''(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop a notice of the rights of individuals under this section, including the right to confidentiality and the limits thereof, and include such notice in documents required by law to be provided to tenants assisted under a covered housing program.

''(2) PROVISION.—The applicable public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program shall provide the notice developed under paragraph (1) to an applicant for or tenant of housing assisted under a covered housing program—

''(A) at the time the applicant is denied residency in a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program;

''(B) at the time the individual is admitted to a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program; and

''(C) in multiple languages, consistent with guidance issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in accordance with Executive Order 13166 (42 U.S.C. 2000d–1 note; relating to access to services for persons with limited English proficiency).

''(e) EMERGENCY RELOCATION AND TRANSFERS.—Each appropriate agency shall develop a model emergency relocation and transfer plan for voluntary use by public housing agencies and owners or managers of housing assisted under a covered housing program that—

''(1) allows tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to relocate or transfer to another available and safe dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program and retain their status as tenants under the covered housing program if—

''(A) the tenant expressly requests to move;

''(B)(i) the tenant reasonably believes that the tenant is threatened with imminent harm from further violence if the tenant remains within the same dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program; or

''(ii) the sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking occurred on the premises during the 90-day period preceding the request to move; and

''(C) the tenant has provided documentation as described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C) or (D) of subsection (c)(3) if requested by a public housing agency or owner or manager;

''(2) incorporates reasonable confidentiality measures to ensure that the public housing agency or owner or manager does not disclose the location of the dwelling unit of a tenant to a person that commits an act of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against the tenant;

''(3) describes how the appropriate agency will coordinate relocations or transfers between dwelling units assisted under a covered housing program;

''(4) takes into consideration the existing rules and regulations of the covered housing program;

''(5) is tailored to the specific type of the covered housing program based on the volume and availability of dwelling units under the control or management of the public housing agency, owner, or manager; and

''(6) provides guidance for use in situations in which it is not feasible for an individual public housing agency, owner, or manager to effectuate a transfer.

''(f) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY TRANSFER.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall establish policies and procedures under which a victim requesting an emergency transfer under subsection (e) may receive, subject to the availability of tenant protection vouchers for assistance under section 8(o)(16) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(16)), assistance under such section.

''(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—The appropriate agency with respect to each covered housing program shall implement this section, as this section applies to the covered housing program.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 6.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (3); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(B) in subsection (l)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by striking '', and that an incident'' and all that follows through ''victim of such violence''; and

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking ''; except that'' and all that follows through ''stalking.''; and

(C) by striking subsection (u).

(2) SECTION 8.—Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (9);

(B) in subsection (d)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and that an applicant'' and all that follows through ''assistance or admission''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking '', and that an incident'' and all that follows through ''victim of such violence''; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking '', except that:'' and all that follows through ''stalking.'';

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (6), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (7), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11);

(D) in subsection (o)—

(i) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking the last sentence;

(ii) in paragraph (7)—

(I) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and that an incident'' and all that follows through ''victim of such violence''; and

(II) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''; except that'' and all that follows through ''stalking.''; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (20); and

(E) by striking subsection (ee).

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to limit the rights or remedies available to any person under section 6 or 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d and 1437f), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) to limit any right, remedy, or procedure otherwise available under any provision of part 5, 91, 880, 882, 883, 884, 886, 891, 903, 960, 966, 982, or 983 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, that—

(i) was issued under the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 2960) or an amendment made by that Act; and

(ii) provides greater protection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking than this Act or the amendments made by this Act; or

*(C) to disqualify an owner, manager, or other individual from participating in or receiving the benefits of the low-income housing tax credit program under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 because of noncompliance with the provisions of this Act or the amendments made by this Act.*

***SEC. 602. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.***

*Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13975; as added by section 611 of Public Law 108–21 (117 Stat. 693)) is amended—*

*(1) in the chapter heading, by striking ''**CHILD VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, OR SEXUAL ASSAULT**'' and inserting ''**VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING**''; and*

*(2) in section 40299 (42 U.S.C. 13975)—*

*(A) in the header, by striking ''**CHILD VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, OR SEXUAL ASSAULT**'' and inserting ''**VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING**'';*

*(B) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''fleeing'';*

*(C) by striking subsection (f); and*

*(D) in subsection (g)—*

*(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$40,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''; and*

*(ii) in paragraph (3)—*

*(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''eligible'' and inserting ''qualified''; and*

*(II) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(D) QUALIFIED APPLICATION DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'qualified application' means an application that—*

*''(i) has been submitted by an eligible applicant;*

*''(ii) does not propose any significant activities that may compromise victim safety;*

*''(iii) reflects an understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and*

*''(iv) does not propose prohibited activities, including mandatory services for victims, background checks of victims, or clinical evaluations to determine eligibility for services.''.*

***SEC. 603. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.***

*Subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.) is amended—*

*(1) in section 41404(i) (42 U.S.C. 14043e–3(i)), by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''; and*

*(2) in section 41405(g) (42 U.S.C. 14043e–4(g)), by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.*

## *TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE*

***SEC. 701. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.***

*Section 41501(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043f(e)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.*

## *TITLE VIII—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS*

***SEC. 801. FRAUD PREVENTION INITIATIVES.***

*(a) CREDIBLE EVIDENCE CONSIDERED.—Section 240A(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229b) is amended by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:*

*''(D) CREDIBLE EVIDENCE CONSIDERED.—In acting on applications under this paragraph, the Attorney General shall consider any credible evidence relevant to the application, including credible evidence submitted by a national of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence accused of the conduct described in subparagraph (A)(i) so long as this evidence is not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.''.*

*(b) APPLICATION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR BATTERED SPOUSE, PARENT, OR CHILD.—Section 204(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)) is amended—*

*(1) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by inserting after subclause (II) the following:*

*''(III)(aa) Upon filing, each petition under this clause shall be assigned to an investigative officer for adjudication and final determination of eligibility.*

*''(bb) During the adjudication of each petition under this paragraph, an investigative officer from a local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall conduct an in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition. The investigative officer may also gather other evidence so long as this evidence is not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. The investigative officer who conducted the in-person interview shall provide to the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility a summary of the interview and any other evidence gathered and a determination of the credibility of the interviewee and other evidence gathered.*

*''(cc) All interviews under this clause shall be conducted under oath and subject to applicable penalties for perjury.*

*''(dd) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall determine whether the petitioner had filed previous applications or petitions for immigration benefits that had been denied and whether the petitioner had been the beneficiary of a previous petition filed pursuant to this section that had been denied. If either was the case, the investigative officer shall consider the denials and the reasons for the denials as part of the adjudication of the petition.*

*''(ee) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall as part of the adjudication of the petition consult with the investigative officer at the local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services who had conducted the in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition.*

*''(ff) Upon the conclusion of the adjudication process under this subparagraph, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall issue a final written determination to approve or deny the petition. The investigative officer shall not approve the petition unless the officer finds, in writing and with particularity, that all requirements under this paragraph, including proof that the alien is a victim of the conduct described in clause (iii)(I)(bb), have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence.*

*''(IV) During the adjudication of a petition under this clause—*

*''(aa) the petition shall not be granted unless the petition is supported by a preponderance of the evidence; and*

*''(bb) all credible evidence submitted by an accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be considered so long as this evidence was not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.*

*''(V)(aa) During the adjudication of a petition under this paragraph, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall determine whether any Federal, State, territorial, tribal, or local law enforcement agency has undertaken an investigation or prosecution of the abusive conduct alleged by the petitioning alien.*

*''(bb) If an investigation or prosecution was commenced, the investigative officer shall—*

*''(AA) obtain as much information as possible about the investigation or prosecution; and*

*''(BB) consider that information as part of the adjudication of the petition.*

*''(cc) If an investigation or prosecution is pending, the adjudication of the petition shall be stayed pending the conclusion of the investigation or prosecution. If no investigation has been undertaken or if a prosecutor's office has not commenced a prosecution after the matter was referred to it, that fact shall be considered by the investigative officer as part of the adjudication of the petition.*

*''(VI) If a petition filed under this paragraph is denied, any obligations under an underlying affidavit of support previously filed by the accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be terminated.'';*

*(2) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by adding at the end the following: ''The petition shall be adjudicated according to the procedures that apply to self-petitioners under clause (iii).'';*

*(3) in subparagraph (A)(vii), by adding at the end the following continuation text:*

*''The petition shall be adjudicated according to the procedures that apply to self-petitioners under clause (iii).'';*

*(4) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting after subclause (II) the following:*

*''(III)(aa) Upon filing, each petition under this clause shall be assigned to an investigative officer for adjudication and final determination of eligibility.*

*''(bb) During the adjudication of each petition under this paragraph, an investigative officer from a local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall conduct an in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition. The investigative officer may also gather other evidence so long as this evidence is not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. The investigative officer who conducted the in-person interview shall provide to the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility a summary of the interview and any other evidence gathered and a determination of the credibility of the interviewee and other evidence gathered.*

*''(cc) All interviews under this clause shall be conducted under oath and subject to applicable penalties for perjury.*

*''(dd) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall determine whether the petitioner had filed previous applicaions or petitions for immigration benefits that had been denied and whether the petitioner had been the beneficiary of a previous petition filed pursuant to this section that had been denied. If either was the case, the investigative officer shall consider the denials and the reasons for the denials as part of the adjudication of the petition.*

*''(ee) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall as part of the adjudication of the petition consult with the investigative officer at the local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services who had conducted the in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition.*

*''(ff) Upon the conclusion of the adjudication process under this subparagraph, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall issue a final written determination to approve or deny the petition. The investigative officer shall not approve the petition unless the officer finds, in writing and with particularity, that all requirements under this paragraph, including proof that the alien is a victim of the conduct described in clause (ii)(I)(bb), have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence.*

*''(IV) During the adjudication of a petition under this clause—*

''(aa) the petition shall not be granted unless the petition is supported by a preponderance of the evidence; and

''(bb) all credible evidence submitted by an accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be considered so long as this evidence was not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

''(V)(aa) During the adjudication of a petition under this clause, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligiblity shall determine whether any Federal, State, territorial, tribal, or local law enforcement agency has undertaken an investigation or prosecution of the abusive conduct alleged by the petitioning alien.

''(bb) If an investigation or prosecution was commenced, the investigative officer shall—

''(AA) obtain as much information as possible about the investigation or prosecution; and

''(BB) consider that information as part of the adjudication of the petition.

''(cc) If an investigation or prosecution is pending, the adjudication of the petition shall be stayed pending the conclusion of the investigation or prosecution. If no investigation has been undertaken or if a prosecutor's office has not commenced a prosecution after the matter was referred to it, that fact shall be considered by the investigative officer as part of the adjudication of the petition.

''(VI) If a petition filed under this clause is denied, any obligations under an underlying affidavit of support previously filed by the accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be terminated.''; and

(5) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by adding at the end the following: ''The petition shall be adjudicated according to the procedures that apply to self-petitioners under clause (ii).''.

**SEC. 802. CLARIFICATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO U VISAS.**

Section 214(p)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)(1)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking ''The petition'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The petition''.

(2) By adding at the end the following:

''(B) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each certification submitted under subparagraph (A) shall confirm under oath that—

''(i) the criminal activity is actively under investigation or a prosecution has been commenced; and

''(ii) the petitioner has provided to law enforcement information that will assist in identifying the perpetrator of the criminal activity or the perpetrator's identity is known.

''(C) REQUIREMENT FOR CERTIFICATION.—No application for a visa under section 101(a)(15)(U) may be granted unless accompanied by the certification as described in this paragraph.''.

**SEC. 803. PROTECTIONS FOR A FIANCÉE OR FIANCÉ OF A CITIZEN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''crime.'' and inserting ''crime described in paragraph (3)(B) and information on any permanent protection or restraining order issued against the petitioner related to any specified crime described in paragraph (3)(B)(i).''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking ''abuse, and stalking.'' and inserting ''abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.''; and

(2) in subsection (r)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''crime.'' and inserting ''crime described in paragraph (5)(B) and information on any permanent protection or restraining order issued against the petitioner related to any specified crime described in subsection (5)(B)(i).''; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(B)(i), by striking ''abuse, and stalking.'' and inserting ''abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.''.

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO K NONIMMIGRANTS.—Section 833 of the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1375a) is amended in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking ''or'' after ''orders'' and inserting ''and''.

**SEC. 804. REGULATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKERS.**

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKER ACT OF 2005.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that includes the name of the component of the Department of Justice responsible for prosecuting violations of the International Marriage Broker Act of 2005 (subtitle D of Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3066) and the amendments made by this title.

(b) REGULATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKERS.—Section 833(d) of the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1375a(d)) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) PROHIBITION ON MARKETING OF OR TO CHILDREN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An international marriage broker shall not provide any individual or entity with personal contact information, photograph, or general information about the background or interests of any individual under the age of 18.

''(B) COMPLIANCE.—To comply with the requirements of subparagraph (A), an international marriage broker shall—

''(i) obtain a valid copy of each foreign national client's birth certificate or other proof of age document issued by an appropriate government entity;

''(ii) indicate on such certificate or document the date it was received by the international marriage broker;

''(iii) retain the original of such certificate or document for 5 years after such date of receipt; and

''(iv) produce such certificate or document upon request to an appropriate authority charged with the enforcement of this paragraph.''.

(2) In paragraph (2)(B)(ii), by striking ''or stalking.'' and inserting ''stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.''.

**SEC. 805. GAO REPORT.**

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report regarding the adjudication of petitions and applications under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)) and the self-petitioning process for VAWA self-petitioners (as that term is defined in section 101(a)(51) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(51)).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) assess the efficiency and reliability of the process for reviewing such petitions and applications, including whether the process includes adequate safeguards against fraud and abuse; and

(2) identify possible improvements to the adjudications of petitions and applications in order to reduce fraud and abuse.

**SEC. 806. TEMPORARY NATURE OF U VISA STATUS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 245(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255(m)) is amended by striking ''the alien is not described'' and inserting ''the individual who was convicted of the criminal activity referred to in section 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(I) that was the basis for the alien being admitted into the United States (or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status) under section 101(a)(15)(U) was himself or herself an alien and has been physically removed to the foreign state of which the alien with nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U) is a national, and if the alien with nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U) is not described''.

(b) DURATION OF NONIMMIGRANT STATUS.—Section 214(p)(6) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)(6)) is amended by striking ''if the alien is eligible for relief under section 245(m) and is unable to obtain such relief because regulations have been issued to implement such section and shall be extended''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to applications for adjustment of status submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and to previously filed applications that are pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 807. ANNUAL REPORT ON IMMIGRATION APPLICATIONS MADE BY VICTIMS OF ABUSE.**

Not later than December 1, 2012, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes the following:

(1) The number of aliens who—

(A) submitted an application for nonimmigrant status under paragraph (15)(T)(i), (15)(U)(i), or (51) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) during the preceding fiscal year;

(B) were granted such nonimmigrant status during such fiscal year; or

(C) were denied such nonimmigrant status during such fiscal year.

(2) The mean amount of time and median amount of time to adjudicate an application for such nonimmigrant status during such fiscal year.

(3) The mean amount of time and median amount of time between the receipt of an application for such nonimmigrant status and the issuance of work authorization to an eligible applicant during the preceding fiscal year.

(4) The number of aliens granted continued presence in the United States under section 107(c)(3) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(3)) during the preceding fiscal year.

(5) A description of any actions being taken to reduce the adjudication and processing time, while ensuring the safe and competent processing, of an application described in paragraph (1) or a request for continued presence referred to in paragraph (4).

(6) The actions being taken to combat fraud and to ensure program integrity.

(7) Each type of criminal activity by reason of which an alien received nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C 1101(a)(15)(U)) during the preceding fiscal year and the number of occurrences of that criminal activity that resulted in such aliens receiving such status.

**SEC. 808. PROTECTION FOR CHILDREN OF VAWA SELF-PETITIONERS.**

Section 204(l)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(l)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

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

''(F) a child of an alien who filed a pending or approved petition for classification or application for adjustment of status or other benefit specified in section 101(a)(51) as a VAWA self-petitioner; or''.

**SEC. 809. PUBLIC CHARGE.**

*Section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED ALIEN VICTIMS.—Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) shall not apply to an alien who—*

*''(i) is a VAWA self-petitioner;*

*''(ii) is an applicant for, or is granted, nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U); or*

*''(iii) is a qualified alien described in section 431(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1641(c)).''.*

**SEC. 810. AGE-OUT PROTECTION FOR U VISA APPLICANTS.**

*Section 214(p) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(7) AGE DETERMINATIONS.—*

*''(A) CHILDREN.—An unmarried alien who seeks to accompany, or follow to join, a parent granted status under section 101(a)(15)(U)(i), and who was under 21 years of age on the date on which such parent petitioned for such status, shall continue to be classified as a child for purposes of section 101(a)(15)(U)(ii), if the alien attains 21 years of age after such parent's petition was filed but while it was pending.*

*''(B) PRINCIPAL ALIENS.—An alien described in clause (i) of section 101(a)(15)(U) shall continue to be treated as an alien described in clause (ii)(I) of such section if the alien attains 21 years of age after the alien's application for status under such clause (i) is filed but while it is pending.''.*

**SEC. 811. HARDSHIP WAIVERS.**

*Section 216(c)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a(c)(4)) is amended—*

*(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;*

*(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''(1), or'' and inserting ''(1); or'';*

*(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon and ''or''; and*

*(4) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:*

*''(D) the alien meets the requirements under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(aa)(BB) and following the marriage ceremony was battered by or subject to extreme cruelty perpetrated by the alien's intended spouse and was not at fault in failing to meet the requirements of paragraph (1).''.*

**SEC. 812. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSE.**

*(a) INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 384(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(b)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (1)—*

*(A) by inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security or the'' before ''Attorney General may''; and*

*(B) by inserting ''Secretary's or the'' before ''Attorney General's discretion'';*

*(2) in paragraph (2)—*

*(A) by inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security or the'' before ''Attorney General may'';*

*(B) by inserting ''Secretary or the'' before ''Attorney General for''; and*

*(C) by inserting ''in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information'' after ''law enforcement purpose'';*

*(3) in paragraph (5), by striking ''Attorney General is'' and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General are''; and*

*(4) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:*

*''(8) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may provide in the discretion of either such Secretary or the Attorney General for the disclosure of information to national security officials to be used solely for a national security purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.''.*

*(b) GUIDELINES.—Subsection (d) (as added by section 817(4) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005) of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)) is amended by inserting ''and severe forms of trafficking in persons or criminal activity listed in section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(u))'' after ''domestic violence''.*

*(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the guidance required by section 384(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)), consistent with the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).*

*(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 384(a)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 is amended by striking ''241(a)(2)'' in the matter following subparagraph (F) and inserting ''237(a)(2)''.*

**SEC. 813. GAO REPORT ON REQUIREMENTS TO COOPERATE WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.**

*(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report regarding the adjudication of petitions and applications under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)).*

*(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—*

*(1) assess the effectiveness of the requirements set out in Section 802 of this Act in ensuring that potential U visa recipients aid in the investigation, apprehension, and prosecution of criminals;*

*(2) determine the effect of the requirements set out in Section 802 of this Act, on the number of U visas issued annually; and*

*(3) determine the effect of the requirements set out in Section 802 of this Act, on the number of individuals seeking U visas.*

**SEC. 814. CONSIDERATION OF OTHER EVIDENCE.**

*Section 237(a)(2)(E)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)(E)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''If the conviction records do not conclusively establish whether a crime of domestic violence constitutes a crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code), the Attorney General may consider any other evidence that the Attorney General determines to be reliable in making this determination, including sentencing reports and police reports.''.*

## TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

**SEC. 901. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**

*Section 2015(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–10(a)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''sex trafficking,'' after ''sexual assault,'';*

*(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''sex trafficking,'' after ''sexual assault,'';*

*(3) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and stalking'' and all that follows and inserting ''sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking;'';*

*(4) in paragraph (7)—*

*(A) by inserting ''sex trafficking,'' after ''sexual assault,'' each place it appears; and*

*(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;*

*(5) in paragraph (8)—*

*(A) by inserting ''sex trafficking,'' after ''stalking,''; and*

*(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and*

*(6) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(9) provide services to address the needs of youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, or stalking and the needs of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including support for the nonabusing parent or the caretaker of the child; and*

*''(10) develop and promote legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.''.*

**SEC. 902. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL COALITIONS.**

*Section 2001(d) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(d)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (1)—*

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

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

*(C) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(D) developing and promoting State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking.''; and*

*(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''individuals or''.*

**SEC. 903. CONSULTATION.**

*Section 903 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045d) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)—*

*(A) by striking ''and the Violence Against Women Act of 2000'' and inserting '', the Violence Against Women Act of 2000''; and*

*(B) by inserting '', and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012'' before the period at the end;*

*(2) in subsection (b)—*

*(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services'' and inserting ''Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of the Interior,''; and*

*(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and stalking'' and inserting ''stalking, and sex trafficking''; and*

*(3) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Attorney General shall submit to Congress an annual report on the annual consultations required under subsection (a) that—*

*''(1) contains the recommendations made under subsection (b) by Indian tribes during the year covered by the report;*

*''(2) describes actions taken during the year covered by the report to respond to recommendations made under subsection (b) during the year or a previous year; and*

*''(3) describes how the Attorney General will work in coordination and collaboration with Indian tribes, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of the Interior to address the recommendations made under subsection (b).*

*''(d) NOTICE.—Not later than 120 days before the date of a consultation under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall notify tribal leaders of the date, time, and location of the consultation.''.*

**SEC. 904. ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIAN WOMEN.**

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 904(a) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–10 note) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (1)—*

*(A) by striking ''The National'' and inserting ''Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the National''; and*

*(B) by inserting ''and in Native villages (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602))'' before the period at the end;*

*(2) in paragraph (2)(A)—*

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

*(B) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and*

*(C) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(vi) sex trafficking.'';*

*(3) in paragraph (4), by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012''; and*

*(4) in paragraph (5), by striking ''this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008'' and inserting ''this subsection $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014''.*

*(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 905(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.*

***SEC. 905. ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TRIBAL LIAISONS.***

*(a) APPOINTMENT.—The Attorney General is authorized and encouraged to appoint the Assistant United States Attorney Tribal Liaison appointed in each judicial district that includes Indian country to also serve as a domestic violence tribal liaison.*

*(b) DUTIES.—The duties of a domestic violence tribal liaison appointed under this section shall include the following:*

*(1) Encouraging and assisting in arrests and Federal prosecution for crimes, including misdemeanor crimes, of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that occur in Indian country.*

*(2) Conducting training sessions for tribal law enforcement officers and other individuals and entities responsible for responding to crimes in Indian country to ensure that such officers, individuals, and entities understand their arrest authority over non-Indian offenders.*

*(3) Developing multidisciplinary teams to combat domestic and sexual violence offenses against Indians by non-Indians.*

*(4) Consulting and coordinating with tribal justice officials and victims' advocates to address any backlog in the prosecution of crimes, including misdemeanor crimes, of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that occur in Indian country.*

*(5) Developing working relationships and maintaining communication with tribal leaders, tribal community and victims' advocates, and tribal justice officials to gather information from, and share appropriate information with, tribal justice officials.*

*(c) INDIAN COUNTRY.—In this section, the term ''Indian country'' has the meaning given such term in section 1151 of title 18.*

*(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.*

## *TITLE X—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS*

***SEC. 1001. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO SEXUAL ABUSE.***

*(a) SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR OR WARD.—Section 2243(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:*

*''(b) OF A WARD.—*

*''(1) OFFENSES.—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly engage, or knowingly attempt to engage, in a sexual act with another person who is—*

*''(A) in official detention or supervised by, or otherwise under the control of, the United States—*

*''(i) during arrest;*

*''(ii) during pretrial release;*

*''(iii) while in official detention or custody; or*

*''(iv) while on probation, supervised release, or parole;*

*''(B) under the professional custodial, supervisory, or disciplinary control or authority of the person engaging or attempting to engage in the sexual act; and*

*''(C) at the time of the sexual act—*

*''(i) in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States;*

*''(ii) in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of, or pursuant to a contract or agreement with, the United States; or*

*''(iii) under supervision or other control by the United States, or by direction of, or pursuant to a contract or agreement with, the United States.*

*''(2) PENALTIES.—Whoever violates paragraph (1)(A) shall—*

*''(A) be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both; and*

*''(B) if, in the course of committing the violation of paragraph (1), the person engages in conduct that would constitute an offense under section 2241 or 2242 if committed in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, be subject to the penalties provided for under section 2241 or 2242, respectively.''.*

*(b) PENALTIES FOR SEXUAL ABUSE.—*

*(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:*

***''§ 250. Penalties for sexual abuse***

*''(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person, in the course of committing an offense under this chapter or under section 901 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3631) to engage in conduct that would constitute an offense under chapter 109A if committed in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.*

*''(b) PENALTIES.—A person that violates subsection (a) shall be subject to the penalties under the provision of chapter 109A that would have been violated if the conduct was committed in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, unless a greater penalty is otherwise authorized by law.''.*

*(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''250. Penalties for sexual abuse.''.*

***SEC. 1002. SEXUAL ABUSE IN CUSTODIAL SETTINGS.***

*(a) SUITS BY PRISONERS.—Section 7(e) of the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (42 U.S.C. 1997e(e)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or the commission of a sexual act (as defined in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code)''.*

*(b) UNITED STATES AS DEFENDANT.—Section 1346(b)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or the commission of a sexual act (as defined in section 2246 of title 18)''.*

*(c) ADOPTION AND EFFECT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.—Section 8 of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607) is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and*

*(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:*

*''(c) APPLICABILITY TO DETENTION FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish a final rule adopting national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of rape and sexual assault in facilities that maintain custody of aliens detained for a violation of the immigrations laws of the United States.*

*''(2) APPLICABILITY.—The standards adopted under paragraph (1) shall apply to detention facilities operated by the Department of Homeland Security and to detention facilities operated under contract with, or pursuant to an intergovernmental service agreement with, the Department.*

*''(3) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—*

*''(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and*

*''(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Homeland Security.*

*''(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall give due consideration to the recommended national standards provided by the Commission under section 7(e).*

*''(d) APPLICABILITY TO CUSTODIAL FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish a final rule adopting national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of rape and sexual assault in facilities that maintain custody of unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))).*

*''(2) APPLICABILITY.—The standards adopted under paragraph (1) shall apply to facilities operated by the Department of Health and Human Services and to facilities operated under contract with the Department.*

*''(3) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—*

*''(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and*

*''(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.*

*''(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall give due consideration to the recommended national standards provided by the Commission under section 7(e).''.*

***SEC. 1003. CRIMINAL PROVISION RELATING TO STALKING, INCLUDING CYBERSTALKING.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2261A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:*

***''§ 2261A. Stalking.***

*''(a) Whoever uses the mail, any interactive computer service, or any facility of interstate or foreign commerce to engage in a course of conduct or travels in interstate or foreign commerce or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or enters or leaves Indian country, with the intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate another person, or place another person under surveillance with the intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate such person and in the course of, or as a result of, such travel or course of conduct—*

*''(1) places that person in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury to such person, a member of their immediate family (as defined in section 115), or their spouse or intimate partner; or*

*''(2) causes or attempts to cause serious bodily injury or serious emotional distress to such person, a member of their immediate family (as defined in section 115), or their spouse or intimate partner;*

*shall be punished as provided in subsection (b).*

*''(b) The punishment for an offense under this section is the same as that for an offense under section 2261, except that if—*

*''(1) the offense involves conduct in violation of a protection order; or*

''(2) the victim of the offense is under the age of 18 years or over the age of 65 years, the offender has reached the age of 18 years at the time the offense was committed, and the offender knew or should have known that the victim was under the age of 18 years or over the age of 65 years;

the maximum term of imprisonment that may be imposed is increased by 5 years over the term of imprisonment otherwise provided for that offense in section 2261.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 2261A in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''2261A. Stalking.''.

**SEC. 1004. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL ASSAULT STATUTE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 113 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) Assault with intent to commit murder or a violation of section 2241 or 2242, by a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''felony under chapter 109A'' and inserting ''violation of section 2241 or 2242'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and without just cause or excuse,'';

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking ''six months'' and inserting ''1 year'';

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking ''1 year'' and inserting ''5 years'';

(F) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking ''substantial bodily injury to an individual who has not attained the age of 16 years'' and inserting ''substantial bodily injury to a spouse or intimate partner, a dating partner, or an individual who has not attained the age of 16 years''; and

(ii) by striking ''fine'' and inserting ''a fine''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) Assault of a spouse, intimate partner, or dating partner by strangling, suffocating, or attempting to strangle or suffocate, by a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''(b) As used in this subsection—'' and inserting the following:

''(b) In this section—'';

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

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) the terms 'dating partner' and 'spouse or intimate partner' have the meanings given those terms in section 2266;

''(4) the term 'strangling' means knowingly or recklessly impeding the normal breathing or circulation of the blood of a person by applying pressure to the throat or neck, regardless of whether that conduct results in any visible injury or whether there is any intent to kill or protractedly injure the victim; and

''(5) the term 'suffocating' means knowingly or recklessly impeding the normal breathing of a person by covering the mouth of the person, the nose of the person, or both, regardless of whether that conduct results in any visible injury or whether there is any intent to kill or protractedly injure the victim.''.

(b) INDIAN MAJOR CRIMES.—Section 1153(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''assault with intent to commit murder, assault with a dangerous weapon, assault resulting in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365 of this title)'' and inserting ''a felony assault under section 113''.

**SEC. 1005. MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCE.**

Section 2241 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2), by striking ''any term of years or life'' and inserting ''not less than 10 years or imprisoned for life''; and

(2) in subsection (b), in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2), by striking ''any term of years or life'' and inserting ''not less than 5 years or imprisoned for life''.

**SEC. 1006. FEDERAL PROTECTION ORDERS.**

(a) FEDERAL PROTECTION ORDERS.—Chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2262 the following:

**''§ 2262A. Federal domestic violence protection orders involving Indians and Indian country**

''(a) PETITION FOR PROTECTION ORDER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A victim of an act of domestic violence, or an Indian tribe as parens patriae on behalf of the victim of an act of domestic violence, may petition a district court of the United States to issue a protection order against the person (whether an Indian or a non-Indian) who is alleged to have committed the act of domestic violence if—

''(A) the victim is an Indian or a minor who resides with or is in the care and custody of an Indian;

''(B) the victim resides or is employed at a place located in the Indian country of the Indian tribe that files the petition; and

''(C) the person against whom the order is sought is alleged to have committed an act of domestic violence in the Indian country.

''(2) CONTENTS OF PETITION.—A petition filed under this section shall contain—

''(A) the facts that meet the requirements under paragraph (1);

''(B) the name of each victim on whose behalf the protection order is sought;

''(C) the name and, if known, the residential address of the person against whom the order is sought;

''(D) a detailed description of the alleged act of domestic violence, including the date or approximate date and the location of the act of domestic violence; and

''(E) the relief sought.

''(3) ISSUANCE OF PROTECTION ORDER.—The court may issue a protection order in accordance with this section and subsections (b) and (c) of section 2265 and Rule 65(d)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if the court finds that such order is reasonably necessary to provide protection against violence, threats, or harassment against, contact or communication with, or physical proximity to—

''(A) a spouse or intimate partner who resides or is employed at a location in the Indian country of the Indian tribe involved in the proceeding; or

''(B) a minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of a spouse or intimate partner who resides or is employed at a location in the Indian country.

''(4) SCOPE OF PROTECTION ORDERS.—Any protection order under this section may—

''(A) prohibit the person against whom the order is sought from—

''(i) threatening to commit or committing an act of domestic violence against or otherwise harassing the spouse or intimate partner or minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner;

''(ii) communicating, directly or indirectly, with the spouse or intimate partner or minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner; and

''(iii) knowingly coming within a specified distance from the spouse or intimate partner or minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner;

''(B) direct the person against whom the order is sought to stay away from the residence, school, or place of employment of the spouse or intimate partner, or any other specified place frequented by the spouse or intimate partner, regardless of whether the residence, school, place of employment, or other specified place is located in Indian country; and

''(C) exclude or bar the person against whom the order is sought from the Indian country of the Indian tribe involved in the proceeding or any portion or area of that Indian country.

''(5) EMERGENCY EX PARTE ORDERS.—If a petition requests an emergency ex-parte protection order and from the facts alleged in the petition there appears to be a danger of a further, imminent act of domestic violence against a victim, the court may grant an emergency ex-parte protection order against the person against whom the order is sought in accordance with the requirements of section 2265(b)(2).

''(6) DURATION OF PROTECTION ORDER.—A protection order under this section may be permanent or of such other shorter duration as the court determines necessary to protect a victim from a further act of domestic violence by the person against whom the order is sought.

''(b) VIOLATION OF PROTECTION ORDER.—A person who intentionally violates a protection order under this section shall be punished as provided in section 2262(b).''.

(b) VIOLATION OF FEDERAL PROTECTION ORDER.—Section 2262(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''this section or a protection order issued under section 2262A''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2266 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

''(11) ACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term 'act of domestic violence' means an act or attempted act of violence or stalking, or a threatened act of violence, by a person against a spouse or intimate partner, or a minor residing with or in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner.

''(12) INDIAN.—The term 'Indian' means a person who is a member of any Indian tribe, regardless of whether that Indian tribe is the plaintiff Indian tribe under section 2262A.

''(13) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

''(14) MINOR.—The term 'minor' means a person under the age of 18 years.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2262 the following:

''2262A. Federal domestic violence protection orders involving Indians and Indian country.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4970, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I'm proud to stand in support of this important and life-saving bill.

According to national statistics, an average three women are killed by a

current or former intimate partner a day, every day, and 24 people per minute are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner. For me, these statistics are way too real.

Some of you may already know that at the age of 17 I dropped out of high school and joined the Air Force. I soon married by 18 and had a young daughter. For me, it was a blessing, but I soon found out that the man I married had a penchant for drinking and was very violent when he drank. I gave him the chance to be the father I thought he could be, and it didn't happen. So I took my daughter, our clothing, and we left.

Like many women who leave an abusive relationship, there were times that the only thing that kept me going was knowing that I was responsible for my daughter, and she depended on me to make a better life for both of us where we both felt safe.

Years later, I experienced another side of domestic violence while working as a deputy sheriff for the Orange County Sheriff's Office. I encountered many victims who had been abused, whether it was from domestic violence, rape, or stalking. These victims were always victims. That's what victims are, all inclusive. Back then, issues like domestic violence and sexual assault weren't really discussed; they were hidden behind closed doors, leaving many of the victims to either underreport or not report at all. They didn't turn for help because they felt helpless. So when the Violence Against Women Act was enacted in 1994, it brought attention to an issue that was underreported, or maybe not even reported at all.

Eighteen years ago, VAWA established within the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services a number of life-saving grant programs for State, local, and Indian tribal governments. Since then, the act has encouraged collaboration among law enforcement officers, judicial personnel, and public and private sector providers to provide help for the victims of domestic and sexual violence. It also addressed the needs of victims of domestic and sexual violence who are elderly, disabled, children, youth, and individuals of ethnic and racial communities, including Native Americans.

Congress has twice reauthorized the VAWA grant programs with strong bipartisan support, once in 2000 and again in 2006. Keeping with the bipartisan nature of the act, the House bill, H.R. 4970, reauthorizes the grant programs in VAWA for a third time at the same funding levels as our colleagues in the Senate agreed to last month.

In addition to making several key improvements to the Senate bill, including nearly doubling resources for eliminating the backlog of unprocessed rape evidence kits, the House bill brings greater accountability to VAWA grant administration by ensuring that funding is spent on the victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and not on Washington bureaucrats.

To achieve these goals, H.R. 4970 requires that the inspectors general of DOJ and HHS conduct an annual audit of at least 10 percent of all VAWA grant recipients and limits the use of funds for OVW salaries and administrative expenses to 5 percent of the annual authorization. H.R. 4970 also requires the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to improve the coordination of grants within the Department in order to eliminate duplication and overlap.

Make no mistake about it: this is a victim-centered bill which includes all victims—an all-inclusive, victim-centered bill. Turning this reauthorization into a political issue is not only wrong, but it is dangerous. It is dangerous. We cannot allow domestic violence in this country to become a campaign issue. It must be a reflection of our best efforts as Americans united against breaking a cycle of violence and helping victims become survivors.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me today in supporting this life-saving legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, because it is a title that does not represent what it ought to underneath.

We've had these kinds of incidents before. In the past, we've always been able to set aside partisan differences and work together to protect the most vulnerable women of our society, abused and battered women. Today, unfortunately, this bill sets aside 20 years of bipartisan progress in our efforts to protect these women.

The bill, as amended by the manager's amendment, rolls back existing protections for battered immigrant women. It fails to include provisions from the bipartisan Senate-passed bill—which all the women in the Senate voted for—which protect native women's lives by authorizing limited tribal criminal domestic violence. It eliminates the language from the bipartisan Senate-passed bill that would help lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender victims of domestic violence receive Violence Against Women Act services without facing additional discrimination.

□ 1530

Now, I'm going to reserve my time here, but I want to just point this out: there are more than 300 organizations—women's organizations, law enforcement organizations, church organizations—that have registered their opposition to H.R. 4970 for the reason that I've suggested. The National Organization for Women, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, the American Civil Liberties Union, more than 20 faith-based leaders of organizations, the National Congress of American Indians, and it goes on and on, police chiefs, captains, detectives, lieutenants and prosecutors.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for all victims of domestic violence and oppose this dangerous proposal that is on the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentlewoman from Florida, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee herself, for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 4970, and I want to again thank my colleague from Florida, SANDY ADAMS, for her work on this legislation.

H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, provides funding for VAWA grant programs for 5 years at the same levels as the Senate-passed bill. There are only a few minor differences between this House bill and the Senate bill.

H.R. 4970 doesn't include language to provide special protected status to certain categories of people because they are already covered under VAWA. H.R. 4970 doesn't include language to allow Indian tribes to prosecute non-Indians because that is unconstitutional. H.R. 4970 does include provisions that prevent fraud and abuse in the immigration process.

This bill authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for valuable services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Those who have supported VAWA in the past should be eager to support this legislation today.

Violence against women doesn't occur along party lines, and neither should reauthorization of these programs. Instead of working with Republicans in a bipartisan effort to protect women from domestic violence, rape, and stalking, some Democrats have chosen to place partisan posturing above the urgent needs of victims of violence.

If Members choose to oppose this bill for political reasons, that's their decision; but there is no good reason to oppose this bill for substantive reasons. A vote against this bill, in my judgment, is a vote against common sense and a vote against helping abused women.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to remind my colleagues on the other side that the 200 or 300 organizations and people that oppose this bill supported the previous legislation. Now, come on.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, ZOE LOFGREN, a senior member of the committee.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Before today, every VAWA bill we've considered over the last 20 years had three things in common: they've all been bipartisan, they've all been written in consultation with the advocates and service providers on the front lines against domestic violence, and they've all increased protections for victims of domestic violence.

This bill, even as amended, shares none of those attributes. It actually reduces protections that exist in current law for victims of domestic violence, rape, and sexual assault. It was developed without any support or consultation from the minority or from the domestic violence advocates. And it is not bipartisan.

Now, the bill's opposed by every leading domestic violence organization. It's opposed by the National Association of Evangelicals and the Willow Creek Church, the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference, all the leading women's groups. It's opposed by law enforcement officials with years of experience fighting domestic violence. It's opposed by tribal authorities, immigration advocates, LGBT groups. The list goes on and on.

So the question really is this: If everyone from the National Organization for Women and Planned Parenthood to the National Association of Evangelicals and the Catholic Church have extreme concerns about this bill, who thinks this is a step in the right direction?

And as far as I can tell, the only groups who openly support the bill and the amendments are groups like SAVE and A Voice for Men, who align themselves, not with battered women, but with the men who abuse them.

I will insert into the RECORD an article from Leith Anderson, the president of the National Association of Evangelicals, and Lynne Hybels, the co-founder of the Willlow Creek Community Church. This is what they say:

Nicole came to the U.S. from Indonesia on a temporary fiancee visa, expecting to enjoy life as a spouse. Instead was trafficked.

They oppose the bill.

[From CNN, May 16, 2012]

PROTECT IMMIGRANT WOMEN FROM VIOLENCE

(By Leith Anderson and Lynne Hybels)

Nicole came to the United States from Indonesia on a temporary fiancée visa, fully expecting that she would enjoy life in a new country with the U.S. citizen she intended to marry. Instead, she found herself trapped as a victim of sex trafficking.

Nicole (not her real name), like thousands of other women, was forced to engage in commercial sex acts against her will. We heard about her when she received support from the Salvation Army STOP-IT Program in Illinois, which serves victims who have been harmed by the sex trade. (The Salvation Army is a denominational member of the National Association of Evangelicals.) Eventually, Nicole escaped from her trafficker and assisted law enforcement in the prosecution of the crime committed against her.

Though Nicole's fiancée visa had lapsed, leaving her susceptible to deportation, our nation's anti-trafficking law provided a legal option for her to be granted permanent legal status by helping law enforcement to prosecute her trafficker. With the help of a nonprofit legal service provider and the Salvation Army, Nicole was able to petition on her own for legal status—and obtain it—through a special ''U'' visa for immigrant victims of crime, allowing her to get back on her feet and begin rebuilding her life.

This week the House of Representatives is considering a proposal to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, first enacted in 1994, but in a new version that would significantly undermine the same U visa program that provided Nicole with safety and permanency in the United States.

The U.S. government estimates that as many as 17,500 foreign-born victims are illegally trafficked in from abroad each year, and academic estimates suggest that at least 100,000 victims of human trafficking live in the United States today.

By force, fraud or coercion, traffickers keep victims enslaved in prostitution or forced labor.

If the House proposal is enacted, thousands like Nicole could remain enslaved, too afraid to speak out because some of their most effective safeguards will have disappeared. The proposal introduced by Rep. Sandy Adams, R-Florida, would dramatically roll back important protections for battered immigrant women and their children. It could face a vote Wednesday afternoon.

Several provisions would leave immigrant victims of human trafficking and domestic abuse no legal way to break the cycle of violence in which they are trapped.

Specifically, this version would remove the incentive of permanent safe haven in the United States for women who help bring abusers to justice. By changing the U visa from permanent to temporary, the bill could validate an abuser's threat that a call to police could result in deportation. Many women would keep quiet rather than risk immigration consequences.

The bill would also allow abusive partners in domestic violence cases to provide input as to whether their victim should qualify for immigration relief, stripping confidentiality provisions that currently protect victims. Abusive spouses, who are in a position to petition to adjust the status of their immigrant wives through marriage, can choose not to do so as a tool of abuse and fear. Abusers frequently deny guilt and falsely accuse victims of fraud or abuse.

We don't want a bill that endangers some of the women and children it purports to help. Overall, this bill's proposed changes to current law would discourage immigrant victims from escaping abuse and reporting crimes, and make all of us less safe.

Women—and, often, their children—come to our churches for sanctuary and hope. We believe Adams' proposal would put more lives in danger. It would perpetuate abusers' use of immigration status as part of the cycle of exploitation.

As evangelical Christians, we are committed to Jesus' great commandment to love God and to love our neighbor, with a particular concern for those who are most vulnerable. Through local churches and ministries, we extend that love when we provide counseling and support for victims of human trafficking and domestic violence. In doing so, we point to the ultimate healing and restoration that we believe is found only in Jesus.

We also love our neighbor by speaking up when laws are proposed that could cause harm, intentionally or not. Loving our neighbor not only means reaching out to those in need, but also means addressing systemic problems that harm those in need.

That's why we're asking Speaker John Boehner and the House leadership to make sure that the Violence Against Women Act continues to protect vulnerable immigrant women who are victims of human trafficking or domestic violence. They need our protection.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO). She is a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the sponsor of the bill, my colleague from Florida, for her work and her courage in bringing this forward.

I rise in support of H.R. 4970. Quickly, I'd like to tell a story about a situation in my hometown where a young boy was in the car with his mother. She was being beaten by her boyfriend, or her friend. She pulls the car over. He steps out of the car to try to flag somebody down to help his mother. He's 11 years old. He's hit and killed in the middle of a domestic violence situation. Tremendously tragic.

We know that sexual and domestic violence can happen to anyone at any age, race, income group, religion, or gender. Worldwide, one in four women is abused. In 2001, in my own home State, 13,000 domestic violence offenses were reported to law enforcement; and half of these offenses were between family members and household members, like that young man on the interstate that night. To be safe in your community, women first need to be safe in their own homes.

We have made great progress, I think, with the Violence Against Women Act that was enacted in 1994; but this current reauthorization builds on the successes of the last decade and will prevent more women and families from suffering. These women are our mothers, our daughters, our sisters, our friends, and our colleagues.

VAWA is working to break the cycle of violence in this country. And by speaking and lending a hand to our neighbors, our friends, our family members, we can break the cycle and take a vocal stand against abuse.

We've heard how this bill has been bipartisan in the past. It can be bipartisan right now. It can be bipartisan today. We can work out the difference. We can do the right thing. That's what we're here for, for that little boy on that interstate that night.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, Mr. NADLER has agreed to permit DALE KILDEE, the gentleman from Michigan, because of an emergency, to be recognized out of order for 1 minute.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill which is grossly inadequate in renewing vital protections for domestic violence victims. For the first time, we have a VAWA authorization that actually makes women less safe by taking away protections from previously covered groups like Native Americans living on reservations.

My Republican colleague will argue that this bill protects Native women by

giving them access to Federal courts, but in many cases the nearest Federal court is over 300 miles away. Do we really expect a woman who has just been abused to get in a car and drive 300 miles for protection? And even then there is no guarantee that a Federal prosecutor will do anything.

Every community in the Nation, except for constitutionally recognized tribal governments, has the authority to protect its residents. The only logical solution is to return local control to tribal governments to stop domestic violence before it escalates.

Instead of voting on partisan H.R. 4970, we should be considering the Senate bill, S. 1925, which included protection for Indian women.

□ 1540

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK), who is a cosponsor of this important pro-victim legislation.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, which is just as I did in 2000 and once again in 2005. It was a critically important bill back then, and it is a critically important bill now. That's why I am urging my colleagues today to stand up for all women in America.

I thank my colleague, SANDY ADAMS, for her very hard work and dedication and also for sharing her personal experiences and turning them into a reason to champion this bill.

Yet, Madam Speaker, despite a lot of hard work by advocacy groups, law enforcement, churches, schools, and so many others around our Nation, violence against women continues to be an alarming problem—murder, sexual violence, domestic violence. More than 1 million women in the U.S. will be victimized this year alone, and it's estimated that one in four women in the U.S. will experience domestic violence at some point in her lifetime. That's one out of every four women.

As a society, we can't seem to find a way to stop this terrible sickness, but this legislation gives victims and their families a safe place to turn for help, such as to community violence prevention programs; protections for victims who are evicted from their homes because of events related to domestic violence or stalking; funding for victim assistance services like grief crisis centers and hotlines; and programs to meet the needs of women of different races or ethnicities.

A vote for this legislation is a vote to protect women—not some women, but all women.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud to represent a facility sheltered from the storm in my congressional district, and I thank them for their hard work and for their dedication in helping victims of domestic violence.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from California, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). While I agree with my colleagues that we must reauthorize VAWA, I cannot support this version of the bill given the numerous ways it fails to protect women and families.

Despite the significant progress we have made as a nation addressing violence against women, nearly one-third of women in the U.S. still report being physically or sexually abused by a husband or boyfriend in their lifetime. Domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking lead to severe social, health, and economic consequences for our communities, with the estimated cost of violence exceeding 70 billion dollars each year.

Historically, each time VAWA has come up for reauthorization, Congress has added beneficial provisions to the bill and passed it with strong bipartisan support. In 2005, we included language referencing culturally and linguistically specific services to help eliminate barriers for many racial and ethnic minorities. My colleagues and I also successfully included a new health title in the last VAWA reauthorization that strengthened our health care system's capacity to prevent violence and develop effective interventions to abuse.

The version of VAWA before us today threatens to roll back those gains and limit protections for victims, ultimately endangering their safety in life-threatening ways. H.R. 4970 omits provisions in the Senate-passed bill that ensure equal treatment and access to services for LGBT survivors. It denies justice for tribal women abused by non-Indians, negating the reality that Native American women suffer domestic violence at epidemic proportions, but remain largely unprotected under current law. It also jeopardizes the personal security of victims who rely on public housing by forcing some to choose between swiftly moving away from an abuser and losing their housing subsidy.

Equally egregious, H.R. 4970 eradicates protections that have benefited immigrant women for nearly 20 years. The legislation creates barriers for immigrant crime victims seeking U-visas and silences those who fear deportation. H.R. 4970 overturns the current ability of immigrant victims of domestic violence to confidentially self-petition for permanent residency, thereby returning power to abusive U.S. citizen and legal permanent resident spouses who wield their status as a tool of dominance and control. Since VAWA's inception in 1994, nearly 75,000 self-petitions have been approved for immigrant victims who would have otherwise remained dependent on an abusive spouse to adjust their status. We cannot reverse course on this important self-petition provision and turn our backs on immigrant women and families.

I am also disappointed that, yet again, provisions to alleviate the economic factors that keep victims in abusive relationships have not been included. For the last 16 years, I have introduced legislation, the Security and Financial Empowerment Act (SAFE Act), to address this issue. The SAFE Act extends eligibility for unemployment benefits to victims forced to leave their jobs due to circumstances stemming from domestic violence, allows victims to take unpaid leave to make court appearances and seek necessary assistance, and it prohibits employers or insurance providers from basing hiring or coverage on an individual's history of abuse. These provisions ensure that domestic violence survivors have the financial security they need to escape an abusive situation. Failing to address these economic concerns is just another way this legislation fails to adequately protect survivors of domestic violence.

It's unfortunate that Republicans are playing politics with women's lives and pushing a bill that deviates so sharply from the kind of VAWA reauthorization that victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking truly need. Hundreds of organizations across the country have opposed HR. 4970 on the grounds that it harms our families and communities. Unconscionably, the GOP appears more concerned about advancing a political agenda than listening to the American people. This is grossly insensitive to the lived experiences of those who tragically find themselves in abusive situations and count on our support.

Victim safety is at the core of VAWA and always has been. I cannot in good conscience vote to pass this version of VAWA, as it erases 18 years of bipartisan efforts to respond to the needs of victims of domestic violence. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting this bill down so that we may consider an alternative VAWA reauthorization proposal that improves protections for all survivors, including immigrant women and other vulnerable populations.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the committee, the gentleman from New York, JERROLD NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, this is a partisan Republican bill that not only rejects the bipartisan reforms to VAWA that were passed in the Senate but that would roll back protections for immigrant women that exist in current law.

For example, with respect to immigration, the House Republican bill, even as amended by the manager's amendment, favors abusers by eliminating the requirement that abuser-provided evidence be investigated and corroborated before it can be used to deny victims protection. It also delays protection to battered victims by staying adjudications during pending investigations or prosecutions.

The bill also fails to fully address the astronomically high rates of domestic violence against Native American women. A major cause is jurisdictional. Tribal governments cannot take action against non-Native Americans who commit acts of domestic violence even on tribal land. The Senate bill, which passed with bipartisan support, would fix this problem. The House Republican bill ignores this issue.

Finally, H.R. 4970 fails to make VAWA fully inclusive. The bipartisan Senate bill would add sexual orientation and gender identity to the eligibility for grant programs under VAWA

so that groups could focus on victims amongst this underserved population. The Senate bill would also include sexual orientation and gender identity as classes in the new VAWA antidiscrimination language. The House Republican bill fails to include these provisions.

The bottom line is that House Republicans have taken the issue of protecting women from violence, which used to be bipartisan, and have made it partisan—just like everything else. Maybe women across America should not be surprised, as this majority has been waging a war on them since the beginning of this Congress. But, my friends, we do not have to let this stand.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill. Let us reject this partisan VAWA reauthorization and work, as the Senate did, on passing a bipartisan measure—or better yet, simply pass the very good, bipartisan Senate bill. We don't need a retrogressive House bill that goes back on existing protections. The Senate did a fine job on a bipartisan basis. We should pass its bill.

Mrs. ADAMS. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), who is also a cosponsor of this important pro-woman legislation.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, in every State and every congressional district—I dare say in every community in our Nation—there is domestic violence. It's a tragedy, and it's often a silent tragedy in a home or in a situation where victims feel trapped. They need to know that the resources to help them are there, and the people who commit these crimes need to understand that the penalties for their abuses are severe. We all need to send the message that this law is important and that this Congress has zero tolerance for violence against women.

I've been to many shelters for victims of domestic violence in Missouri. They can't publish their addresses publicly. Still today, there is a network of women who can get you to a safe place, but you might not know who they are in your community until they save your life.

Domestic violence, rape, sexual abuse, and sexual assault are rarely discussed because they are such painful and shameful subjects, but they afflict women of all ages and from all walks of life. We can bring some small relief to all of the victims of these atrocities by speaking with one voice today and not trying to make this a political issue.

These crimes are not acceptable—ever. The criminals who commit them deserve every bit of the stringent punishments contained in this legislation, making any one of them think twice before raising a hand in anger. Giving one woman the courage to escape grave danger in her own home or sending one young person out into the world with an understanding of the seriousness of these crimes all make today in the House and this bill worthwhile. I urge the bipartisan passage of this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, JUDY CHU, a member of the committee.

Ms. CHU. As a former rape counselor, I've gone to emergency rooms and have seen the damage that sexual assault and domestic violence have caused. That is why I was so relieved when the Violence Against Women Act passed. And for the last 20 years, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have come together for legislation to protect women from violence. But not anymore.

Though the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to reauthorize VAWA, with the support of 15 Republicans, including every female Republican Senator, this Republican House bill differs greatly. It declares war on women. The manager's amendment tries to make some changes, but don't be fooled. They are just small tweaks designed to pull the wool over women's eyes. They are trying to sneak in a bill that still fails to protect all women, that leaves LGBT victims out, and that prevents Native American women from seeing their abusers prosecuted.

Let me be clear. This bill still rolls back existing law. For instance, with this bill, there is new, expedited deportation for any abused immigrant woman coming forth who has had even the slightest of errors in her report. If she goes to an emergency room and is in pain but has an error in her report, then she would be deported.

Let's make sure that this bill does not pass. I urge its defeat.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), who is a cosponsor of the legislation and the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I can't believe what I am hearing on the other side of the aisle.

I was the author of the last reauthorization of VAWA. It passed this House 415–4. Many of the Members who are complaining about the inadequacy of the present law weren't around to try to strengthen it, and they didn't attempt to propose amendments. Instead, they seemed to have fallen for the contagion that started on the other side of the Capitol by expanding the scope of the law in a very controversial manner and by making an issue of whether a non-Indian can be prosecuted in a tribal court, which brings up huge constitutional issues because the Bill of Rights does not apply in tribal courts.

I don't think it is the authors of this bill, and particularly the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS), who have anything to do with making this a partisan bill. It is the people on the other side of the aisle on both sides of the Capitol who have decided to use this as a political issue.

□ 1550

And there was one Member of the other body that said the Republican Party has declared war on women. That's not the case. This bill increases authorizations. It makes it more effective, and it limits administrative expenses so that the money is spent on victims. It really is a victims' rights bill.

If those who are up here complaining about this legislation and strongly opposing it cause its defeat, the first casualty of the war on women is going to be the most important bill that has protected women for the last 18 years, the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, if the people on the other side are successful, the blood of the defeat of this bill will be on your hands, not on ours.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to remind my dear friend from Wisconsin, when he was chairman of the committee, in the 2005 Judiciary Committee report, he said:

> These protections are designed to ensure that abusers and criminals cannot use the immigration system against their victims, as abusers are known for interfering or undermining their victim's immigration cases and encouraging immigration officers to pursue removal actions against their victims.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member from Illinois, MIKE QUIGLEY.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I agree, it's not political, but the Senate had it right.

Every year we reauthorize this, we expand who we're protecting. The scenery is moving behind us, as well. We need to make sure we take those people into consideration. Strive as you might to avoid trying to protect LGBT victims, the Senate had it right, and we should do that here.

According to a recent survey of service providers who work with LGBT victims, 85 percent work with victims who have been denied services because of his or her sexual orientation or gender identity. Gender-neutral language is not sufficient. Gay men are not turned away from shelters because they're men; they're turned away because of discrimination based on their sexual orientation.

Discrimination is real. Violence is violence. Personal stories matter, but they should matter to everyone. Every one of these people are citizens of our country that deserve equal protection. Discrimination is real, and we can't pretend it doesn't exist or hope that we don't have to have—

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I know there are folks who don't want to, in any way, have a pro-gay vote on it, but this is protecting human beings. It's the right thing to do. It should have been in this part of the bill. I suggest everyone vote ''no.''

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to myself just to point out that the survey that we've heard about was received back, and the complaint was the lack of data that it received. I will remind my colleagues on

the other side that this bill and the current law protects all victims.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), who is a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012. And I would like to commend my good friend, Mrs. ADAMS from Florida, for spearheading this reauthorization. Mrs. ADAMS is a former law enforcement officer and knows the effects of domestic violence all too well and the chronic problems that we are faced with in this country.

We've all heard the statistics. The following are directly from the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence:

One in four women will experience domestic violence in her lifetime;

The health-related costs of intimate partner violence equals at least $5.8 billion annually;

One in six women and one in 33 men have experienced an attempted or completed rape. Men aren't immune from this either;

Thirty to 60 percent of perpetrators of intimate partner violence also abuse the children in the household;

Domestic violence is one of the most chronically underreported crimes, for good reason.

These are difficult statistics, Madam Speaker, and they are certainly not easy to think about, but that's the reality we face in America. H.R. 4970 goes a long way to help the victims, their families, and law enforcement in working to lower those statistics by providing authorization for 5 years, enough time for agencies and departments to make plans and programs, as well as carry them through. Penalties for sexual assault and abuse are made stronger, improvements are made in emergency housing for victims, and great strides are made to end the backlog of testing rape kits.

I've been blessed to never have experienced this personally, but as a child, I witnessed it. My mother had a friend who ended up so violently attacked, so physically harmed, that she stayed at our house until she could finally get well enough, and my mother finally talked her into getting out of that environment. But that was the fourth or the fifth time that that lady, Rita, ended up staying in our house.

When I was a young adult having children, a friend of mine, again, had the same issue happen to her. What I realized was we didn't have anything in Clermont County to help them, but we had a homeless shelter that was very marginal. So I worked with the county prosecutor. You know I'm a runner. For 15 years, we put on a 5K to put money in the pot to keep that homeless shelter open so that women had a place to go.

Madam Speaker, we can't continue to go back on the backs of good volunteers in America. We, as a government, have to help these women, too. If we had those programs in place, Rita wouldn't have ended up in our house. She would have ended up in a place that could have psychologically and physically helped her. If we had had these programs in place, my friend Karen wouldn't have had to have been on the street, as well.

I urge my colleagues to face this reality head-on, and let's vote for this bill. It's time we do it for our women.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

More than 300 organizations oppose this bill, including the American Red Cross and the National Council Against Domestic Violence.

I ask the floor manager: Who supports it?

I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the committee, HANK JOHNSON of Georgia, himself a former magistrate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, the so-called VAWA bill, also known as the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. It should be renamed WAWA, or ''War Against Women Act.'' This bill rolls back existing protections and is simply shocking in its callousness towards women and victims of abuse

Native American women, they are women, too. Three out of five are victims of domestic and sexual violence. They are murder victims at the rate of 10 times the national average, but yet H.R. 4970 denies protections to help those women. It also rolls back U visa protections for certain immigrant women who depend on their spouses for their immigration status. These women are particularly vulnerable to abuse. LGBT victims are excluded also.

Instead of this flawed bill, we should be considering the bipartisan Senate bill. And domestic violence does not recognize political parties. I urge House Republicans to come back to the table with a bill that we can all be proud to call the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

□ 1600

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4970. The bill, as reported out of the Judiciary Committee, lacked provisions protecting tribal women. But Chairman SMITH and his staff, along with Leader CANTOR and Congresswoman ADAMS, worked with me to ensure that the protections for tribal women were added and included in this bill.

This bill does not change any existing authority that tribal courts possess but adds an additional tool in Federal court to combat violence against tribal women. The bill includes a mechanism for tribes to petition a Federal court on the victim's behalf, which is important to victims of limited means living in remote locations.

I support the tribal provisions of the Senate-passed VAWA and the provisions found in the SAVE Native Women Act, H.R. 4154, of which I'm a cosponsor. I believe that those provisions are, indeed, constitutional. But the protections found in this bill will have a positive effect in Indian country. These provisions aren't perfect, but they improve current law considerably. I support the progress made in this bill. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4970. We cannot improve a bill and strengthen tribal sovereignty if we can't get a bill to conference.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Why do we find ourselves here today having this kind of debate that calls upon the higher angels of all Members, recognizing that as I stand on the floor today, some woman is losing her life. She may be a Native American woman. That individual may be from the LGBT community or the immigrant community.

Why are we here today divided when all we needed to do was to work in a bipartisan manner? The Senate bill, which tracked the process and the strategy and the approach that we've used in all of the reauthorizations of VAWA; we have always expanded it to reach the needs of new victims. What do you say to a Native American woman when you limit the ability for that woman to be protected? In fact, in particular, you make it that much harder, for what you do is that it authorizes tribal governments to seek protection orders on behalf of victims with or without their protection or permission, violating the core principles that such victims must have autonomy. Why that language?

With respect to the LGBT community, my friends on the other side will say, They're already protected. But we realize that the clarity of the law gives the protection that is necessary when someone is desperate, because as the Federal Government passes laws, it permeates to counties and cities and hamlets that need to have the interpretation to ensure that the law is equally applied. So this is why we call for the passage of the Senate bill and a bipartisan bill.

And my friends on the other side of the aisle—seven Republicans wrote Chairman SMITH and said, We want the bipartisan bill. That's what we're asking for, not anything extraordinary.

When you talk about providing for rape kits and someone says on the other side, We've increased it to 75 percent to address the backlog—well, in actuality, they have not because they've taken money from some other programs. So, Madam Speaker, all I can say is, Why are we here? Let us stand united to help women. Let us not default on our allowance that we've

been given to serve the American people, and the women are desperate. Someone is dying as I speak.

Vote for the Senate bill. Let us do this in a bipartisan way.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) who is also a cosponsor of this very good legislation.

Mrs. MYRICK. I would like to thank the Judiciary Committee for bringing this bill forward and a special thanks to SANDY ADAMS for the incredible work she's done on this bill. It took tremendous courage on her part to produce a good bill in the face of tremendous relentless partisan attacks. Sandy has seen the challenges women face daily as a former law enforcement officer.

As a woman, I'm proud of this bill. It reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act programs for 5 years and provides more than $600 million per year to help prevent domestic violence and protect those victims of abuse. For almost two decades, VAWA provisions have helped women across the country, and Congress needs to continue these important initiatives.

Most of us know of domestic violence situations that take place in our districts all the time, unfortunately. Again, unfortunately, this problem is increasing all across the country. The need for help is huge. So it's very important that we provide the resources to the women who are being abused, and they can have a place to go and someone to help them get through what has to be an absolutely horrible experience in their life. Thank goodness I have never experienced it.

Our bill offers significant improvements. There is greater accountability and transparency with the funding of these programs. We have strengthened the penalties against abusers, which is so important, and we've improved the services and protections for younger victims. Lastly, we've streamlined and updated the immigration provisions in the bill to address considerable fraud while still offering protections under the Violence Against Women Act, the statutes that are there to protect immigrant victims.

So I'm very proud to offer my support for the bill, and I'm very proud to be a cosponsor. I would urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this reauthorization.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to LINDA SÁNCHEZ, a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose this Republican bill that dangerously leaves victims of domestic violence worse off than they are under current law. To say that this legislation builds on current law is patently false.

Our Senate colleagues passed a strong version of the Violence Against Women Act with broad bipartisan support. Every Republican woman in the Senate voted in favor of it. Instead of crafting a bill of similar strength, my Republican friends in this body have insisted on taking back crucial protections for abused victims throughout our country. This Republican bill makes it more difficult for immigrant victims to work with law enforcement to report and help prosecute serious and violent criminals.

This Republican bill pretends the LGBT community doesn't exist and would allow victim service organizations to discriminate against LGBT victims when they seek help.

This Republican bill would further endanger the lives of Native American women who suffer abuse in epidemic proportions in this country. This Republican bill doesn't expand protections for women; it puts more women at risk by weakening current protections.

America's women deserve better. I encourage all of my colleagues to reject this Republican bill and support the Democratic alternative.

Mrs. ADAMS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from Minnesota, BETTY MCCOLLUM.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I oppose this bill. For the first time, the Violence Against Women Act is now a divisive piece of legislation. We could be voting on a bipartisan bill already passed by the Senate, but instead, the Tea Party majority of the Republicans has chosen to bring a bipartisan discriminatory bill to the floor today, and it eliminates protections for victims of violent crime.

All women who experience violence have the right to be protected. They need to know that their attackers will be tried in a court of law. And the purpose of VAWA has always been to ensure that all victims of violence are protected and that all their basic human rights are upheld no matter what one's sexual orientation, ethnicity, or legal status in this country is.

This country failed to protect all women, and that's why this legislation failed to get the support from the advocates and from women all across this country.

I oppose this measure, and I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

□ 1610

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Michigan has 13¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington, RICK LARSEN.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, in 2006, I, along with Senator CANTWELL, made sure that the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act, or IMBRA, was enacted as part of the last reauthorization of VAWA. It put regulations in place to protect foreign women brought here through the mail-order bride industry to keep them from falling prey to serial abusers.

Pushing this legislation forward 6 years ago was important to me because a young woman named Anastasia King, a so-called mail-order bride, was found dead. She had been strangled to death by her husband and buried in a shallow grave in 2000 in a wooded area in my district. Her husband had a domestic violence protection order issued against him from a previous wife. Indle King killed Anastasia because he wanted to get a new bride and didn't want to pay for a divorce.

The VAWA bill being considered in the House today does not go far enough to strengthen those same protections that we established in 2006. It leaves out important amendments to IMBRA that passed in the bipartisan Senate bill, like putting penalties in place to keep a man like Indle King from simply lying about his violent history so as to lure another woman here to be abused and then discarded.

We must use this reauthorization process to strengthen protections against abusers, not strengthen abusers' upper hand. We must use this reauthorization process to reaffirm that VAWA's protections are for all victims, including tribal women and LGBT individuals.

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

This is the third time I have asked my friends on the other side to please tell me why all of the women's organizations, law enforcement organizations—some 200-plus—are against this bill, and all of them were supporting the previous bill.

I yield to the distinguished manager of the bill, a dear friend of mine, for a response.

Mrs. ADAMS. Thank you, Mr. CONYERS.

I will tell you, shame on them. Shame on them. This bill reauthorizes VAWA for 5 years at the same levels as the Senate. It protects victims.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Since we're shaming on every organization that protects women, would you tell me who supports the Republican version of the bill? Name somebody.

Mrs. ADAMS. If the gentleman would yield, I can say that I do, and I know that we have a list of them.

I will tell you, Mr. CONYERS, that I have sat quietly and tried to behave here, but I am offended when I hear that this does not protect victims. I am offended when I hear that we are politicizing something that was politicized

on the other side in the other Chamber and by the other side of the aisle.

So I have very much concern about that because, as someone who has been in the situation, who has been on the scenes of these crimes, we are trying to reauthorize something that is very important to victims across our Nation—victims, not politics. And that's where I stand on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I have asked why hundreds of organizations are supporting it, and you say: Shame on them. I ask who's supporting the Republican measure and you say: I am. Well, I'm glad to know that. And I think that just about tells everybody where the logic and the support for this bill is. There is none. It's a Republican—not a prank, but a serious blow to women. And that's what the organizations know, and that's why, Madam Floor Manager, they're opposed to this bill.

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 2 minutes to ZOE LOFGREN, a member of the committee.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I think sometimes it's helpful to get into the nitty-gritty of legislation. This bill changes the law that exists today and reduces protection for immigrant women in key ways. Let me just talk about one of the ways.

If you are an immigrant temporarily here, or even without your documents, and you are a victim of domestic violence and the police want to keep you here because you're a witness or they need your help in a prosecution, the police can obtain what is called a U visa so you get to stay here. That's in the current law. It was bipartisan. It was done in the year 2000.

This bill changes that in important ways. Under current law, if you are a U visa holder, you have the possibility of applying for a permanent visa. Why is that important? Because otherwise, if you come forward to cooperate with the police, you could be voluntarily deporting yourself and be separated from your children, and that is a deterrent to people coming forward to work with the police. That's why it was crafted the way it was. Even under the manager's amendment, there is a diminution of that possibility, and it would lead to absurd results.

I'll give you an example.

Under the manager's amendment, you can only apply for the residence if your abuser had been deported to the country where you are from. So a U visa is for 4 years. If your abuser is serving a 5-year sentence, you have to be deported, and then your abuser will come after you the next year. It's a stupid provision, unfortunately. I can't believe that that's the intended result. I know Mrs. ADAMS is sincere, but that's what is in the bill. And that's why people object to the bill—that, among many other provisions that will endanger women and take us back from where we were.

I think that when you take a look at not just the groups that support the Senate bill instead of this, but the groups that support this bill, who embrace abusers, you know where you need to stand—and that's not with this bill, despite the sincerity of the author.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first clarify. The bill requires that U visa holders actually assist law enforcement. Current law does not. Let's make that very clear. The other thing is we do want them to cooperate because we do want those perpetrators off the streets. We want to make sure they're off the streets so that no other victim is victimized.

In the earlier version of the bill, I was very concerned about: What about the next victim? If we do this and we don't address this, what about the next victim? Which victim doesn't make it out of that house? And I've heard my colleagues on the other side talk about how we're trying to do something because of immigration. No. We're trying to do something to protect the victims and the next victims if we don't get the circle of violence stopped. It always repeats itself.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to our leader, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership on this important issue, not only as this legislation comes to the floor, but for the past couple of decades on the subject. I commend the maker of our motion to accept the Senate bill, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, for her sincere leadership on this issue as well.

Madam Speaker, 18 years ago, Members of Congress came together—some of us gathered in this Chamber right now—came together to make history with the original passage of the Violence Against Women Act. We helped ensure that no victim of domestic violence has to suffer in silence.

I want to especially salute our Vice President, JOE BIDEN, who was chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate at the time, who worked with our chairman and many Members on both sides of the aisle to pass that legislation, again, making history.

□ 1620

The original Violence Against Women Act took domestic violence out of the shadows and shone bright sunshine on it.

In the years since, domestic violence has decreased by more than 50 percent—more than 50 percent. What a remarkable outcome. Twice in the intervening years we have come together in a bipartisan way to reauthorize and strengthen the law. This year our colleagues in the Senate acted similarly, passing a strong bill with a strong bipartisan vote of 68–1, including the support of every single woman in the Senate, Democratic and Republican alike. In doing so, they not only built on the history of the past, but they made progress for the safety of American women.

In sharp contrast, sadly, while it was a strong bipartisan bill in the Senate, and our substitute that we requested from the Rules Committee was to be able to put forth the Senate bill, so that would be the Senate Democrats and Republicans and House Democrats all in agreement, unfortunately in sharp contrast, House Republicans have brought to the floor today a bill that is controversial in that it will weaken the protections we have given to those who suffer domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

This legislation on the floor fails vulnerable people—members of the LGBT community, Native American women, and immigrant victims. All people deserve to be protected from domestic violence. There should be no exceptions to this law. We can't say women of America, we're passing a bill to protect you—not so fast in your applause if you happen to be a member of the LGBT community, an immigrant or otherwise, or a Native American woman.

Because the Republican bill is a step backward from the current law of the land, more than 300 organizations have spoken out in opposition, from the American Bar Association to the YWCA.

Local law enforcement officials have said that this Republican House bill ''will impede criminal investigations, undermine prosecutions, and interfere with victim safety.'' I repeat the quotation. The local law enforcement officials have said this bill ''will impede criminal investigations, undermine prosecutions and interfere with victim safety.''

Religious organizations such as the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service and the National Association of Evangelicals have also expressed strong opposition to certain provisions of this legislation.

The many advocates and experts who work day in and day out on this issue, on the issue of domestic violence, have also opposed the House Republican version of the Violence Against Women Act. Republicans have chosen not to listen to the professionals in the field and are failing to give the many organizations serving battered women the tools that they need.

The Obama administration has said in their Statement of Administration Policy that the legislation ''rolls back existing law and removes long-standing protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault—crimes that predominantly affect women.'' That is why the President's senior advisers have said that they would recommend that the President veto this bill.

Today, this House of Representatives has heard powerful statements from women Members of Congress about the

need to pass a strong Violence Against Women bill. I hope that the safety of women will be high on the list of our colleagues as they determine their vote.

For nearly 20 years, the Violence Against Women Act has strengthened communities and provided critical lifesaving support to victims of violence. Because of this law, more victims get the help they need and domestic violence rates have decreased. Not only has VAWA saved lives; it has saved money. All Americans are entitled to feel safe, including in their own homes—every one of us. Yet too many women continue to live in fear. That is why we must strengthen, never weaken, the Violence Against Women Act.

And I want to commend the members of the Judiciary Committee, my colleagues on the House side, the Democratic side, who have brought such tremendous intellectual resource to this legislation, listening to those who minister to the needs of women who have been victims of domestic violence and to those who are trying to protect it.

I know that everyone in this body, Democratic and Republican alike, have the same goal, which is the safety of women. We not only want us to have the same goal, we want us to have the same goal for all women in America. And that's why we must strengthen, never weaken, the Violence Against Women Act.

Because this bill on the floor rolls back current law and fails to protect all victims of violence, I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

MAY 16, 2012.

UPDATED: MORE THAN 300 ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSE HOUSE GOP VAWA BILL

Today, the House will consider H.R. 4970, the House GOP Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Reauthorization bill. The bill is being considered under a closed rule.

More than 300 organizations oppose the House GOP bill, including such groups as the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Network to End Domestic Violence, National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, Break the Cycle, Legal Momentum, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, National Organization for Women, Feminist Majority, YWCA USA, AAUW, Business and Professional Women's Foundation, National Women's Law Center, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, American Bar Association, NAACP, National Council of La Raza, Human Rights Campaign, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, and National Congress of American Indians.

The National Association of Evangelicals and the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service are opposed to the immigrant provisions in the bill.

The Administration has also issued a veto threat on the bill.

---

MAY 16, 2012.

A VOTE FOR H.R. 4970 IS A VOTE AGAINST VAWA

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Please see below for the more than 320 groups and individuals who have written in opposition to key provisions of H.R. 4970:

1. Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.
2. Advocates for Human Rights
3. African Services Committee
4. Alachua County Victim Services and Rape Crisis Center
5. Alaska Federation of Natives
6. Alianza Latina en Contra la Agresión Sexual
7. Alliance for Immigrants Rights & Reform—Michigan
8. American Bar Association
9. American Civil Liberties Union
10. American Federation of Labor
11. American Gateways
12. American Immigration Lawyers Association
13. American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA), Washington Chapter
14. American Jewish Committee
15. American Public Health Association
16. Americans for Immigrant Justice, Inc.
17. America's Voice Education Fund
18. Anindita Dasgupta, MA, Doctoral Candidate at the University of California, San Diego
19. Anita Raj, PhD, Professor of Medicine and Global Public Health at the University of California, San Diego
20. Artemis Justice Center
21. ASHA for Women
22. Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund
23. Asian Pacific American Legal Center, a Member of the Asian American Center
24. Advancing Justice
25. Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence
26. Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach
27. ASISTA
28. Ayuda
29. Bangladeshi American Democratic Caucus of Michigan
30. Bangladeshi American Democratic Caucus
31. Boesche Legal Clinic, University of Tulsa College of Law
32. Boston University Civil Litigation Program
33. Break the Cycle
34. California Coalition Against Sexual Assault
35. California Partnership to End Domestic Violence
36. Caminar Latino
37. Campaign for Community Change
38. Canal Alliance
39. Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition
40. Captain Maria Alvarenga Watkins, (Retired) Metropolitan Police
41. Department, Washington, D.C.
42. Casa Cornelia Law Center
43. Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities
44. CASA de Maryland, Inc.
45. Casa de Proyecto Libertad
46. Casa Esperanza
47. Center for Family Policy & Practice
48. Center for Gender & Refugee Studies
49. Center for Pan Asian Community Services, Inc.
50. Center for Victim and Human Rights
51. CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers
52. Central American Resource Center
53. Chief Brian Kyes, Chelsea Police Department, Massachusetts
54. Chief Pete Helein, Appleton Wisconsin Police Department
55. Christian Community Development Association
56. Church World Service
57. Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice
58. Coalition Against Religious Discrimination
59. Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles
60. Coalition to Abolish Slavery & Trafficking
61. Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault
62. Community Action and Human Services Department
63. Community Action Network
64. Community Immigration Law Center
65. Connecticut Legal Services Inc.
66. Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
67. Community Refugee and Immigration Services
68. Community Solutions
69. Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.
70. Cris M. Sullivan, Ph.D., Professor, Ecological/Community Psychology, Associate Chair, Psychology Department
71. Detective Sergeant Robert Mahoney, Peabody Police Department, Massachusetts
72. Detective Shelli Sonnenberg, Boise Police Department, Idaho
73. Detective Stacey Ivie, Alexandria Police Department, Virginia
74. Domestic Violence in the African American Community
75. Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project
76. DREAM Activist Virginia
77. Education Not Deportation Project of the United We Dream Network
78. El Rescate Legal Services, Inc.
79. Empire Justice Center
80. Enlace Comunitario
81. Equal Justice Center
82. Esperanza
83. Esperanza Peace and Justice Center
84. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
85. Evan Stark, Ph.D., MA, MSW, Professor and Director of Public Health, School of Public Affairs and Administration, Rutgers University—Newark & Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration, UMDNJ—School of Public Health
86. FaithAction International House
87. Families and the Law Clinic, Columbus School of Law, Catholic University of America
88. Families Against Mandatory Minimums
89. Families for Freedom
90. Family Counseling Services of Greater Miami, Inc.
91. Farmworker Justice
92. Feminist Majority
93. First Focus
94. Florida Coastal Immigrant Rights
95. Florida Coastal Immigrant Rights Clinic
96. Franciscan Action Network
97. Freedom Network (USA)
98. Fuerza Latina
99. Futures Without Violence
100. Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network
101. Georgia Asylum and Immigration Network (GAIN)
102. Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights
103. Gibbs Houston Pauw
104. Giselle Hass, PsyD, Adjunct Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, Center for Applied Legal Studies
105. Gulfcoast Legal Services
106. Haven Women's Center of Stanislaus
107. HAVEN, Oakland County Michigan
108. Hawai'i Coalition for Immigration Reform
109. Hawaii State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
110. Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society
111. Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society—Pennsylvania
112. Helene Berman, RN, Ph.D., President of the Nursing Network on Violence Against Women International
113. Holy Cross Ministries of Utah
114. Human Rights Campaign

115. Human Rights Initiative of North Texas
116. Human Rights Watch
117. Immigrant Defense Project
118. Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota
119. Immigrant Legal Center of Boulder County
120. Immigrant Rights Clinic, Rutgers School of Law—Newark
121. Immigration Equality
122. inMotion, Inc.
123. InterCultural Advocacy Institute
124. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona
125. International Institute of the Bay Area
126. Intimate Partner Violence Assistance Clinic University of Florida
127. Iowa Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church
128. Levin College of Law
129. Jacquelyn Campbell, Ph.D., RN, FAAN, Anna D. Wolf Chair, The
130. Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing and National Director, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Nurse Faculty Scholars
131. Jane Doe Inc.
132. Jay G. Silverman, Ph.D. Professor of Medicine and Global Health Division of Global Public Health Senior Fellow, Center on Global Justice University of California at San Diego, School of Medicine Adjunct Associate Professor of Society, Human Development and Health Harvard School of Public Health
133. Jewish Women International
134. Just Neighbors
135. Justice For Our Neighbors
136. Justice For Our Neighbors—Southeastern Michigan
137. Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights
138. Kentucky Domestic Violence Association
139. Korean American Resource & Cultural Center
140. Korean Resource Center
141. La Fe Multi-Ethnic Ministries, Intervarsity Christian Fellowship/USA
142. La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians
143. Latin American Association
144. Latin American Coalition
145. Latina/o Bar Association of Washington
146. LatinoJustice PRLDEF
147. Leadership Conference of Women Religious
148. Legal Aid Service of Collier County
149. Legal Aid Society of Minneapolis
150. Legal Aid Society of Rochester, New York
151. Legal Aid Society of the Orange County Bar Association, Inc.
152. Legal Aid Society—Employment Law Center
153. Legal Momentum
154. Legal Services for Children
155. Leslye E. Orloff, J.D. Director, National Immigrant Women's Advocacy Project, American University Washington College of Law
156. Lieutenant Carole Germano, Danvers Police Department, Massachusetts
157. Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service
158. Lutheran Social Services of New England
159. Mary Ann Dutton, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Georgetown University Medical Center
160. Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence
161. Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition
162. Maui International Language School
163. Mennonite Central Committee U.S.
164. Michigan Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights
165. Michigan Indo-American Democratic Caucus
166. Michigan Muslim Democratic Caucus
167. Midwest Association of Farmworker Organizations
168. Midwest Association of Farmworker Organizations
169. Mil Mujeres
170. Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women
171. Mountain Crisis Services
172. Mujeres Latinas En Accion
173. Muslim Public Affairs Council
174. My Sister's Place (New York)
175. My Sister's Place, Inc. (D.C.)
176. Nassau County Coalition Against Domestic Violence
177. NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.
178. National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd
179. National African Immigrant and Refugee Women's Network
180. National Alliance to End Sexual Violence
181. National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum
182. National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers
183. National Association of Evangelicals
184. National Association of Federal Defenders
185. National Center for Transgender Equality
186. National Center for Victims of Crime
187. National Coalition for LGBT Health
188. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
189. National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs
190. National Coalition on Black Civic Participation
191. National Congress of American Indians
192. National Congress of American Indians Task Force on Violence Against Women
193. National Council of Jewish Women
194. National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
195. National Council of La Raza
196. National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
197. National Domestic Violence Hotline
198. National Employment Law Project
199. National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference
200. National Hispanic Council on Aging
201. National Immigrant Justice Center
202. National Immigration Forum
203. National Immigration Law Center
204. National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild
205. National Korean American Service & Education Consortium
206. National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health
207. National Latino Evangelical Coalition
208. National Legal Aid & Defender Association
209. National Network to End Domestic Violence
210. National Organization for Women Foundation
211. National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault
212. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence
213. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and the Women of Color Network
214. National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women
215. Nawal Ammar, PhD, Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology
216. Neighbors in Support of Immigrants
217. NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
218. Network for Victim Recovery of DC
219. Nevada Hispanic Services Inc.
220. New Bridges Immigrant Resource Center
221. New Mexico Asian Family Center
222. New Sanctuary Coalition of NYC
223. New York Anti-Trafficking Network
224. New York State Coalition Against Sexual Assault
225. North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence
226. North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault
227. North Carolina Stop Human Trafficking
228. Northwest Immigrant Rights Project
229. Officer Michael LaRiviere, Salem Police Department, Massachusetts
230. Ohio Alliance to End Sexual Violence
231. Paso del Norte Civil Rights Project
232. Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center
233. Physicians for Human Rights
234. Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
235. Political Asylum Immigration Representation Project
236. Public Justice Center
237. Rachael Rodriguez, Ph.D., Associate Professor in the School of Nursing at Edgewood College
238. RAICES
239. Rainbow Services, Ltd.
240. Refuge House, Inc.
241. Refugio del Rio Grande, Inc.
242. Rhonda Giger, Prosecutor—City of Bothell, WA
243. Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network
244. Ross Silverman LLP
245. Rural Women's Health Project
246. Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law
247. SEPA Mujer Inc., Servicios para el Avance de la Mujer
248. Sergeant Inspector Antonio Flores, San Francisco Police Department, California
249. Service Employees International Union
250. Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network
251. Sex Workers Project at the Urban Justice Center
252. Sexual Assault Response Services of Southern Maine
253. Sexual Violence Center
254. Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S.
255. Sierra County Victim Assistance Unit
256. Sisters of Mercy Institute Justice Team
257. Sisters of Mercy of the Americas
258. Sisters of Mercy South Central Community
259. Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia
260. Social Justice Action Network
261. Sojourners
262. South Asian Americans Leading Together
263. Southern Poverty Law Center
264. Stephanie J. Nawyn, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, Michigan State University
265. Student Action with Farmworkers
266. Supervising Deputy Sheriff Marcus Bruning, St. Louis County
267. Sheriff's Office, Missouri
268. Tahirih Justice Center
269. Tapestri, Inc
270. The Advocates for Human Rights
271. The Bridge to Hope
272. The Episcopal Church
273. The Immigrant Legal Resource Center
274. The Kansas/Missouri Dream Alliance
275. The Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights
276. The Legal Aid Society
277. The Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County
278. The P.E.A.C.E*. Initiative
279. The Sentencing Project
280. The United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries

281. The Violence Intervention Program
282. The William Kellibrew Foundation
283. TN Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
284. Transgender Law Center
285. UC Davis Immigration Law Clinic
286. UFW Foundation
287. Unidas, The National Latina LGBT Human Rights Organization
288. Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations
289. United Methodist Church
290. United Migrant Opportunity Services
291. United Migrant Opportunity Services/UMOS Inc.
292. United Women.org
293. University of Miami, School of Nursing & Health Studies
294. U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops
295. VIDA Legal Assistance, Inc.
296. Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates
297. Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
298. Violence Intervention Program
299. Virginia Coalition of Latino Organizations
300. Virginia Organizing
301. Virginia Sexual & Domestic Violence Action Alliance
302. Voces de la Frontera
303. Voces Unidas for Justice
304. Voices of Immigrants in Action/Rural Women's Health Project
305. Voices of Men
306. Volunteer Attorneys for Rural Nevadans
307. Walnut Avenue Women's Center
308. Washington Defender Association's Immigration Project
309. Washington Immigration Defense Group
310. Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
311. WeCount!
312. Who Is My Neighbor? Inc.
313. Willow Creek Community Church
314. Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence
315. Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault
316. Women Against Abuse
317. Women of Color Network
318. Women's Crisis Support—Defensa de Mujeres
319. Women's Law Project
320. Women's Refugee Commission
321. Worker Justice Center of New York
322. Workers Rights Clinic
323. World Evangelical Alliance
324. World Relief
325. Wyoming Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
326. YWCA USA

For further information on the overwhelming opposition to H.R. 4970, please visit the Minority Judiciary Committee web site: http://democrats.judiciary.house.gov/issue/materials-opposing-republican-violence-against-women-act-hr-4970

Or contact House Judiciary Democratic Staff, Ron LeGrand and Jenny Perrino.

We strongly encourage all colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 4970 today.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), who is also a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, for nearly 20 years the Violence Against Women Act has supported programs that assist victims of domestic abuse, stalking, and sexual assault. I'm proud to support the legislation that's on the House floor today because it reauthorizes those programs, strengthens them by targeting more funding to programs that need it, and processing that needs it, and also gives some new provisions which I helped work on with the Judiciary Committee to better serve our Native Americans.

This piece of legislation which provides services to all victims without discrimination has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support. Unfortunately, because some in Congress saw an opportunity to use abuse victims as a prop in a political game, today we're having a different discussion, and I feel it's shameful. House Republicans are not going to allow the Violence Against Women Act to get sidelined because of politics. It's simply too important.

One area of particular concern to people back home in South Dakota is provisions for Native Americans and Native American women. Native American women suffer from higher levels of abuse than non-Indian women, but all too often they don't get to see their perpetrators brought to justice. It's simply unacceptable.

This Violence Against Women Act improves upon many of the programs that are designed specifically to aid Native American women, and it also includes new provisions to improve Congress's response to potential problems they may run into. Furthermore, to better ensure that Native American women have improved recourse against abusive individuals, I worked with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the staff to include language in this bill to empower Native American women to either petition individually the Federal courts or through their tribal courts for a Federal restraining order. Ensuring that these women have the ability to obtain a protection order is a vital step towards stopping the cycle of abuse that many of them suffer through. It impacts disproportionately those in Indian Country over other areas of the Nation.

Those who have suffered from violence and abuse have gone through enough. Let's not cause more harm by putting politics before victims, and let's support and reauthorize the improved Violence Against Women Act today.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, in fact, the new tribal protection orders added by the manager's amendment would reverse the Violence Against Women Act's victim-centered approach and would require Native women to sometimes travel hours to obtain protection orders from a Federal district court.

Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished whip of the House of Representatives, STENY HOYER of Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished ranking member from Michigan who has been such an extraordinary fighter for the rights of all people in our country, and I rise in opposition to this bill.

□ 1630

I would say, as an aside, the last speaker talked about Native Americans. The National Congress of American Indians of course says this matter does nothing to address the crux of the issue—the lack of local authority to handle misdemeanor-level domestic and dating violence when the perpetrator is non-Indian. It goes on to oppose this legislation.

I rise in sadness, Madam Speaker. I was the cosponsor of the original Violence Against Women Act in 1994. We passed a bipartisan bill that has helped law enforcement significantly reduce domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

While great progress has been made, unfortunately one in three American women still experience violence by a partner, stalking, or sexual assault. That's why this bill is a perfect example of why we need to work together in a bipartisan fashion to reauthorize and strengthen the Violence Against Women Act. I will tell my friends the Senate did this. Why is it that we have to choose disunity and confrontation over consensus? I don't know why that is, particularly on an issue of this great importance to the American people.

The Senate came together, 68 of them—two-thirds of the United States Senate, Republicans and Democrats, overwhelmingly supported this. Every woman in the United States Senate supported the Senate bill—everyone, Republican women and Democratic women, who know firsthand the crisis that confronts our communities.

However, this version was reported by the Judiciary Committee with no bipartisan support—and indeed bipartisan opposition. Why do we have to do that? We could have come together. We should have come together. The Senate came together. There is no reason we can't, other than to make our points on a partisan basis.

This bill is weaker than existing law, it is regressive, and it sends the wrong message about our values. The Senate's version extends new protections to Native Americans and to all who are targeted, regardless of sexual orientation. Isn't that our value, to protect every individual? ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all individuals are endowed by their Creator.'' Shouldn't we protect all individuals, not exclude some?

Not only does the House version fail to include those protections, it also makes it harder for law enforcement to encourage immigrant victims to come forward to seek help and justice. I met with over 30 members of the law enforcement community on Monday. We sat around and we talked about, generally, gang violence, but we talked about VAWA. We talked about the ability of people to come forward and make complaints, feel comfortable in doing that, and enhance the ability to get domestic defenders out of the cycle of violence against domestic partners or

others. They all agreed that we ought to make it easier, not harder. We make it harder in this bill. This is not the right way to go.

This version is opposed by hundreds of groups. I've got a list here. I'm not going to read it. Leader PELOSI submitted it for the RECORD. Hundreds of groups are opposed to this legislation, including the American Bar Association, and are urging a ''no'' vote.

I'm going to vote ''no'' on this, and I hope all my colleagues do as well so that we can adopt a bill that has overwhelming bipartisan support and the support of these groups. Why do we confront these groups and say: Nope, you're wrong, we know better; we know better; you've worked on this for years and decades, but we're going to go our own way?

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

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased to yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

This version is opposed, as I said, by hundreds of groups representing victims, advocates, faith-based organizations, as well as law enforcement.

Now, almost every one of us, every one of us—or most, I imagine—has had some personal experience with this. In our own families, ourselves, as lawyers, as doctors, as neighbors, as friends, as fellow church members, we all know the cost of this violence. Let us come together and act together.

This should not be a vehicle for partisan confrontation. Instead, we should adopt the Senate's bipartisan version and ensure that law enforcement agencies have the tools they need to prevent domestic violence and provide victims with the assistance they need.

Let us vote ''no'' on this legislation, and then let us move forward in a bipartisan, constructive, overwhelmingly supported fashion like our colleagues in the United States Senate did in a bipartisan way.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say that I agree that all victims need to be covered, and that is what this piece of legislation does. We do not segment out. We do not pit victim against victim. It is all victims.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield now 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, 2 out of every 10 women in America will be a victim of rape in her lifetime. More than that will experience severe physical violence by an intimate partner. Madam Speaker, which one of those women is not worthy of protection or support as a result of this legislation?

H.R. 4970 is opposed by tribal governments because Native American women will have less protection under this bill. H.R. 4970 is opposed by groups that support immigrants because immigrant women will find themselves victims of these crimes without the support that they need. And the community of LGBT Americans will find themselves without the support they would get under the Senate version of this legislation.

Once again, the House majority demonstrates the dysfunction in Washington, D.C. Instead of applauding the overwhelming vote in the Senate with a bipartisan vote that passed just recently by 68 votes in the Senate for a Violence Against Women Act to be reauthorized and putting that bipartisan bill on this floor, our Republican colleagues in the House went the other way.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to put the Senate bill on the floor, get this work done, follow the lead of the American public that says: Get to work, make it happen, and protect women who are the victims of violence in this country.

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 5¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, it's with great disappointment that I rise today in opposition to this bill, not because the issue of violence against women is not real, but because this House bill does not do enough to address domestic violence and protect women.

Sadly, instead of taking action on a bipartisan bill that has passed the Senate that meets the need to protect America's women, the Republican majority has chosen confrontation over compromise with a bill that is seriously limited, particularly in the protections it offers to Native American women.

It was my great hope that the House Republicans would rise to do the right thing. Don't hide behind excuses—do the right thing. Let's close the loophole that allows abusers to get away with violence, especially against Native American women. It's not right that abusers game these loopholes to beat their victims. Reject this bill and take up the Senate version.

Mrs. ADAMS. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this bill has been revealed to be reauthorizing certain grant programs, but it really doesn't. It undermines the safety of the most vulnerable victims of violence. It rolls back important protections for immigrant victims, putting them in a worse position than under current law, and excludes other vulnerable populations, such as tribal women, LGBTQ. In short, any alleged improvements made by this bill cannot conceal the overwhelming harm that it will cause.

When I asked who supports this bill, the floor manager could name only one person. She said, I do. And when I asked her why do all of the women's organizations and law enforcement organizations oppose the bill, she made some other comment about why that was so.

□ 1640

Ladies and gentlemen, we must turn back this unacceptable piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), my dear friend, a former Federal prosecutor and an original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. GOWDY. Nell Lindsey was a nurse at a local hospital. Her shift had ended, and it was time to go home. She couldn't take her own car because her husband had disabled the car so it wouldn't work. This is the same husband who had broken her jaw on a family vacation, the same husband who had knocked out her teeth in an Applebee's parking lot while her children watched, the same husband who had called their oldest son a sexual-orientation epithet, and put beer in the baby bottle of their youngest child.

So Nell Lindsey got a ride home from the hospital from work with a friend of hers. And as they were headed home, they saw an ominous sight, Madam Speaker. They saw the car of her estranged husband. Now, he had been ordered to stay away from her, Madam Speaker, but he didn't care. And there was a conditional bond to stay away from her, but he didn't care. And there was a court order, an order of protection to stay away from her, but he didn't care.

And when Nell Lindsey and her friend saw that ominous sight of Marion Lindsey in a car, they did a very smart thing, Madam Speaker. They headed straight for the Inman Police Department. And they're jumping over railroad tracks, and they're running stop signs, and they're running red lights. And Nell gets out her cell phone and she calls 911. And she says, Please help, please help.

So they pull into the back parking lot of the Inman Police Department, and she still has the cell phone to her ear, and through the audiotape that we played at trial, Madam Speaker, you could hear Nell Lindsey saying, Please help, please help. And then you heard four gunshots. And when they took her body out of the back seat of that car, she still had the cell phone in her hand.

The system failed Nell Lindsey, Madam Speaker. She did everything we tell battered and abused women to do. The courts couldn't save her, the prosecutors couldn't save her. Her husband's on death row, but that doesn't

save her. But even in her death, Madam Speaker, she did something good because she spawned changes in South Carolina in the way that we treat violence against women.

And with the help of Violence Against Women grants, like the ones that are at jeopardy today, with the help of those grants, and a woman named Lynn Hawkins, who I must concede, Madam Speaker, does not share my political ideology in any way, shape, or form, but she put the political sloganeering and the bumper stickers behind and she said, let's change the system in South Carolina, and we did it. It wasn't in time to save Nell Lindsey, but it was in time to save a graveyard full of other women in our State.

So I'm going to ask simply this, Madam Speaker: Can we stop the election-year gimmicks? Can we stop these manufactured wars that pit one group of Americans against another group of Americans?

I spent 16 years prosecuting men who raped, stabbed, strangled, shot, and killed women. I have a mother, a wife, a daughter, three sisters, and the images of countless women indelibly imprinted on my mind because they were killed by men who claimed to care about them.

This is not about politics to me. If you want to make women safer, then change the way we draw juries, change the discovery rules, improve the rape shield statute. But stop focusing on November's election for just one afternoon and wonder with me what good we can accomplish if we will stop the political games, and if we could pick up some humanity and embrace the fact that, even in a political environment as dysfunctional as this one, we can find common ground when it comes to fighting for those who have no voice, who have nobody to stand up for them.

Madam Speaker, the political games have to stop, at least for a day. They have to stop. If this bill fails, it will be because those on the other side were so bent on making a point that they stopped caring about making a difference.

Madam Speaker, the Senate bill is fundamentally and constitutionally flawed. Further, to say, Madam Chair, it continues to pit one group of Americans against another group of Americans solely for political reasons. Lady Justice doesn't do that, and politicians shouldn't do it either. I urge support for this bill.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, the House Majority's version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, which eliminates important protections for women that have been supported on a bipartisan basis for many years.

The tragedy of domestic violence is a reality for many families in our country and around the world. Unfortunately, it likely touches someone we know. Domestic violence affects people at all income levels, ethnicities, and ages.

Since its enactment in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) has been improved with each renewal in 2000 and 2005.

It has been done on a bipartisan basis. The Senate's 2012 VAWA reauthorization bill passed by a 68–31 margin.

The same cannot be said for this bill, which barely passed the House Judiciary Committee by a 17–15 vote along mostly partisan lines. Rather than addressing serious gaps in protection and services, H.R. 4970 rolls back critical safeguards that have long been part of this law and repeals current law requiring abuser-submitted evidence to be corroborated before it can be used against a victim. These safeguards were included as part of previous reauthorizations and are included in S. 1925, the Senate's 2012 bipartisan reauthorization bill. With these provisions stripped, H.R. 4970 leaves countless women, including LGBT, immigrant, and American Indian victims at risk.

The bill puts abused immigrant women at increased risk by imposing new, burdensome procedural hurdles that would delay or deny protections and put victims in a more vulnerable position than they would be under current law. Law enforcement groups, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National District Attorneys Association, and National Association of Attorneys General support provisions in current law and in the Senate bill that protect immigrant women and help police and prosecutors pursue cases against dangerous perpetrators.

The House Majority's VAWA reauthorization would abolish significant enhancements contained in the bipartisan Senate bill. For LGBT victims of domestic violence, H.R. 4970 fails to prohibit discrimination and ensure equal access to services. This bill would do away with provisions designed to provide justice to American Indian women by eliminating provisions empowering tribes with jurisdiction to prosecute non-Indian perpetrators on their lands.

Our Nation's most vulnerable victims of violence stand to lose from this reauthorization should it become law. I am dismayed to see that some could actually support legislation that provides protections for abusers rather than the abused. I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 4970.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. This controversial bill would weaken long-standing protections and fails to protect the most vulnerable victims of violence.

Last month, the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Instead of supporting the bipartisan Senate bill, House Republicans introduced a dangerous partisan bill that rolls back many vital protections for battered women and shifts the power into the hands of abusers. This bill fails to protect battered immigrant spouses legally here, diminishes protections for the LGBT community, and neglects challenges facing Native American victims. It is a slap in the face to victims and those who have worked tirelessly to protect them.

One out of every four women in the United States is physically assaulted by an intimate partner and more than 740,000 children and youth are treated in hospital emergency departments as a result of violence each year—more than 84 every hour. In Texas, last year the number of family violence fatalities increased 28 percent from 2010. In El Paso, Texas according to the El Paso Police Department, police responded to 200 reports of sexual assault and 4,500 domestic violence cases just last year.

These numbers indicate the severity of a widespread problem that can have devastating social and health-related consequences and this bill will only weaken the confidentiality provisions for victims seeking protection from further violence. This bill reverses the ''U'' visa program that encourages immigrant victims of crime to report and help prosecute serious criminal activity and now will create obstacles for those seeking to report crimes. Now immigrant victims will be far less likely to share potentially valuable information with police that could help solve crimes and prosecute offenders.

Republicans in the House should drop their misguided attempt to undermine the Violence Against Women Act that puts the safety and security of women at risk and instead should reauthorize and strengthen the existing program, as the Senate has already done. House Republicans should be ashamed of politicizing such an important issue and for attempting to roll back longstanding bipartisan protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual violence.

As the National Organization for Women has stated, this bill ''disregards the biases and disrespect that certain victims face when seeking help from the criminal justice system and access to lifesaving services, effectively giving second-class treatment to Native American, immigrant women, and LGBT victims. The bill smacks of willful ignorance of the problem and hostility to people deemed not to be 'true' victims.'' I fully support this statement because the fact of the matter is, violence is violence, regardless of who the victim is.

As a husband, father, and grandfather to four wonderful women, this issue is very important to me. If there is any issue where we should all agree, it is to help stop domestic and sexual violence, and to protect all victims. This should not be a political issue, but a matter of protecting those whom are most vulnerable. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this partisan measure.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, and I encourage the majority to instead take up the bipartisan version of the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization that passed the Senate. I would like to thank my colleague, GWEN MOORE for her steadfast and unyielding work on this issue, and I was proud to join her as a cosponsor of the version of the VAWA reauthorization that she introduced in the House.

Since 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has been reauthorized without controversy, almost entirely devoid of any partisan rancor or division. It is an essential piece of legislation that seeks to protect the victims of abuse and offer them much-needed support. Since its original passage, and during each of the previous reauthorizations, Congress has continued to improve the VAWA by increasing protections for women every time it has come to the floor.

This year, both the bipartisan Senate bill and Congresswoman MOORE's bill offer reforms that make certain that when we pass a law that protects all women, we mean all

women—with no exceptions. The reauthorization should include the new language proposed in those bills which would guarantee that the law will not discriminate against any woman based on her race, color, religion, national origin or sexual orientation.

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that my Republican colleagues will end this partisan gamesmanship on an issue that has always been, and should always be a bipartisan one. I join my colleagues, as well as hundreds of organizations and groups, and women across the country in opposing this bill.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us to pass the bipartisan Senate bill which ensures equal protection to all women in the United States of America.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I believe every Member of the House supports the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. However, I oppose the bill we are considering today because it contains serious gaps in its protections for Native American victims of domestic violence and it does not include language to ban discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered victims in grant programs under the bill.

The bill fails to grant the tribal police and courts, generally the closest legal authorities for an alleged incident of domestic violence occurring on a reservation, the authority to address an incident occurring on tribal lands. Instead, tribal residents in my district would be forced to rely on Federal courts, located several hours away in Tacoma and Seattle, for help and protection. This puts a terrible and potentially dangerous burden on Indian victims in need of a protection order, many of whom do not have the means to travel this distance. Furthermore, the requirement forcing a victim to disclose her residential address called for in Section 1006 of the bill may well put her in further jeopardy.

I am also deeply concerned about the bill's refusal to prohibit discrimination against LGBT individuals in all VAWA programs. No victim of violence of any kind should be denied assistance simply because his or her sexual orientation. It is wrong that the bill further perpetuates this inequity, and I fear the reasons are purely political.

The answer to this problem is simple. A bipartisan compromise reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act passed the other body with 68 votes in favor, including 15 Republicans. It resolved these issues in a way that was acceptable to both sides, and I encourage the leadership in the House to allow this bill to come to the floor for a vote immediately.

I urge my colleagues to reject this flawed bill and to push for the consideration of a truly bipartisan reauthorization bill before the week is out.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant but strong opposition to H.R. 4970, a needlessly partisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) that unwisely undermines important protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Initially enacted in 1994, VAWA acknowledges the harmful and persistent impact that domestic violence, sexual assault, and dating violence has on our society. Nearly one in four women are the victims of rape or abuse by a partner during adulthood, with young women between the ages of 16 and 24 experiencing the highest rate of partner violence. One in four girls and one in six boys are sexually abused before the age of 18, half of whom are victims of incest. Nationwide, approximately three women are killed each day by a current or former intimate partner.

In addition to the physical and emotional trauma experienced by victims, domestic violence and sexual assaults impose a tremendous economic cost on our nation. Rape is the most costly crime to its victims, totaling $127 billion a year in medical costs, lost earnings, and diminished quality of life. The cost of intimate partner violence exceeds $5.8 billion, including $4.1 billion in direct health care expenses. Over 25 percent of domestic violence victims report that they lost a job, at least in part, because of this violence. In total, domestic violence is estimated to cost employers in the U.S. up to $13 billion every year.

To address this staggering problem, VAWA established streamlined programs to provide law enforcement, judges and prosecutors, and social service providers with the resources they need to hold offenders accountable and support the needs of victims. It allowed for coordinated, community-based services for victims and strengthened housing protections. VAWA also created important prevention programs for young people and improved the response to violence against Native American women and those in underserved communities. The tangible results of VAWA are impressive and should make all Americans proud.

Since 1994, reporting of domestic violence has increased by as much as 51 percent, while the number of individuals killed by an intimate partner has decreased 34 percent for women and 57 percent for men. States have enacted important protections for victims of stalking and strengthened rape laws in response to VAWA. Many more victims of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault are able to access critical services. An entire generation of justice system professionals now understands that our society cannot tolerate these crimes. In just the first six years after enactment, VAWA saved an estimated $12.6 billion in net averted costs.

Yet, the bill before us today betrays the bipartisan history of VAWA. It fails to contain important reforms included in a Senate-passed version of the bill that ensure LGBT, Native American, and immigrant women receive the protections they deserve. The bill lacks protections for LGBT survivors despite the fact that studies have clearly shown that these individuals are underserved explicitly because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. It fails to provide American Indian women effective recourse to bring justice against non-Indian abusers, even though these women face rates of victimization more than double that of non-Indian women. And the bill, for the first time ever, weakens protections in current law for migrant victims of violence. The bill would leave immigrant victims without meaningful access to protection, create processing delays that will keep women in life-threatening situations for longer periods of time, and undermine law enforcement efforts to investigate and prosecute violent crimes with the assistance of immigrant victims.

Compounding the serious flaws in the legislation, Republicans forced the bill to the floor under a closed rule, allowing no opportunity for Democratic Members to offer amendments to improve the bill. Instead of following a truly democratic process to debate these important policy provisions, the majority finds it more important to shield their side from uncomfortable votes. This procedure is inappropriate for legislation as important as VAWA and is clearly inconsistent with the majority's pledge for a more open Congress.

VAWA always has been, and should have remained, a bipartisan bill. I am deeply troubled that my Republican colleagues decided to roll back protections for victims of abuse and failed to include the responsible reforms contained in the Senate bill that passed by a bipartisan vote of 68–31. We must pass a strong VAWA reauthorization, but this bill falls well short of that critical necessity.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I encourage the Republican leadership to allow a vote on the bipartisan Senate bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I cannot support the H.R. 4970, the Republican bill that rolls back critical protections for domestic violence victims. Until now, reauthorization of the Violence against Women Act has involved a strong, bipartisan effort. In sharp contrast to this bipartisan history, the Republican Leadership aggressively is pushing a bill that weakens current law, shifts power into the hands of abusers, delays or denies protection to battered spouses and victims of heinous crimes such as rape and sexual assault, prevents law enforcement from gaining the cooperation of many immigrant victims of serious crimes, and leaves more dangerous criminals on the streets to strike again. This is unacceptable and undermines the intent of the bill to protect all victims of domestic and sexual violence.

In April 2012, the Senate passed by a vote of 68 to 31 a bipartisan bill that advanced the Federal government's commitment to protecting all victims—a bill that strengthens current law. In sharp contrast to the bipartisan Senate bill, the Republican bill fails to include key protections for Native American, immigrant, and LGBT victims of domestic violence. Even with the Manager's Amendment, the Republican bill undermines key protects for many domestic violence victims, making them less safe and tarnishing our American value of protecting the vulnerable. It is no wonder that over 100 organizations oppose the House Republican bill.

So, I stand with the diverse group of organizations—including the NAACP, the National Women's Law Center, the Human Rights Campaign, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors to strongly oppose the House Republican bill and to support the bipartisan Senate bill. As policymakers, we should be protecting our citizens, not decreasing their safety.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which is an affront to women, their rights and their safety.

It is worth noting that the Violence Against Women Act was originally passed under a Republican Congress. Its provisions that protect immigrant women passed in 2000 and 2005—again during Republican majorities.

Yet, today, we are voting on legislation that would gut these protections, delivering women seeking help into the hands of their abusers—endangering their safety and their lives.

Immigrant women are disproportionately impacted by domestic violence. One study from New York City found that 51 percent of domestic partner homicide victims were foreign-

born. Other research has suggested that, among undocumented Latina women, the rate of battering is as high as 34%.

For immigrant women, there can be language barriers preventing them from seeking help. In many cases, abusers may try to use the threat of deportation to prevent their victims from leaving.

The Violence Against Women Act is designed to help those who are most vulnerable and who need assistance. Instead, the provisions being offered by the Majority, today, would make it harder for those who have been battered to escape abuse and find safety. This legislation weakens confidentiality protections that prevent abusers from knowing their victims are seeking help. Needless, duplicative interviews with DHS would make it harder for those who are abused to secure assistance through the immigration system. The legislation would also make it more difficult for those cooperating with law enforcement to avoid deportation. Collectively, these provisions effectively cut women off from help, making it harder for them to avail themselves of the legal process.

Make no mistake: despite what our Republican colleagues say, these provisions will not reduce immigration fraud. That argument is a red herring. Indeed, there is not one shred of evidence suggesting female immigrants are misusing the Violence Against Women Act.

How can we turn our back on women who need assistance? What kind of a message does it send to pass this legislation? Are we saying to those who suffer abuse they do not ''count'' because they are undocumented?

I say to my colleagues—let us send another message. Reject this legislation. Pass a real Violence Against Women Act that does not divide us by playing politics, but extends help to women who need it.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, it is with great disappointment that I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Alainst Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2012. I was proud to support the original Violence Against Women Act when Congress passed it with bipartisan support in 1994 because it created landmark programs to help victims of domestic violence, provided grants for law enforcement agencies, and established new categories of crimes such as stalking. VAWA is one of the true bipartisan success stories in Congress and it has achieved a real, significant and lasting impact on our nation. Since VAWA first passed, the annual incidence of domestic violence has decreased by 53 percent. However, there is still much work to be done, as approximately one in five women have been raped in their lifetime, and 45 percent of the women killed in the United States die after being attacked by an intimate partner.

Given the fact that violence against women continues to be a serious problem in this country, it is disappointing to see the Republican majority pursue such a partisan and reckless path forward with this legislation. Instead of following the Senate's lead, which passed an effective and bipartisan bill to reauthorize VAWA, the GOP has decided to play politics with this important issue and has significantly weakened protections for battered women and instituted discriminatory policies. Specifically, H.R. 4970 does not include key provisions of the Senate bill which ensure that LGBT victims are not discriminated against in VAWA programs. We can all agree that no victim of domestic abuse should be denied care because of their sexual orientation. As a lifetime supporter of civil rights I cannot in good conscience support legislation which would permit this to happen.

Further, three out of five Native American women are victims of domestic violence in their lifetime, which is a pressing national problem. The Senate bill addresses this concern by including provisions which would give Native American tribal governments jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute incidents of violence, in addition to providing grants to assist tribes in prosecuting such crimes. Yet H.R. 4970 does not adequately address these concerns by not including any of these provisions in the legislation. Such crass indifference makes this legislation impossible to support.

The path forward to reauthorize VAWA is clear. The Senate sent a clear message by passing a strong, bipartisan bill, and the House should do the same. Let us stop fighting these needless partisan battles and instead come together to reauthorize a program which has worked so well over the years. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 4970 and support the Senate bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, has historically provided a vast network of support for victims of dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking since its initial passage in 1994. Declining instances of domestic violence and increased awareness surrounding these forms of abuse are a testament to the success of VAWA's programs, and to the importance of its preservation. Unless VAWA is reauthorized, these programs will no longer be available to protect the countless victims of domestic violence and abuse throughout the United States.

Today, as Congress seeks to reauthorize this landmark piece of legislation for the third time, VAWA is at serious risk of being stripped of its most important provisions. The Senate version of VAWA was adopted on April 26 with bipartisan support, and not only preserves important protections for women but also expands those protections to LGBT individuals and Native American women. Conversely, H.R. 4970 represents a partisan bill that rolls back existing protections and excludes entire groups of victims.

As long as H.R. 4970 excludes critical improvements and disregards the recommendations of key stakeholders, I cannot support this bill. In the previous reauthorization, VAWA was drafted in a bipartisan fashion and included meaningful provisions for protecting battered and abused individuals, and as such I supported its passage. Unfortunately, H.R. 4970 completely fails to achieve the original objectives behind VAWA, and actually does more to harm women than it does to help them overcome their aggressors.

To show my support for VAWA, I have joined my colleagues as a cosponsor of H.R. 4271, an alternative to H.R. 4970 that contains language more consistent with the original intent of the bill. H.R. 4271 is simply a better bill that goes further to recognize the same prevalence of abuse among Native American women and LGBT individuals, and ensures that all victims are protected regardless of sexual orientation or national origin.

Madam Speaker, this attack on women needs to stop immediately. I can find no justification for why this Congress should exclude certain groups of women from the protections afforded by VAWA. The bill that is being considered before the House today does a disservice to victims of domestic abuse in the U.S., and falls drastically short of the original intent of the law.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012. The Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, has been instrumental in protecting women from domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Domestic violence often has devastating consequences for women, their families, and society as a whole.

VAWA provides essential grants including educational programs for the prevention of domestic violence in schools, battered women's shelters, a national domestic violence hotline, grants to improve law enforcement and prosecution of violent crimes against women, among others. It also provides much needed services for the protection of children from maltreatment, sexual assault, and domestic violence.

A manager's amendment was offered to address some immigrant protection issues with H.R. 4970, but did very little to change the original bill. H.R. 4970 would change the requirements for abused immigrant spouses of U.S. citizens and permanent residents by imposing a higher standard of proof than required for asylum applications, and by allowing government adjudicators to break confidentiality and interview an accused abuser. The revised bill would only prohibit basing decisions exclusively on the information provided by the abusive spouse. The bill would also decrease protections for immigrant victims by undermining the U visa program, which allows an immigrant victim of a serious crime to stay in the U.S. to assist law enforcement in investigating and prosecuting the crime. The manager's amendment only provides a small portion of victims the opportunity to adjust their legal status after their U visa expires. Battered immigrant spouses would be less likely to report abuse if they could still be deported and their abusive spouses would be made aware they are trying to seek help.

H.R. 4970 ignores improving the safety of co-ed students on college campuses. Provisions to strengthen requirements for universities to report on how they address sexual violence on campus, were removed from the bill. If college campuses are not protected from sexual harassment, assault, or violence; students will not be able to learn and could potentially miss out on true educational opportunities.

The bill would not restore Native American tribal courts' jurisdiction over crimes of domestic violence or dating violence committed on reservations and tribal lands in cases where the victim is a tribal member but the defendant is not. Those cases currently fall outside the jurisdiction of both tribal and state courts and are rarely prosecuted on the federal level.

I believe it is important to provide preventative domestic violence programs as well as help those who have been affected by domestic violence with programs that can help them recover and protect them in the future. Many of the domestic violence programs that we have today would not be able to continue without the reauthorization of VAWA. H.R. 4970

mitigates VAWA's 18-year history and abandons many victims of domestic and sexual violence.

As a supporter of VAWA from the beginning, I urge all my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4970 and to vote on a bill that would allow these much needed programs and services to continue so that we may work to stop domestic violence.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, this week, the House of Representatives is expected to take up a bill reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), a traditionally noncontroversial bill that improves the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes against women. The bill works: We've seen a 60 percent decrease in domestic violence since the bill first passed in 1994.

The Senate recently passed its version of this bill in an overwhelming, bipartisan vote. Unfortunately, the partisan House version rolls back some of its most critical components, limiting protections for certain classes of women. In fact, women's advocacy groups like the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence say this bill would discourage victims of these heinous crimes from going to the police for help and actually increase abusers' power.

I can't support this bill for a number of reasons, but chief among them are its failure to include provisions to help reduce violence against young women on college campuses. This issue, in particular, resonates as we mark the second anniversary of the tragic death of Yeardley Love, a Baltimore native and student athlete at the University of Virginia who was beaten by her abusive ex-boyfriend.

Yeardley's mother, Sharon Love, recently visited Washington to encourage lawmakers to swiftly pass the VAWA reauthorization approved by the Senate. That bill requires colleges to provide clear protocols and disciplinary policies for reports of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking. It also requires colleges to help victims report the incident to law enforcement and seek a protective order if they choose to do so, as well as provide victims with options to change academic, living and transportation arrangements. Finally, it provides prevention programs for students who could be abusers, victims and bystanders.

It is shameful that the architects of the House bill have opted to remove these critical components. I am urging House leadership to bring the Senate version to a vote so we can provide real protection to women of all ages and races.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, House Republicans say they want to prevent violence against women, yet because of their ideological agenda, the bill on the floor this week actually eliminates current protections for battered women, placing them in danger.

Domestic violence does not respect any boundary; it does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or political affiliation.

Turning Points, the only domestic violence intervention program in Prince William County, served 6,000 clients last year. In Fairfax County, there were more than 8,000 cases of domestic violence reported, and we have seen a 40 percent increase in homelessness due to domestic violence.

Yet House Republicans would make it harder for women to come forward to report abuse. In a letter to the Judiciary Committee, law enforcement officials from across the Nation said the Republican bill, quote, ''will turn back the clock on over 17 years' of progress made by law enforcement in reducing violence against women and children in our communities.''

Madam Speaker, protecting women and children from abusive situations should not be a partisan issue. We should take up the Senate's bipartisan bill and not further abuse these poor victims.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, It is with great pleasure to rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Act. In doing so, I am reminded of an old Samoan belief that the female siblings are the ''tama sa'' or sacred child in the family. They are to be treated with respect, care and love—offenders of this ancient taboo often faced extreme consequences. Madam Speaker, I am in full support of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

While I fully support reauthorization of an Act of Congress that since 1994 has been an essential tool to protect victims of domestic and sexual violence, I do however have some major concerns with H.R. 4970, legislation before us today. Unlike the Senate reauthorization bill, S. 1925, introduced by Senators PATRICK LEAHY and MIKE CRAPO and was passed by the Senate last month with strong bipartisan support, H.R. 4970 introduced by my colleague Ms. SANDY ADAMS, will effectively bring more harm than protect victims of domestic violence.

Madam Speaker, unlike S. 1925, H.R. 4970 offers no protection for Indian spouses abused on tribal land. Under a 1978 Supreme Court decision, non-Indians cannot be prosecuted by tribal courts for crimes committed on tribal land. Last July, the Justice Department recommended that Congress give tribes local authority to prosecute non-Indians in misdemeanor domestic and dating violence cases.

Madam Speaker, the Senate reauthorization bill, S. 1925, will do just that. It will recognize certain tribes' concurrent jurisdiction to investigate, prosecute, convict, and sentence persons who assault Indian spouses, intimate partners, or dating partners, or who violate protection orders, in Indian country. It recognizes that tribal nations may be best able to address in their own communities—neither the United States nor any State would lose any criminal jurisdiction as a result.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4970 on the other hand, completely ignores this ongoing injustice against Indian spouses, wives or partners, on tribal lands.

I am also disappointed that certain provisions in H.R. 4970 would strip away some of the existing protection for immigrant victims of abusive relationships. As it stands now, VAWA allows battered immigrants to petition for their own immigrant status, independent of their abusive spouses and thus freeing them from their spouse's abuse and control. If enacted however, H.R. 4970 will allow immigration officers to interview an alleged offender and consider the information obtained in making a determination about the adjudication of a battered immigrant's petition for status. This allows abusers to manipulate the immigration process to cause further harm on the victim. Moreover, it will reveal confidential information necessary to protect the victim and her children from the unwanted advances of an abusive spouse or partner.

Madam Speaker, in the ancient Samoan culture, it is a great shame to the male sibling if any harm or injury happens to the ''sacred child''. It is within this cultural context, and also with a deep sense of fairness and justice that I urge my colleagues to pass the Senate reauthorization bill. The house bill H.R. 4970, while it was written with good intention, does not do justice for the women of this country.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, the House Republican version of this bill rolls back existing protections for immigrants who are victims of domestic violence and strips provisions in the Senate version that protect Native Americans and LGBT abuse victims.

Republicans have decided to use this nonpartisan issue to push their war on women further than many of us thought possible. This new bill says that if a Native American or immigrant—documented or not—is the victim of abuse, the government should turn a blind eye. This is a cold, heartless vision of what law enforcement means to the American people, and it's hard to find words strong enough to reject it.

The House bill eliminates an existing confidentiality clause known as the self-petitioning process that allows abused women to apply confidentially, if appropriate, for protected immigration status. If the clause is removed from current law, women legally in the country because of a pending marriage who suffer abuse would not be able to keep their applications for permanent status private from their abusers. Boyfriends or husbands would be able to revoke the citizenship application, making the abused woman revert to undocumented status and limiting her legal options.

Men shouldn't be able to abuse women and control their access to law enforcement at the same time. This is a scary scenario that we shouldn't even have to contemplate.

Currently, Federal and State law enforcement officers have exclusive authority to prosecute misdemeanor domestic violence crimes committed by non-Indians on Tribal lands, many of which are known to go unprosecuted for logistical and other reasons. The Senate VAWA reauthorization bill lets Tribal law enforcement exercise jurisdiction over such cases, while the House version maintains the status quo. The unfortunate situation of abused Native women has been ignored for far too long. The law should protect all women from abuse, wherever they live. Republicans found an awful lot of nerve to deny equal protection to millions of Native American women for no reason I can tell.

The Senate version includes a provision that helps colleges and universities increase violence-prevention education and reduce dating abuse and sexual assault. The House version does not include that language. The Senate version prevents any entity that receives Federal anti-abuse grants from turning away LGBT victims when they have suffered from domestic violence or abuse. The House version is silent on the issue.

According to a National Network to End Domestic Violence report, ''Domestic violence impacts one in four American women over their lifetimes, and 15.5 million children are exposed to domestic violence each year. Victims rely on services to escape violence and rebuild their lives. When victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence or stalking take the difficult step to reach out for help, many are in life-threatening situations and must be able to find immediate refuge.''

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, offered by Representative ADAMS of Florida. I wish to extend my deep appreciation to Representative ADAMS for her leadership in introducing this legislation and my heart goes out to her and all of the women across the country who have been victims of domestic violence.

Each year, there are more than 200,000 victims of sexual assault nationwide. Sixty-two domestic violence deaths occurred in my home State of Indiana within a recent twelve-month period. As a husband to a wonderful wife and a father of two precious daughters, I strongly support efforts to end sexual violence and domestic abuse.

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was originally passed by Congress in 1994 to address rising violent crime rates against women, and in subsequent years we have witnessed a dramatic reduction in the incidence of domestic violence in this country. In 2006, I supported legislation to reauthorize VAWA, which added improvements to enhance sentencing for repeat sex offenders and require pretrial detention of child pornographers.

While we have made progress in our fight against domestic and sexual violence, there is still work to be done, and that is why this reauthorization legislation is so important. Today's legislation continues our fight to prevent victims of these tragic crimes. It includes enhanced tools for law enforcement to arrest abusers and those who violate protection orders. It increases penalties for sexual assault and abuse. It funds programs to aid domestic violence victims seeking refuge from their abusers, and it promotes awareness in an effort to prevent these crimes from occurring in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to support this reauthorization of VAWA and to support our continued efforts to combat sexual violence and domestic abuse.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, House Republicans say they want to prevent violence against women, yet because of their ideological agenda, the bill on the floor this week actually eliminates current protections for battered women, placing them in danger.

Domestic violence does not respect any boundary; it does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or political affiliation.

Turning Points, the only domestic violence intervention program in Prince William County, served 6,000 clients last year. In Fairfax County, there were more than 8,000 cases of domestic violence reported, and we have seen a 40 percent increase in homelessness due to domestic violence.

Yet House Republicans would make it harder for women to come forward to report abuse. In a letter to the Judiciary Committee, law enforcement officials from across the Nation said the Republican bill, quote, ''will turn back the clock on over 17 years' of progress made by law enforcement in reducing violence against women and children in our communities.''

Madam Speaker, protecting women and children from abusive situations should not be a partisan issue. We should take up the Senate's bipartisan bill and not further abuse these poor victims.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) should present Congress with an opportunity to set aside our many differences and work together so that women and families across the country can lead safer, healthier, and happier lives. VAWA has transformed our Nation's response to violence against women and brought critically needed resources to states and local communities so they can prosecute these crimes. Reauthorizing VAWA is essential. For these reasons, I am both saddened and angered that the Republican House majority has squandered this opportunity.

All women, no matter what their background or lifestyle, deserve to live free of violence and danger. Our Senate colleagues recognize this. They passed a thoughtful reauthorization bill that helps women in need.

The Senate bill prohibits discrimination against gay or transgender individuals in VAWA programs. It ensures that immigrant women can file domestic violence complaints without fear for their safety. It extends vital protections to Native American women by permitting non-Indian men who commit violent crimes against them on tribal land to be prosecuted through the tribal system. It also includes important improvements to better address the high rates of dating violence and sexual assault experienced by people in college and other educational settings.

In contrast, the House Republican VAWA bill leaves out all of these protections. It delivers the reprehensible message that women in the United States are not worthy of protection if they are gay, Indian, or non-citizens and it flat out fails to make other needed updates to the law.

Congress should not be in the business of choosing who is and is not deserving of safety. Every woman should have access to protective services if and when she needs it. The regressive policy in H.R. 4970 falls far short of this goal. I stand with President Obama and women's advocates across our country in opposing this bill and I urge all my colleagues to vote against it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Yes, ma'am, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Moore moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4970 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 30, after line 3, insert the following:

**SEC. 6. PROTECTING CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVACY OF VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE.**

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to eliminate, reduce, or otherwise limit any protection in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act that provides confidentiality to victims of domestic violence to protect such victims from future violence. This protection includes preventing notification of a victim's efforts to seek assistance from law enforcement from being exposed or transmitted to the victim's suspected batterer.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, if the final amendment that I'm offering here today were to be adopted, is it not the case that the bill will be amended and that the House will then proceed to final passage right away?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair stated on February 27, 2002, and May 10, 2012, if a motion to recommit with forthwith instructions is adopted, the amendment is reported by the chair of the committee and is immediately before the House.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit simply clarifies that the preservation of confidentiality to protect the victims' identity to avoid retaliation and even loss of life shall not be weakened as compared to current law.

□ 1650

We have debated the need to expand this bill beyond what the author has put in. We have lost that debate because the Rules Committee has put forth a closed rule, and we do not have the opportunity to present the Senate version of the bill, which passed overwhelmingly in the Senate 68–31. So we have lost that battle for the Violence Against Women Act to include all women.

In this motion, we are simply trying to reestablish one little sliver—one little piece—in this bill that we are hoping the majority will recognize will greatly enhance the safety of all women. This motion simply protects the victim's identity to avoid retaliation and even the loss of life, and it makes sure it is not weakened as compared to current law. Now, we are going to be told that the manager's amendment does that, but it does not.

Under current law, abused women are able to seek help and come forward to authorities under the condition of confidentiality; but H.R. 4970, as amended, does a couple of things. For example, it delays the protection of battered victims by staying adjudications before pending investigations or prosecutions are completed. It creates a negative inference against the victim if law enforcement does not open a formal investigation or if prosecutors fail to prosecute the perpetrator. I can tell you that, notwithstanding the due process rights of abusers, current law provides a very delicate balance between the due process rights of abusers and the confidentiality of those accusers.

The fact that the bill was amended in this way restimulates me to remember

an incident in my own life when the balance of rights was tipped in favor of the abuser. I am reminded of a time when I got into an automobile, with a man whom I thought to be a personal friend, to go get some fried chicken. He pulled in behind some vacant buildings, and he raped me and choked me almost to death. When I went to the hospital, I was encouraged by an advocate—this was in the 1970s, long before there was a Violence Against Women Act, long before there was a Rape Shield Act—to take him to court.

Indeed, I was on trial because, like this bill—and just like what I experienced—I had to prove as a victim that I was not being fraudulent in my accusations. Oh, they brought up how I was an unwed mother with a baby. Maybe I seduced him. They talked about how I was dressed, and they carried me through all kinds of bureaucratic hoops. Ultimately, he was found to be not guilty; although, I had done everything that I was told to do in terms of prosecuting this. I cannot stress the solemn nature of this issue.

It doesn't surprise me that she had the cell phone in her hand but that she lost her life because she couldn't escape this man. It doesn't surprise me that she was shot four times behind the police station. The most dangerous time for a woman is when she is trying to escape her perpetrator, when she is trying to do something about it, when she is trying to turn her life around, hers and her children's.

When the perpetrator is given the tools that this bill gives him to have an abuser's rights prevail over the rights of the victim's, she will have the cell phone in her hand, but she will lose her life anyway because she cannot escape this man. The manager's amendment does not fix this. We have heard from 325 groups and organizations that oppose this bill and say that the manager's amendment does not fix it, so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ADAMS. I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, Democrats in Congress and others have been accusing Republicans for months for waging a war on women. We've been called antivictim, elitist, homophobic, and racist. These ridiculous attacks stop now—right here, right now. It's a shame, really. We've always had a bipartisan vote on this issue. It has always been a bipartisan issue, but this year, it has turned into an election year politic.

The Violence Against Women Act was bipartisan legislation when it was enacted in 1994 and when it was reauthorized by a Republican-controlled House in 2000 and in 2006. Instead of coming together to reauthorize grant programs to help victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have created a phony war on women to score political points. These attacks are unfortunate and divisive. Domestic violence knows no political or socioeconomic boundaries. Neither should legislation to fund these important programs.

Critics of this bill outright dismiss the dozens of good, broadly bipartisan things that this bill does in its nearly 200 pages of text, and they have chosen to focus their attention on a handful of things it doesn't do. So let's be real about what the bill does:

It reauthorizes the VAWA grant programs for 5 years at the same levels as the Senate-passed bill. That's over $680 million a year in Federal funds to support these programs, and this is on top of the increase in funding for these programs that were adopted just last week by this House in the CJS appropriations bill.

It sets aside specific funding for sexual assault investigations, prosecutions, and victim services as well as reauthorizes State rape prevention education programs, programs to promote educational awareness to prevent violence and to improve services for young victims. The bill also improves emergency and transitional housing services for victims.

This bill provides greater protections to Indian women by designating domestic violence tribal liaisons within the U.S. Attorney's Offices, and it creates a new provision to allow victims of domestic violence or Indian tribes on behalf of victims to seek protection orders from U.S. district courts against Indian or non-Indian abusers.

When I made the decision to pack what few belongings I could carry and leave with my daughter to escape an abusive relationship, all I cared about was protecting my daughter and providing her a safe and healthy life. In my years of service in law enforcement, not once did a domestic assault or rape victim question where the help was coming from or which political party or organizations endorsed the law that made that funding possible.

The reason for that is this: This bill isn't about Washington politics. It's about people's lives.

If you vote against this bill today, you will vote to deny help to millions of victims. Opponents are willing to sacrifice helping millions of American women escape their abusers in the name of political gamesmanship, so I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit and ''yes'' on the final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4970, if ordered, and suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 2621, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 236, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Cassidy
Filner
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Labrador
Landry
Sánchez, Linda T.
Slaughter

□ 1720

Messrs. RUNYAN and FINCHER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri, MARCHANT, BROOKS and MEEHAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPEIER and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 257, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 257, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 205, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—222

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—205

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Gonzalez
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Cassidy
Filner
Labrador
Slaughter

□ 1729

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 258, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

## CHIMNEY ROCK NATIONAL MONUMENT ESTABLISHMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2621) to establish the Chimney Rock National Monument in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, 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.

## BLOCKING PROPERTY OF PERSONS THREATENING THE PEACE, SECURITY, OR STABILITY OF YEMEN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–109)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the ''order'') declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Yemen and others to threaten Yemen's peace, security, and stability.

The order does not target the entire country of Yemen or its government, but rather targets those who threaten the peace, security, or stability of Yemen, including by obstructing the implementation of the agreement of November 23, 2011, between the Government of Yemen and those in opposition to it, which provides for a peaceful transition of power that meets the legitimate demands and aspirations of the Yemeni people for change, or by obstructing the political process in Yemen. The order provides criteria for the blocking of property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to: have engaged in acts that directly or indirectly threaten the peace, security, or stability of Yemen, such as acts that obstruct the implementation of the agreement of November 23, 2011, between the Government of Yemen and those in opposition to it, which provides for a peaceful transition of power in Yemen, or that obstruct the political process in Yemen; be a political or military leader of an entity that has engaged in the acts described above; have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, the acts described above or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

The designation criteria will be applied in accordance with applicable Federal law including, where appropriate, the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 16, 2012*.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

## NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5740) to extend the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5740

*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 ''National Flood Insurance Program Extension Act''.

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4026) is amended by striking ''the earlier of the date of the enactment into law of an Act that specifically amends the date specified in this section or May 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012''.

(b) FINANCING.—Section 1309(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking ''the earlier of the date of the enactment into law of an Act that specifically amends the date specified in this section or May 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012''.

**SEC. 3. USE OF PRIVATE INSURANCE TO SATISFY MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.**

Section 102(b) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''lending institutions not to make'' and inserting ''lending institutions—

''(A) not to make'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking ''less.'' and inserting ''less; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) to accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under subparagraph (A) if the coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such subparagraph.'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''provided in paragraph (1).'' the following new sentence: ''Each Federal agency lender shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.'';

(3) in paragraph (3), in the matter following subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'private flood insurance' means a contract for flood insurance coverage allowed for sale under the laws of any State.''.

**SEC. 4. PRIVATIZATION INITIATIVES.**

(a) FEMA AND GAO REPORTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess a broad range of options, methods, and strategies for privatizing the national flood insurance program and shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate with recommendations for the best manner to accomplish such privatization.

(b) PRIVATE RISK-MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may carry out such private risk-management initiatives under the national flood insurance program as the Administrator considers appropriate to determine the capacity of private insurers, reinsurers, and financial markets to assist communities, on a voluntary basis only, in managing the full range of financial risks associated with flooding.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall assess the capacity of the private reinsurance, capital, and financial markets by seeking proposals to assume a portion of the program's insurance risk and submit to the Congress a report describing the response to such request for proposals and the results of such assessment.

(3) PROTOCOL FOR RELEASE OF DATA.—The Administrator shall develop a protocol to provide for the release of data sufficient to

conduct the assessment required under paragraph (2).

(c) REINSURANCE.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) in section 1331(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4051(a)(2)), by inserting '', including as reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the flood insurance program'' before '', on such terms'';

(2) in section 1332(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4052(c)(2)), by inserting ''or reinsurance'' after ''flood insurance coverage'';

(3) in section 1335(a) (42 U.S.C. 4055(a))—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Director is authorized to secure reinsurance coverage of coverage provided by the flood insurance program from private market insurance, reinsurance, and capital market sources at rates and on terms determined by the Director to be reasonable and appropriate in an amount sufficient to maintain the ability of the program to pay claims and that minimizes the likelihood that the program will utilize the borrowing authority provided under section 1309.'';

(4) in section 1346(a) (12 U.S.C. 4082(a))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', or for purposes of securing reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the program,'' before ''of any or all of'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''estimating'' and inserting ''Estimating''; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''receiving'' and inserting ''Receiving''; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''making'' and inserting ''Making''; and

(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''otherwise'' and inserting ''Otherwise''; and

(ii) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (5); and

(F) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) Placing reinsurance coverage on insurance provided by such program.''; and

(5) in section 1370(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 4121(a)(3)), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', is subject to the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pursuant to section 13(a) or 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)), or is authorized by the Director to assume reinsurance on risks insured by the flood insurance program''.

(d) ASSESSMENT OF CLAIMS-PAYING ABILITY.—

(1) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct an assessment of the claims-paying ability of the national flood insurance program, including the program's utilization of private sector reinsurance and reinsurance equivalents, with and without reliance on borrowing authority under section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016). In conducting the assessment, the Administrator shall take into consideration regional concentrations of coverage written by the program, peak flood zones, and relevant mitigation measures.

(2) REPORT.—The Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress of the results of each such assessment, and make such report available to the public, not later than 30 days after completion of the assessment.

**SEC. 5. STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.**

(a) STUDIES.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess options, methods, and strategies for offering voluntary community-based flood insurance policy options and incorporating such options into the national flood insurance program. Such studies shall take into consideration and analyze how the policy options would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on the results and conclusions of the study such agency conducted under subsection (a), and each such report shall include recommendations for the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance options into the national flood insurance program and for a strategy to implement such options that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous materials on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 1740

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to ask my colleagues for their support of H.R. 5740, the National Flood Insurance Program Extension Act.

The program is set to expire on May 31, and this critical legislation will spare property owners and the housing market from another lapse in the NFIP. It extends the National Flood Insurance Program's authorization for 30 days, until June 30. In addition, it would initiate several noncontroversial reforms to develop private sector options in the flood insurance market.

Like many of my colleagues—especially my good friend and cosponsor of both this bill and our long-term reauthorization, the gentlelady from California, MAXINE WATERS—I am frustrated that the House must consider yet another short-term extension. It has been 10 months since the House sent H.R. 1309, a comprehensive, bipartisan reform and a 5-year reauthorization measure, to the Senate.

Our Committee on Financial Services approved H.R. 1309 by a unanimous vote of 54–0 in the committee, and it passed on the House floor by a vote of 406–22. As part of that process, we secured the input and support of groups representing the views of everyone from taxpayers to businesses to wildlife defenders. And yet, after five additional short-term extensions, the Senate has still not considered any legislation to reform the NFIP. Instead, all we hear are excuses and rumors—that the administration doesn't want Congress to look productive, that floor time in the Senate is too precious, or that Senate leaders simply don't want to deal with possibly difficult amendments.

The time for excuses has run out. This program is more than $17 billion in debt to the taxpayers. We owe it to the homeowners, to the housing market, and to taxpayers to begin the process of fixing this program, even if we must do it 30 days at a time.

Today, we are sending to the Senate H.R. 5740. Should the Senate pass this short-term extension bill, it will have around 6 weeks from today to take up a flood reform measure and send it to the House. In the meantime, this 30-day extension will initiate key elements of our bipartisan House-passed reforms. It opens the door to private sector participation by asking FEMA and the GAO to study the cost and feasibility of private reinsurance, as well as the private market's capacity to provide new options for homeowners. It also says that private insurance coverage can take the place of government coverage to meet the requirements of lenders in flood-prone areas. The sooner we begin making these changes, the sooner taxpayers can stop bearing the full expense and risk of an outdated flood program.

Over the next 6 weeks, the Senate will have more than enough time to pass long-term reform. Again, last July, the House passed H.R. 1309 by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, 406–22. The House then sent this text to the Senate two additional times. In December, the House passed flood reform as part of H.R. 3630, the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act, and last week the House passed the same flood measure as part of H.R. 5652, the Reconciliation Act.

But this isn't like other partisan battles. It should not be that difficult. Even the White House is with us. In September 2011, President Obama released a statement in support of our reforms as part of his ''Plan for Economic Growth and Debt Reduction'' because the House bill would spare taxpayers from billions in losses.

Senate Banking Committee Chairman JOHNSON has secured committee approval of his own version, S. 1940, along with strong bipartisan support. And in February, 41 Senators—Republicans and Democrats—sent a letter to Senate leadership asking that Senate leaders REID and MCCONNELL schedule

flood insurance reform for floor consideration.

There is simply no reason that in the next few days we cannot sit down and reconcile any differences that remain between the House and Senate visions for flood reform, and today's legislation will give the Senate time to make that a possibility. It will also begin the process of fixing the NFIP and protecting taxpayers from unnecessary risk.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill because this program is too important to let lapse and too in debt to continue without reform.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The National Flood Insurance Program plays a very, very key role in our Nation's efforts to prevent and recover from flood disasters. Floods are now the number one natural disaster in the United States in terms of lives lost and property damaged.

Now, here is exactly what the National Flood Insurance Program does:

First, it identifies areas of flood risk; secondly, it encourages communities to implement measures to mitigate against the risk of flood loss; thirdly, it provides financial assistance to help individuals recover more rapidly from flooding disasters, and it lessens the financial impact of flood disasters on individuals, on businesses, and all levels of government.

In recent years, a series of short-term reauthorizations and temporary suspensions of the NFIP have eroded confidence in the program among our stakeholders—including State government, tribal governments, local communities, individual policyholders, mortgage lenders, and the private insurance industry. In addition to disrupting the program's day-to-day operations, short-term reauthorizations and temporary suspensions—like what we're doing here in 30 days—creates significant uncertainty regarding the Federal Government's long-term commitment to underwriting and indemnifying flood losses. So in the absence of such a commitment, our stakeholders are less likely to make the necessary investments that are needed to successfully sustain, strengthen, and grow the program, thereby undermining the program's effectiveness and efficiency over time.

As my colleague, Mrs. BIGGERT, mentioned earlier, Congress last passed a bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program authorization on December 23, 2011—5 months ago—as a part of the full-year omnibus appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012. Even prior to this action, we in the House took decisive action to extend the flood insurance program the way it should be by approving a 5-year flood insurance reform reauthorization bill last July that passed this House on a strongly bipartisan Republican and Democratic vote of 406–22.

Unfortunately, the National Flood Insurance Program is set now to expire May 31, just over 2 weeks from today, and guess what? June 1 also happens to mark the official start of the hurricane season in this country. This lets you know how we have got to put pressure on the Senate to act responsibly. Here we are attempting to pass a 30-day extension just 2 weeks before the devastating hurricane season starts. Urgency is necessary here. This is why reauthorizing of the National Flood Insurance Program before it expires is essential to our Nation's efforts to prevent and recover from flood disasters.

So I'm pleased that the bill that we have before us does extend the program for 30 days, but it is not a perfect bill, as I said. I believe that many in this Chamber—just about everybody in the House of Representatives—would prefer to see the Senate take up and pass our bill for the 5-year extension, H.R. 1309. Short of that, I believe that many on our side would prefer to take up a flood extension bill that will provide a clean extension.

In addition, there is the possibility—count it, with 2 weeks to go, who knows—the Senate simply may not agree to an extension that only runs 30 days and includes authorization provisions. We just learned last evening that the junior Senator from Oklahoma, Senator TOM COBURN, objected to the majority leader's request to take up and approve a clean, short-term extension bill that would extend the program until December 31, 2012. So here we are, 2 weeks before the hurricane season starts, and the flood program runs out, and still no action from the Senate.

□ 1750

I think it is also important to note that while this body repeatedly has voiced concern with spending, particularly with spending that is not offset with cuts, the Congressional Budget Office has indicated this bill will cost $2 million over 5 years, an amount that is not offset in this bill.

Despite some of these shortcomings, I believe it is of utmost importance that we avoid any lapse in the program. Any lapse, regardless of the duration, would cause significant dislocation in our very fragile housing market for borrowers unable to complete mortgage closings, for insurance agents that sell national flood insurance policies as a part of their business, and for insurance companies that may be forced to reevaluate their voluntary participation, our National Flood Insurance Program's own Write Your Own program. All are very vital.

Finally, we have a broad coalition of stakeholders who support the bill, who support the 5-year extension, including industry insurance trade groups, floodplain managers, the Realtors who are holding their annual conference in Washington, D.C., this week, many other groups. In addition, FEMA's Administrator, Mr. Craig Fugate, recently sent a letter to Congress urging approval of the extension. So here we are, we've got to pass this 30-day extension.

In conclusion, I just want to add that, thanks to Mrs. BIGGERT and to Ms. WATERS, we were able to do something that was vitally needed. As many of you know, my State of Georgia was devastated with floods; and one of the things that did come out of this is, during the hardship times, very difficult for individuals to pay for the flood insurance in a lump sum. As we have made part of our extension effort, they can now pay in quarterly installments, and that's a great thing.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the gentlelady.

We're here on the floor discussing this bill for one reason and for one reason only, and that's that the Senate has not done their job.

Ten months ago, Madam Speaker, this House passed a bipartisan, long-term reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program. Our bill passed unanimously out of committee and then passed the House, overwhelmingly, with over 400 votes, Democrats and Republicans joining together.

Our bill not only included a 5-year reauthorization of the program, a long-term reauthorization, which is what's needed, but included many needed reforms that reduce the burden on taxpayers, increase private market participation, and help bring certainty to the housing market.

We did our job, Madam Speaker, but the Senate's failed to do their job. Seventeen temporary extensions. Perhaps none of us should be surprised. After all, it's been 3 years since the Senate even bothered to pass a budget. Not to mention, at a time when millions of Americans are out of work, the Senate has failed to vote on 27 job-creating bills we passed out of the House, overwhelmingly.

Now Majority Leader HARRY REID has failed to find time to schedule floor time, even though the Senate, under the leadership of Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member SHELBY, unanimously passed a bill almost identical to the bill we passed 10 months ago.

But because of a dysfunctional Senate that's not working, we're once again faced with the risk of having the flood insurance shut down, as the gentleman from Georgia said, right before hurricane season starts. I can't think of a worse time. A shutdown of flood insurance, even a temporary one, would do tremendous damage to our struggling economy and our Nation's fragile housing market.

Specifically, what does it mean? I'd like to introduce a letter from the National Association of Realtors. It is already delaying close to 1,300 house closings every day. If it expires, it will

stop all development dead in its tracks in 21,000 communities across America.

Let me close by saying I want to commend our colleague, Mrs. BIGGERT. Congresswoman BIGGERT has done an exceptional job on this important issue. I'd like to commend Congresswoman and Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS. They've worked, over the last year, for a long-term reauthorization. We've come together and done our job.

I would like to commend the Senate, but, unfortunately, the Senate is not working. It's time for the Senate to pass a 5-year bill, and it's time for them to pass it immediately. That's why, although we have passed a 5-year reauthorization, we're here. But we're only passing a 1-month extension because the best they can do is another extension—number 17—which would put it into December, when we all know that's a lame duck Congress and we're going to be confronted with tremendous other issues at that time.

To the Senate I say: Let's get going.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS,®
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2012.*

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Chairman, House Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: The 1 million members of the National Association of REALTORS® supports a temporary extension of National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) authority to enable the Senate to finish work on its long-term reauthorization and reform measure (S. 1940). The House is scheduled to vote on H.R. 5740 to extend authority by 30 days to June 30, 2012. We urge a yes vote.

NFIP authority is set to expire on May 31, 2012. Consequently, property buyers in more than 21,000 communities across the United States will no longer be able to obtain the flood insurance required by law for the purchase of a home or building. Each day that program authority lapses, more than 1,300 home sales will be delayed or cancelled. Allowing another lapse only exacerbates the many serious economic challenges facing a nation that relies on a vibrant real estate market for its economy.

Homebuyers, small business owners and local communities urge the House to vote yes on H.R. 5740 to keep the NFIP from lapsing. Your vote to extend authority will avoid further market disruption while Congress works toward long-term reauthorization and reform.

Sincerely,
MAURICE ''MOE'' VEISSI,
*2012 President, National Association of REALTORS®.*

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I'd like to thank Representative SCOTT for his leadership on this issue. I'd like to thank Chairman BACHUS for his support for all of the work that has gone into flood insurance reform.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5740, the National Flood Insurance Program Extension Act of 2012. But more than anybody, I'd like to thank Representative BIGGERT for her hard work on this bill and flood insurance reform, and I'm pleased to cosponsor this legislation.

While this bill, by no means, is a substitute for the comprehensive set of reforms included in H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act, a bipartisan bill which passed the House last year, I believe that we must act to pass this bill so that the flood insurance program does not lapse.

The flood insurance program provides valuable protection for approximately 5.5 million homeowners. Unfortunately, the lack of a long-term authorization has placed the program at risk. The program lapsed three times in 2010. These lapses meant FEMA was not able to write new policies, renew expiring policies, or increase coverage limits. Given the current crisis in the housing market, this instability in the flood insurance program is hampering that market's recovery and must be addressed.

The current authorization for the flood insurance program expires on May 31. The next day, hurricane season begins. It is irresponsible to have our Nation's homeowners vulnerable to flooding at any time, but to allow such a lapse during hurricane season is especially troubling.

Even though this bill only extends the program for 30 days, I hope that this brief window will give our counterparts in the Senate enough time to pass their flood insurance reform bill so that this program has all of the resources it needs to fully serve homeowners and the communities in which they live.

I strongly urge an ''aye'' vote on this bill in the hope that the next flood insurance bill we vote on is a comprehensive reauthorization bill.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentlelady yielding time to me, especially because I am opposed to this bill. I would just have one question for my colleagues, and I would ask this: What in the world is the Federal Government doing in the national flood insurance business?

And I would give the sponsors certainly of this legislation credit for the fact that they're trying to reform what I think is an unnecessary Federal Government boondoggle. But rather than reforming this, I think we need to eliminate this program.

Let me just give you an example, Mr. Speaker.

So many of us were very strongly opposed to ObamaCare, the government takeover of health care, because we didn't believe the Federal Government should be running the health care for our entire Nation. But apparently we have no problem with the Federal Government running a National Flood Insurance Program.

This program was created in 1968. We started writing policies in 1972, and today this program is almost $18 billion in debt. And FEMA says that this debt will never be paid for, never, never be paid off. So not only is the Federal Government improperly running a flood insurance program, it's operating a very bad flood insurance program.

This program is not actuarially sound. It charges some of the highest risk areas subsidized rates and charges other areas of no risk astronomical rates to pay for those subsidies.

□ 1800

You can use my home State of Michigan as a great example where our residents have been forced into this program and have been charged thousands of dollars every year even though we have almost no risk of flooding. In Michigan, we actually look down at the water, not up at the water. We've paid multiple times more in premiums than we've ever received back in benefits. In short, Mr. Speaker, the people of the great State of Michigan are getting fleeced by this program.

Obviously, we are a compassionate Nation. When we have a case of a natural disaster, or what have you, we need to make sure that we step up and give relief to our fellow Americans, but what we are doing here today is simply not fair. What we should have is a national catastrophic fund so that everybody pays, not just some who are being forced to subsidize others. That is not fair.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues would join me in rejecting the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program so that we can get to work on a way to allow the private marketplace to move in and to replace it.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Thank you, Congressman SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the National Flood Insurance Program, and I urge support on both sides of the aisle for the 30-day extension today, H.R. 5740.

I would like to thank my friend, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS from California, and my esteemed colleague, Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT of Illinois, for their work on this bill and on H.R. 1309, which I proudly cosponsored. Ideally, we should be increasing certainty for homeowners by reauthorizing the program for 5 years, as effected by H.R. 1309, which passed the House last July with over 400 votes. Now it waits for Senate action. I respectfully urge our counterparts in the Senate to pass a longer-term authorization.

Since 2008, the National Flood Insurance Program has operated on several short-term extensions, which only increase uncertainty in the housing market. As hurricane season approaches, Congress needs to act with all diligence to provide stability for the housing market and to give peace of mind to homeowners.

Mrs. BIGGERT. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a member of the committee.

Mr. DOLD. I certainly want to thank my good friend from Illinois for her leadership and for her giving me some time, and I want to thank the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for her leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 5740. The history of American flood disasters has clearly shown us two things:

First, an effective and proactive National Flood Insurance Program with paid-in premiums is a much better deal for taxpayers than after-the-fact Federal disaster assistance, which was the inevitable Federal response to flood disasters before this program's inception;

Second, any lapse in the program's authorization irreparably damages our mortgage and real estate markets, and avoiding that irreparable damage is particularly important right now when those markets are already so seriously challenged.

Although reauthorization is essential, we also recognize that the program needs meaningful reforms. We must gradually diminish taxpayer exposure to flood losses while improving the program's solvency and self-sufficiency; and we must work with the private sector to expand its role in protecting against flood disasters.

Under Chairwoman BIGGERT's leadership, a long-term reauthorization bill with these necessary reforms, H.R. 1309, passed out of the Financial Services Committee unanimously, 54–0, and then the same bill received nearly unanimous bipartisan support right down here where over 400 Members voted in its favor. With that kind of overwhelming bipartisan support, I must say that it's a little frustrating that we're here once again discussing a short-term reauthorization, largely because the other body hasn't considered the long-term bill, even though the long-term bill passed out of the Senate Banking Committee by voice vote.

One thing that seems clear is that the strategy of short-term authorizations, the corresponding temporary program lapses and uncertainty do not work to minimize taxpayer risk or to expand the private sector's role, but we must deal with the existing realities. To properly reform and strengthen this program, we need to reauthorize this program on a long-term basis, and we need to do so promptly; but the Senate hasn't acted, and we can't tolerate any lapse in the program.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5740, which will avoid a destructive program lapse while we continue to work towards a long-term authorization.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond very briefly.

There is a great urgency here. There is a very serious cry coming from the American people. That cry is saying, Help us, and the kind of help we need is to prepare for the storm before the hurricane is raging.

We live in storm alley. Now, I can tell you from firsthand experience that I represent a district in the State of Georgia where in 2010, I believe it was, we had the worst flood in over 500 years. I represent the Chattahoochee River, which overflowed. I represent one county in which we had 10 people who lost their lives, and seven of those people were from one county in my district, in Douglas County. Cobb County had losses. We got on, I guess we call it, Air Force Two with Vice President BIDEN, and we flew down with FEMA and Homeland Security, and we toured that place. I'm sure you all saw on CNN and Fox and MSNBC—and on all the news stations—where Six Flags Over Georgia, the amusement park, was totally under water.

So I can speak for my community and my area as those of us in the House have spoken—over 400 strong. Why in the world the United States Senate is sitting on the reauthorization is a mystery amidst the cry coming from the American people. Now our season is on us. Hurricane season starts in 2 weeks.

Let me just tell you that I've heard from one of the individuals on the other side, and I wanted to respond to some of those concerns as to why this bill is so important.

Our reauthorization bill would require annual notifications to homeowners who are living in flood zones about the risks in their communities. Many people move into these areas, and they don't even know they're in flood zones. What we've got in this bill is that they will be notified every year. They need that information so they can make the adjustments. I mentioned the affordable insurance coverage. I need not mention the flood maps, themselves, many of which all throughout this country are outdated, that leave many of your constituents and my constituents—I hope the Senate is hearing because they're their constituents as well—at risk for flood damage without even their knowledge.

Let's hope that this message gets across to the Senate that we need action. The American people are crying for help, and we need to give it to them immediately. We've got 2 weeks to do it, and we dare not let this hurricane season come upon us with the National Flood Insurance Program's having expired.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DUFFY. I first want to recognize the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for their great and hard work on the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program.

While I rise today in support of this short-term extension, I have to be frank and honest and tell you that I am disappointed that we haven't found both Chambers coming together to reauthorize this program for 5 years. What this does is to create uncertainty in the market. For the individual who may have a home in a floodplain or for a community that has many of its pieces of property in a floodplain, without having a long-term bill, it creates uncertainty for them.

□ 1810

It creates uncertainty in the housing market, which has obviously gone through some very strenuous times since the 2008 financial crisis. This legislation, a long-term fix, would help breed certainty in that market as well.

As we look back at last summer, we passed this legislation with both sides of the aisle coming together. It doesn't happen very often. It was one of those great moments in the House where it was a vote of 406–22. Both Republicans and Democrats joined hands in passing this legislation. Now we're just waiting for the Senate to act. It's a bill that's going to save $4.2 billion over the course of 10 years. It includes reforms that are going to save taxpayers money by eliminating unnecessary rate subsidies and encouraging the development of a private flood insurance market.

I support the short-term extension, but I also encourage the Senate to act.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I would inquire if the lady from Illinois has any more speakers.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I think we have just one more speaker.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, once again we find that good legislation that was passed by the House has been taken hostage by the Senate.

As we approach yet another deadline on the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program, the Senate is refusing to take up our long-term solution.

Ten months ago, we passed a 5-year bill that would bring much needed certainty and stability to the people depending on this program. The short-term package before us today fails to provide a long-term solution to a very real long-term problem.

NFIP provides flood insurance to more than 20,000 communities across this Nation, including more than 50,000 families in my district. Many of my constituents in Mississippi are still dealing with the effects of Hurricane Katrina. They have experienced record flooding in recent years, and we are fast approaching another hurricane season. We have no other choice. We must act now. It is out of necessity that I support this short-term extension, but we must remain focused on a longer-term solution for the sake of those in the Gulf Coast States and high-risk flood areas. They depend on the National Flood Insurance Program.

Between now and the next time this extension expires, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to revisit and embrace H.R. 1309, our 5-year solution.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will close with my remarks.

I'm hoping that perhaps Members of the Senate may be watching C–SPAN and watching us in the House. If not, I just simply urge their constituents to give them a call and ask them to move. It would be great to move on H.R. 1309. Because even if you do this temporary one, it's 30 days and we're right back here in another 4 weeks at the time that hurricanes are raging. We are really playing with fire here, and we're not doing the American people justice, and we're not doing right here.

As the gentleman from Louisiana just mentioned, vivid in our minds has got to be Katrina. We can talk about Andrew in Florida or you can talk about Hazel up in New York. Our whole country is coastline, and flooding is the worst natural disaster in our country in terms of loss of life, in terms of property. Folks need this financial assistance from this flood insurance program.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to move and do the right thing. I urge the American people to contact their Senators and let them know we do not need to be standing naked in the face of fierce hurricanes without help and without support simply because the United States Senate failed to act in the best interest of the American people.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS of Florida). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

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

I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for managing this bill and for all of his mention of how important this is. I also would again like to thank the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for being a cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we did not have to be here on the floor once again with a short-term extension of the NFIP, but this program is too important to homeowners, to the housing market, and to the communities in the flood-prone areas for Congress to let it expire at the end of the month. It is also too in debt to continue without reform. And despite our best efforts in the House, the Senate has been unwilling or unable to pass a long-term NFIP reauthorization and reform bill.

As has been mentioned over and over, the House passed our 5-year NFIP reauthorization reform bill, H.R. 1309, last July with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of more than 400 votes. It also won unanimous support in the Financial Services Committee. But the Senate has not yet approved any version of flood reform. So here we are once again on the verge of a lapse in NFIP.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to stop playing games with this important program and start enacting long-term reforms now. With today's bill, we begin that process. First, it extends the program for an additional month to spare property owners and the housing market from another lapse. In addition, it would initiate several noncontroversial reforms to develop private sector options in the flood insurance market. This is all part of the 5-year bill that we have.

Reforming the NFIP is simply too important to ignore. Our extension will give the Senate time to act, and it will begin the process of fixing NFIP to protect taxpayers from unnecessary risk.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5740, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment that this House is once again considering a short-term extension to the National Flood Insurance Program.

It has been nearly ten years since the program was last reauthorized, and the need for reauthorization has only grown more pressing. While a lapse in the program would be detrimental to countless homeowners, the program cannot continue to be sustained through a patchwork of short-term extensions.

Last July, the House of Representatives passed a long-term extension of the program with broad bipartisan support. Shortly after, the Senate Banking Committee reported its own reauthorization which is now simply gathering dust in the Senate. With the start of hurricane season only weeks away, now is not the time for the Senate's typical complacency.

Floods affect every state in the Union, and all Americans deserve the comfort of knowing they will be able to continue to benefit from the security that the National Flood Insurance Program has provided homeowners and lending institutions since 1968.

This program must be modernized and reformed to meet the realities of American homeowners and taxpayers. I urge my Senate colleagues to swiftly bring their reauthorization bill to the floor so that we can finally move a long-term reauthorization forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5740.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I unintentionally voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 253 when I intended to vote ''no'' on the motion to consider H. Res. 656, providing for consideration of the bill, H.R. 4970, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and providing for consideration of the bill, H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I reiterate my strong support for the protection of women from acts of violence and my opposition to the reauthorization as currently written and brought forth.

## NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7 (c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4348, the conference report to extend Federal highway programs.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Barrow moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to insist on title II of the House bill, regarding approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4310.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 656 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4310.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1820

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROSS of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, which

overwhelmingly passed the Committee on Armed Services. In keeping with the committee's tradition of bipartisanship, Ranking Member SMITH and I worked collaboratively to produce this bill and solicited input from each of our members.

The legislation advances our national security objectives, provides support and logistical resources for our warfighters, and helps the United States confront the national security challenges of the 21st century. The bill authorizes $554 billion for national defense in the base budget, consistent with the allocation provided by the House Budget Committee. It also authorizes $88.5 billion for overseas contingency operations.

The legislation continues my priorities set forth when I was elected chairman. It contains no earmarks. It carefully analyzes the Defense Department for inefficiencies and savings. It helps ensure the Pentagon's new national defense strategy is not a hollow one. And despite historic cuts to our wartime military, it plugs critical capability and strategic shortfalls opened in the President's budget submission.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 achieves these goals by working to:

Number one, ensure our troops deployed in Afghanistan and globally, including the National Guard who are the Nation's first line of defense at home, have the equipment, resources, authorities, training, and time they need to successfully complete their missions and return home safely;

Number two, care for our warfighters, veterans, and their families with the support they've earned through their service;

Three, provide critical strategic capabilities in an era of austerity;

Fourth, mandate fiscal responsibility, transparency, and accountability within the Department of Defense; and

Finally, improve the relationship between the Defense Department and the supporting industrial base by eliminating red tape and incentivizing competition.

Mr. Chairman, in 2012 we affirmed that the President is authorized to detain certain al Qaeda terrorists pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, or AUMF. Ten years after the horrific attacks of 9/11, it was time for Congress to once again ensure that our men and women in uniform have the authority they need to continue to fight and win the war on terror.

Foreign terrorist groups, such as al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, still pose a grave threat to all U.S. citizens. As a result of last year's bill, we've heard from a number of concerned citizens wondering what this affirmation meant in relation to the rights of U.S. citizens. As a result, in this year's bill, we've incorporated Representatives SCOTT RIGELL and JEFF LANDRY's Right to Habeas Corpus Act, which affirms the availability of the ''great writ'' habeas corpus to any person detained in the United States pursuant to the AUMF. As we all know, the writ of habeas corpus is the ultimate protection against any unlawful detention by the Executive.

I am especially proud of the bipartisan work done on defense industry reform. We have several provisions in our bill that adopt bipartisan recommendations to improve the relationship between the Pentagon and the defense industry. In a time of declining defense budgets, we can no longer afford to conduct business as usual. This bill encourages small businesses to compete for Pentagon contracts and closely scrutinizes every penny that the taxpayers send to the Armed Forces.

Finally, in light of the Pentagon's new national security strategy, it's Congress' constitutional obligation to ensure this new force posture is not a hollow one. To that end, we provide modest increases in combat capabilities, with a particular emphasis on our Navy fleet and critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms.

I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee for working with us to bring this measure to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues to support passage of this bill. In partnership with you, we look forward to passing the 51st consecutive National Defense Authorization Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I want to thank Chairman MCKEON, the committee members, and the staff who, once again, did an outstanding bipartisan job in putting together this bill.

One of the paramount duties of our Congress is to provide for the common defense and, most importantly, make sure that our men and women who serve us in uniform have all the support they need to fulfill the missions that we ask them to do. I believe this bill meets that standard.

I thank the chairman for his willingness to work in a bipartisan fashion with me and my staff. I believe we have upheld the tradition of this committee and have shown that Congress can, in fact, work together to get things done, and I always appreciate that opportunity.

Most importantly, this bill prioritizes supporting the warfighter. We still have around 70,000 U.S. troops deployed in Afghanistan fighting the war. We need to make sure they have the equipment and support they need to do that. I believe this bill meets that mission.

This bill also recognizes the threats we face and adequately funds the need to meet those threats, most importantly, the threat from terrorist and nonstate actors like al Qaeda and their affiliates. We have strong support for the Special Operations Command as well as for intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance to make sure that we can continue to defeat the terrorist networks that would threaten us. Those are the top priorities.

We also make sure that our troops get the 1.7 percent pay raise they need and get the support for both the individual troops and for their families that are necessary to continue to serve us. We must always remember that we have an all-volunteer military. We are dependent upon the willingness of people to volunteer. We must make sure that we honor that service. We have done that, and we have done it quite well, to the point where we have the finest military the world has ever seen, and the support from this Congress is critical to maintaining that.

While there is much in this bill that I think is excellent and that I support, I will note just one caution as we go forward: Our bill is $8 billion over the Budget Control Act. It is over what the Senate is going to mark up. At some point, we are going to have to rationalize that and figure out how to make our national security strategy and our defense budget work in an era where our budgets are coming down.

We have a sizable deficit, and I believe it's critical that we put together a strategic plan and plan for the future. It's not enough to go year by year. We don't want to wake up 2 or 3 years from now and find out that we've funded more programs than we can afford to complete. We need a strategic vision, and we're going to have to work to get to that number and get to that cooperation with the Senate.

I also want to emphasize the importance of an amendment that I plan to offer that would change how we handle indefinite detention in military custody. I do not believe the executive branch should have that power to indefinitely detain or place in military custody people captured or arrested here in the U.S. I believe the United States Constitution and our due process system provides plenty of protections. We have arrested and convicted over 400 terrorists using that system. We have not used the indefinite detention in military custody power given to the President, and we have been able to protect ourselves. It's important that we protect the Constitution and that amendment is ruled in order, so I would hope that the full House would pass it.

I am very pleased with the bill. Again, I thank the chairman for his outstanding work in making sure that this bill supports the men and women in uniform who so bravely serve us. I believe it meets that objective. And I appreciate working with Mr. MCKEON, all of his staff, and all of the members of the committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to respond to my good friend, the ranking member, Mr. SMITH

from Washington. He's correct, we are $8 billion over the amount that was in the Deficit Reduction Act. In the budget the President submitted to us, it was $4 billion over. And we went about $3.7 billion above that. But in the overall budget that we will pass out of the House—and we did pass out of the House, under Budget Chairman RYAN—we increased the spending for defense due to the priorities that we feel are most important and the constitutional requirement that we have to provide for the common defense. But we will cut in other areas of the budget so that we comply fully with the Deficit Reduction Act.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee of Tactical Air and Land Forces, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT. I rise in support of H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I have the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee. Our jurisdiction includes approximately $65 billion of Department of Defense research, development, and procurement programs within the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

I want to first thank the subcommittee's ranking member, SILVESTRE REYES from Texas, and an incredible staff for their support in the hearing process and in completing the markup of this bill. Under the leadership of Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH, the committee effort is truly bipartisan.

The committee's focus is to support the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families, providing the equipment they need and the support they so deserve. Our first priority is providing the equipment to support our military personnel serving in Afghanistan and other areas where they may be under threat of hostile actions.

Over $2 billion in the President's budget request is recommended to be authorized to address urgent operational needs for the warfighter, to include counter-improvised explosive device requirements. An additional $500 million is provided for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account.

The committee bill sustains the Nation's heavy armored production base by maintaining minimum sustained production of upgrade modifications for Abrams tanks, Bradley fighting vehicles, and Hercules recovery vehicles. The Army's budget request would result in a production break of 3 to 4 years for the upgrade of these heavy-armored vehicles, which would negatively impact many small businesses.

The committee believes maintaining a minimum sustained production is a better alternative for taxpayer dollars than closing production lines and then paying to reopen the production lines years later. Minimum sustained production would also retain the valuable workforce and supplier base that would otherwise be lost and provide upgraded vehicles to the Army Heavy Brigade Combat teams.

The committee bill would also retain the Air Force's Global Hawk Block 30 unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft to support the deployed warfighter rather than placing these aircraft in storage, as the Air Force plan would do.

In addition the committee bill would fund over 150 helicopters of varying types for the Army and approximately 70 fighter aircraft of varying types for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their support in providing an excellent bill to support the men and women of our armed forces.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank our ranking member and my colleagues for their indulgence in letting me go a little out of turn here.

By most counts, the United States Department of Defense is the second largest organization in the world, behind only the rest of the United States Federal Government, if you took out the Department of Defense. It is the only organization of that size that doesn't have audited financial statements. So in an organization that spends over $500 billion a year, we cannot say to the taxpayers of our country with certainty exactly what is spent where, by whom, and for what.

My friend, Congressman MIKE CONAWAY from Texas, has made correction of this problem a special mission of his since he joined this institution. And I would like to thank him because he chaired a panel that Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH saw fit to appoint in this Congress to look at how to fix that problem. The solution to the problem, I think, is well on the way to being achieved. Secretary Panetta and Mr. Hale, who's the comptroller of the Pentagon, worked diligently on this and made it a very high priority. And the panel on which I was privileged to serve had voluminous hearings to find out the progress that we were making.

Suffice it to say that we are impatient—and we should be. But I do believe that the cooperative relationship between the panel created by the chairman and the ranking member and the Department of Defense is leading us to the day when we will have a clear-eyed assessment of exactly what is being spent on what, by whom, and when.

There will be an amendment, in all probability, offered later in this debate which would codify the deadline for reaching some of the milestones along that path. I will respectfully oppose that amendment because I think codification of this requirement will actually retard our progress rather than enhance it.

So I look forward to debate about all aspects of this bill. I'm proud to have supported the bill in the full committee markup.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the vice chairman of the Armed Service Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I commend Chairman MCKEON for his leadership in developing this bill throughout the course of the year and appreciate the working relationship that he and the ranking member have, as evidenced by the fact that this bill was reported out of committee by a vote of 56–5. And I certainly agree with the comments of Mr. ANDREWS. One of the bipartisan goals of this committee is to make sure the taxpayers get every dollar of value possible for the money we spend for defense, and that is a goal that I think we are making good progress toward.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to express special appreciation to the members of the staff of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, especially Mr. LANGEVIN, our ranking member.

To summarize that portion of the bill, I think one could do it in three parts. One is to support the people and missions of the U.S. Special Operations Command while also providing objective oversight of what they do. Special Operations Forces are at the forefront of protecting this country, but that also puts them at the forefront of a lot of legal and policy issues, and that makes communication between the Congress and the Special Operations Forces and their lawyers and other overseers especially important.

Secondly, our portion of the bill tries to sow and nurture the seeds of future capability, such as our science and technology programs. It's always tempting to cut research and development in tight budget times, but if you do that, then you are handicapping yourself from having the capability you need in the future.

And, thirdly, this mark tries to take several steps forward on oversight and policy in the critical new domain of warfare of cyber. Obviously, we have talked a lot about that in recent weeks on the floor of this House.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I just make the point that we have lots of problems around the world, but this bill comes to the floor in a time of war. So as we come with these various amendments that cut this, that, and the other thing, we all need to keep in mind that there are still people out there trying to kill as many Americans as they possibly can, as recent news reports reflect. We ought to be cautious about that.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the ranking member of the Tactical Air and Land Subcommittee.

Mr. REYES. I want to thank our chairman from California and the

ranking member for, again, leading the way in a bipartisan effort.

Although probably not a perfect bill, under the circumstances, with troops still deployed in war zones, I think a bipartisan agreement to this very important and critical legislation was reached. I especially want to thank my chairman, Chairman BARTLETT, for working and continuing the tradition of working on a bipartisan basis. I am pleased that our portion of H.R. 4310 supports, I believe, all the high-priority acquisition programs in the President's budget.

Some examples are: it fully funds the Army's Ground Combat Vehicle program at about $640 million. It provides $5.8 billion for Army helicopters, UAVs and other aviation platforms and upgrades. It also provides $1.6 billion for 21 V–22 Ospreys, which are a critical component of supporting our troops and their operations in Afghanistan today.

□ 1840

It further provides $2.2 billion for upgrading the Army's tactical communications network. It increases funding for the Abrams tanks by $181 million. It also increases funding for Bradley fighting vehicles by $140 million. And more than anything, it protects our industrial base at this pivotal and critical time to ensure that we don't lose the expertise and the quality workforce that we have in this country and all their capabilities.

But I guess the most important legislative provision in H.R. 4310 is legislation requiring the Air Force to continue to operate the Global Hawk Block 30 unmanned aerial system, which just reached operational capability in August of 2011. This is important because testimony before our committee underscores what we have known all along and in the 4 years I was chairman of the Intelligence Committee, that we have to continue to emphasize ISR capability. This legislation, H.R. 4310, holds the Air Force to its plan from last year to continue to operate both the Global Hawk and U–2 systems through 2014. So I ask all Members to support this critical piece of legislation.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership for the national defense of our country.

I rise in support of the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act. As you've heard, Mr. Chairman, this bill reflects a bipartisan effort to address the many issues impacting the readiness of our military.

This year's bill prohibits funding from being used to plan for another round of BRAC, which I believe would be founded on a flawed premise that assumes the administration's proposal for a reduced force structure is correct. I categorically refuse to accept a diminished Department of Defense and believe that additional force structure is necessary to support our combatant commanders.

We have also done our best to craft a bipartisan way forward on depot maintenance reform, returning the Nation to a long-standing balance between the public and private sectors. Although I will admit this bill is not all things to all people, we look forward to continuing to improve these portions of the bill in conference.

This bill also takes several steps to ensure our Navy readiness, including the restoration of funding to retain three Ticonderoga class guided missile cruisers that the Navy proposed to retire well before the end of their expected service life.

Finally, in this year's bill, we address the administration's efforts to reduce military and civilian workforce, while increasing its contractor full-time equivalents. By building upon last year's effort to direct the DOD to create a policy for total force management, we direct GAO, in this year's bill, to provide their assessment of what measures DOD is taking to appropriately balance its current and future workforce structure against its requirements.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of the Armed Services Committee, especially my Readiness Subcommittee ranking member, Ms. BORDALLO, for their help in providing the unyielding support for the men and women who so heavily rely on our efforts, and our staff who work tirelessly to produce this product.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), the ranking member on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for the time, and I also want to thank Mr. TURNER, our chairman on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, for his leadership, and all of the members who work on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee for all of their work and contributions to this year's mark.

I think that there are a lot of issue areas that we can agree upon, especially in the Strategic Forces Committee, to make our Nation stronger and to really look after our nuclear arsenal.

I think there are particular provisions that I really like in this bill, for example, the cost effective and accountability on some of these things. And supporting nuclear nonproliferation, for example, is a very important issue, and I think this bill does a good job on that. Maintaining a safe and secure and reliable nuclear arsenal, I think that is also important. Fully authorizing the environmental cleanup that we have to do related to these activities, that is also included in this bill. Increasing the regional missile defense systems that we have that protect our troops when they are, for example, in Europe, when they're deployed, and also our allies for the short- and medium-range missile attacks that might happen, protecting long-term and cost-effective investments in our military space assets, these are all areas that we have agreed upon.

However, I am extremely concerned about some of the other issue areas where we do not agree. For example, provisions that impede nuclear weapons reductions, I think that is incredibly important to allow the administration to move forward, not only with New START Treaty, but also to look at other ways in which we can bring down our arsenal if we don't need it.

The governance and management reforms that will undermine independent oversight related to health and safety, including nuclear safety.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank my ranking member.

These are very important to our people who work in this arena. What is their safety going to be when they're working with nuclear weapons in the complexes that we have? I think that the standards and the way, the management way that the Republicans like to do are going to probably cause some inconsistent standards in protecting our workers—and risk people's lives, quite frankly.

Increasing funding for nuclear weapons by more than $400 million over the President's budget request when our own Pentagon didn't want that, or increasing funding for the ground-based midcourse defense program by over $350 million while there are still test failures going out, when we have had 9 of 17 tests fail on us, then I don't think we should be continuing to invest in the same system. We should look and try to take care and find out what went wrong.

I look forward to trying to work these things out in the conference.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. I thank Chairman MCKEON.

Mr. Chairman, much of this bill is totally bipartisan. Two important provisions relate to missile defense and our nuclear weapons infrastructure modernization. Let me talk briefly about those two.

The first, in this bill we restore the funding for our national missile defense system, the budget for which the President has repeatedly slashed. This bill also sets up a third missile defense site for the east coast, adding another layer to homeland defense.

The bill fully funds the nuclear modernization program that President Obama promised when he sought ratification of the New START Treaty. National security demands Members make a choice—fully fund modernization or don't implement New START.

Also a focus of this bill is reform of the National Nuclear Security Administration. If we didn't strike the right balance after several bipartisan sessions and hearings Ms. SÁNCHEZ and I convened, we have a long process ahead of us to work to get it right.

As the National Academies, Strategic Posture Commission, and others have found, NNSA is, quite simply, broken and cannot afford to be left unfixed. I am absolutely committed to working with the minority and the administration to ensure a more efficient NNSA that has the nuclear deterrent and safety as unchallenged priorities. I look forward to an administration proposal on the subject.

I thank the gentlelady from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), our ranking member, for her support, leadership, and contributions to our process thus far this year. I want to thank Chairman MCKEON for his leadership.

Nuclear weapons and missile defense are two very important issues for the safety and security of our Nation. Our subcommittee has taken a strong commitment to these, and we look forward to this bill moving forward to the Senate as we try to strengthen both our missile defense capability and our nuclear deterrent.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. DAVIS) ranking member on the Personnel Subcommittee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their leadership, and Chairman WILSON for making our subcommittee work a bipartisan effort. I also want to thank the staff for producing this important piece of legislation.

I am pleased the bill includes provisions that are important to our men and women in uniform, such as a 1.7 percent pay raise, improvements and additional efforts to combat sexual assault, transition assistance for members leaving the service, and Impact Aid funding for our military children.

However, I am concerned because the majority on this committee adopted several amendments that distract from the wonderful work that we have done. Two provisions deal with gays in the military. The first would prohibit same-sex marriage ceremonies from being performed on military installations.

□ 1850

Mr. Chairman, we already had this debate, and the American people support gays and lesbians openly serving in our military. Denying a servicemember the ability to use a military facility to hold a ceremony that others have access to is wrong and it's discriminatory. But most importantly, that ceremony would not be in violation of DOMA because DOMA only states that a marriage is between a man and a woman. It literally does not say anything else.

The second provision that was passed in committee is even more troubling to me. This provision would seek to protect the religious beliefs of chaplains and servicemembers. The issue of protecting the religious beliefs of chaplains was already addressed last year, and the law on this is very clear:

A military chaplain who, as a matter of conscience or moral principle, does not wish to perform a marriage may not be required to do so.

So this really comes down to protecting discriminatory acts against gays and lesbians in uniform, which is contrary to the military core values of good order and discipline. I hope we can resolve this issue in a way that does not allow discrimination against a group of servicemembers based solely on their sexual orientation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. The other issue I want to raise—and several of my colleagues have raised this already—is the fact that this bill is $8 billion over the Budget Control Act. While we made a number of decisions to restore cuts from the President's budget, we will need to resolve this difference at some point, and this means that programs will need to be cut. My hope is that the pay and benefits of our brave men and women will not be the bill-payer when we must reduce spending in this bill.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. I'd like to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their leadership in moving H.R. 4310, the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act, as it overwhelmingly passed the House Armed Services Committee.

The provisions of this bill aptly demonstrate our collective commitment to our Nation's heroes—the men and women of our armed services who sacrifice so much each and every day for all of us. I've seen their efforts firsthand, having the opportunity to travel five times to Afghanistan, and I recently had the opportunity to visit wounded warriors in Bethesda and Balboa. Each visit reinforces how much this Nation owes the members of our all-volunteer force. Against this backdrop, I have worked to ensure that decisions made in Congress fulfill the appropriate oversight role in taking care of our troops and veterans and securing our Nation's defense.

The bill before us today lives up to those solemn commitments. In particular, this bill blocks the proposed increase in TRICARE fees proposed by the administration. The administration's proposal places an unconscionable burden on our oldest and most vulnerable veterans by increasing their fees by 345 percent over a 10-year period. The bill recognizes our budgetary limits, but also keeps faith with America's veterans and servicemembers.

This bill ensures that as we consider transition in Afghanistan, we adequately understand associated risks. Based on the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee findings, this bill calls for periodic assessments of the factors resulting in such trends and the effectiveness of transfer agreements we've negotiated with foreign countries. This bill, through an amendment, also requires an assessment focused on similar trends for the Parwan Detention Facility in Afghanistan.

Finally, this bill helps to preserve our Nation's maritime dominance by authorizing new construction of up to 10 destroyers and up to 10 submarines, as well as preventing early retirement of three cruisers. These assets will provide for our common defense, ensure we have the necessary resources for our strategic pivot to the Asia-Pacific, and help to maintain a healthy shipbuilding industrial base.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, can you give us an update on the time left on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 17 minutes, and the gentleman from California has 14½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the ranking member on the Emerging Threats Subcommittee.

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, Chairman THORNBERRY, and the members of the committee, as well as the staff, for their efforts in crafting this year's bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act, which affirms our commitment to the dedicated men and women of our military, the infrastructure that enables their efforts, and the research and development required to maintain our technological edge.

I am particularly pleased that H.R. 4310 includes provisions I advocated to prevent the proposed cut in the production of the peerless Virginia-class submarines. These electric boats—which are critical to our national security and built in my district through Quonset/Davisville by the hardworking men and women that work there—are being built ahead of schedule and under budget. This bill preserves the two-boat-per-year model that has enabled such great efficiencies.

I would also like to note the inclusion of my amendment to accelerate

the deployment of the most promising directed-energy initiatives. Just recently, the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments issued a report that clearly showed that many directed energy technologies have matured to the point that ''cultural factors and the lack of resources, not technological maturity'' are the most significant barriers to operational deployment. These technologies have the potential to fundamentally shift how our military operates in the complex environments of the future and enables DOD's objectives of a ''smaller, lighter, more agile, flexible joint force that can conduct a full range of military activities.''

Additionally, this legislation prioritizes and supports the Department's cybersecurity and IT efforts. Cyber has long been a chief focus of mine; and while I'm encouraged that this legislation continues to address this critical issue, much remains to be done. FBI Director Mueller has said that cybersecurity could soon be more of a threat than terrorism, yet our Federal Government still lacks a single point of accountability for cybersecurity, and our critical infrastructure lacks many basic protections.

I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will allow floor consideration of two amendments I offered that would enable a comprehensive approach to cybersecurity across the government and secure the infrastructure on which our military and our Nation depend.

On balance, this is a good bill. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work, as well as the staff.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHILLING).

Mr. SCHILLING. I'd like to thank Chairman BUCK MCKEON for his hard work and dedication to getting this put together, and all of the staff members.

I rise today in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. This bill shows our support for our troops and allows them to continue their mission in defending our country. We are facing difficult fiscal choices, but we must not penalize our brave men and women who are in harm's way.

I am particularly supportive of how this bill supports small businesses that contract with the Department of Defense, our organic base that ensures our soldiers are equipped and ensures that those who would do harm to our Nation are not allowed within its borders. I am also pleased that it will provide insight on how TRICARE can be better suited to the needs of the children of our warfighters, and that it will provide more flexibility for the DOD to bring our soldiers who are missing in action home from previous conflicts.

I am privileged to represent the Rock Island Arsenal in the Illinois 17th District. These hardworking men and women support our warfighters with the tools they need to accomplish their goals and missions. I look forward to continuing my work on the House Armed Services Committee with my colleagues to ensure that our organic base is ready and able to respond when our warfighters need them.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill and pass it for the 51st year in a row.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to highlight the Defense Business Panel's work over the past 6 months and discuss our proposals for a series of procurement, contracting, and export control reforms that seek to help small and medium-sized businesses access the nearly $400 billion-a-year defense market.

Burdensome regulations and arcane auditing requirements are driving many companies to quit the defense market and are deterring new suppliers from entering the market. I am pleased that many of the bipartisan recommendations from the Defense Business Panel's report, ''Challenges to Doing Business with the Department of Defense,'' have made it into this year's National Defense Authorization Act and have received overwhelming support by the HASC committee members.

To ensure the Pentagon uses small businesses more, the FY13 NDAA requires the Department of Defense to award 25 percent of the total value of all prime contracts each year to small businesses. The panel heard from many companies around the Nation about how to modernize our export control regime. Tomorrow we may be debating an amendment that would grant the administration authority to remove commercial satellites and components from the Munitions List to the Commerce Control List. I would strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1900

The panel focused on the steps that can be taken to commercialize innovative products that originate from small businesses. This year's NDAA will restore 1 percent funding for expenses for the commercialization and readiness program and will require program offices to import SBIR Phase 2 programs into programs of record, when appropriate.

We accomplished much to help small businesses over the panel's 6 months of work, but we've only scratched the surface. More can be done to help small businesses contract with the DOD, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to implement these changes.

Finally, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), who is the chairman of this panel, for his leadership, and the chairman of the full committee and ranking member, Mr. MCKEON and Mr. SMITH, for appointing the panel.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST), my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee, and a man who has led troops in battle.

Mr. WEST. Thank you, Chairman MCKEON, and thank you, Ranking Member SMITH.

I stand today to offer my support for H.R. 4310, Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act.

To echo the comments of my colleague from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), I am very happy to see that the recommendations from the Defense Business Panel will be included in this legislation because we have to streamline our processing and our contracting opportunities as well for our small businesses.

I'm also very happy to know that the End Strength Reduction Act was included in this legislation to make sure that we have the proper procedures in tearing down the reduction of our forces, and making sure we periodically go back and reassess our national security objectives to make sure that our end strength of our military meets those objectives.

I'm also very pleased to know that we continue to protect the well-earned TRICARE health care benefits for our veterans and for military retirees, staying away from the tripling of those health care rates. We will continue to index that toward the COLA.

We will continue to provide for the proper support of our military families and their children and the programs on our installations.

But most importantly, I am very happy to know that we will continue to resource our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, and our Marines, because as we are standing here today debating this piece of legislation, someone is out there being the watchman on the wall. Someone is out there about to go on a patrol, and they are trusting and depending upon us to do the right thing through the amendment process of this legislation to ensure that they are given the resources so they can provide victory and once again provide for the common defense of this great Nation.

We must make sure that our military cannot be seen as a bill payer for fiscal irresponsibility. And the most important thing is, when you look at our track record for predicting the next conflict, it is not a good track record.

We must make sure that we do not destroy our military and decimate its capabilities and capacities while we're trying to rectify the fiscal situation here. Let's stay focused on our primary responsibility of providing for the common defense.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), the ranking member on the Seapower Subcommittee.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the Seapower

and Projection Forces Subcommittee, I want to thank Chairman AKIN for his hard work in helping our subcommittee put together our portion of the FY 13 National Defense Authorization Act. Throughout the process, there was a strong bipartisan effort to deliver what is truly needed by our men and women in uniform.

There are a number of provisions with which I'm particularly pleased: The multiyear procurement authority for up to 10 Virginia Class attack submarines. This provision also gives incremental funding authority and restores advance procurement in FY 13 that will allow the Navy to procure a second Virginia class submarine in FY 13.

Also, the multiyear procurement authority for up to 10 DDG–51 Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers and the extension of the Ford-Class Aircraft Carrier incremental funding from 5 years to 6 years.

The bill also contains several Littoral Combat Ship provisions. However, I want to be clear that these provisions do not indicate that the subcommittee no longer supports the LCS program. These provisions simply ask the Navy to update the subcommittee on the program's status, and ask the GAO to analyze the program and ensure that any issues that previously have occurred will have been addressed and corrected. This will provide the Navy the opportunity to address any and all concerns that may still exist.

I want to thank our committee for its hard work, Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their excellent work and leadership. I also want to thank the HASC staff, Tom MacKenzie, Heath Bope, Phil MacNaughton and Emily Waterlander, and the personal staff, Justin Johnson, Blair Milligan and Kaitlin Helms, for their efforts and expertise throughout this authorization process.

This is a bill we could and ought to support, and stand up for our men and women in uniform. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), my friend and colleague and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership on behalf of the military families, servicemembers, and veterans of our country.

The Military Personnel titles of the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act are a product of an open, bipartisan process. These personnel titles provide our warfighters, veterans, and military families the care and support they deserve, additionally ensuring that proposed drawdown plans do not cut to the heart of the Army and Marine Corps.

Specifically, this year's proposal will first authorize a troop pay increase of 1.7 percent, and extend bonuses and special pay; additionally, limit the end strength reduction for the active Army and Marine Corps; also provide significant new regulations for combating sexual assault within the military, and extend access to family housing and commissary and exchange benefits for troops who are involuntarily separated.

Additionally, we will extend some TRICARE benefits to members of the Selected Reserve who are involuntarily separated. And finally, make clear that the nonmilitary contributions to health care benefits through a career of service represent prepayment of health care premiums in retirement.

In conclusion, I want to thank Ranking Member Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS and her staff for her contributions in this process. We are joined, of course, by dedicated members of the subcommittee. Their recommendations are clearly reflected in this mark.

Finally, I want to appreciate the service and dedication of the subcommittee majority staff, John Chapla, Debra Wada, Jeanette James, Mike Higgins, Craig Greene and Jim Weiss, along with my military legislative assistant, Chad Sydnor, and Military Fellow, Marine Master Gunnery Sergeant Michelle King.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4310.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), the ranking member of the Readiness Subcommittee.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the defense authorization bill for FY13. The underlying legislation continues to make sure that our men and women in uniform are provided with the resources to be well trained and equipped.

Although the war in Iraq is over and we begin a drawdown of the surge forces in Afghanistan, we continue to face challenges with our readiness. The bill supports the Department's reset efforts, which are important to addressing readiness challenges in our global commands, particularly in the U.S. Pacific Command.

The bill provides authorization for more than $11 billion in funding for military construction projects, including family housing. And our bill does not authorize an unwarranted round of base closures and realignments.

The bill also continues this committee's support for the realignment of military forces in the Pacific, including the military buildup on Guam. As we refocus on the Asia-Pacific region, our bill makes efforts to remove restrictions that are impeding the DOD's ability to move forward with the realignment. The revised agreement between the United States and Japan is a step in the right direction, and our bill helps move that effort forward.

I'm greatly concerned by amendments that were adopted at Full Committee markup that roll back efforts by DOD to invest in biofuels. This investment is needed for our long-term security needs, both operationally and at military installations across the world. The cost of traditional fields has skyrocketed, and those increased costs are eating away at readiness requirements. We need to make the investment in alternative fuels now, in order to free the Department from the shackle of foreign fossil fuels in the future.

I strongly support the bill's prohibition on the retirement of the Global Hawk aircraft. The Global Hawk is a critical ISR asset, and the Air Force rationale for wanting to retire this aircraft and continue flying on aging aircraft for the foreseeable future was lacking. As we refocus to the Asia-Pacific region, commanders in the AOR need more ISR assets, not less. I'm glad we keep the Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft flying.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

□ 1910

Ms. BORDALLO. Again, Mr. Chairman, along these lines, I believe the bill takes important steps to protect the Air National Guard from unwarranted cuts in mission realignments. I appreciate that the bill does not increase most TRICARE fees and copays and that it prohibits the department from implementing new fees.

I want to thank Chairman FORBES for his strong partnership on the Readiness Subcommittee and also to thank members of the staff.

Again, I support the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the measure as well.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for working so diligently with me to protect the civil liberties that we enjoy so much in our country.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate the protection of these civil liberties in this bill, we need to ask ourselves: What are we trying to provide? We must protect every citizen's basic due process rights. What are those basic due process rights?

Specifically, it would be the right to notice, the opportunity to be heard, the right to a neutral forum, the right to counsel when before the court, and the right to an appeal. Some of my colleagues are proposing the creation of additional rights. Doing so does not further protect us under the Constitution nor does it further the protections of our constituents.

They say we must allow foreign terrorists captured domestically to be tried in criminal court, enveloping them with all of the protections granted to civil criminals. It gives them access to our national security intelligence that ordinary Americans currently are denied. We incentivize them to come to America. The base text of

the bill makes it clear and precise that anyone detained is afforded access to the basic rights of due process that I mentioned earlier. Therefore, those basic rights are now enshrined.

I urge Members to support the underlying bill, accompanied by the Gohmert-Landry-Rigell amendment, and to oppose any other attempts to create additional rights for foreign terrorists.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

There are no additional rights contained in this amendment. We have the rights that are in the Constitution that are the due process. The gentleman's comment that additional rights are being granted by this is patently false. The Constitution is clear. It provides all persons in the United States the same rights. All we are doing is going back to the Constitution and repealing the authority of the President to circumvent those rights and reduce them. That's a very critical point that we will talk further about tomorrow.

I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman.

Yesterday, we debated H. Res. 568, which draws a red line for military action at Iran's achieving a nuclear weapons ''capability,'' a nebulous and undefined term that could include a civilian nuclear program. As a result, the language in that bill makes a negotiated solution impossible.

Now, this bill, H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act, in section 1221 makes military action against Iran a U.S. policy. Right in the bill, it talks about deployments and military action. To create a plan, under article B of section 1222, it says that the Secretary of Defense shall prepare a plan for the Fifth Fleet to conduct military deployments. In section A of article II, it says that there should be prepositioning, sufficient supplies of aircraft, munitions—bombs, fuel, and other materials—for both air- and sea-based missions against Iran. So that sets the stage for war. Then section B calls for an execution of the war, bolstering United States' capabilities to launch a sustained sea and air campaign against a range of Iranian nuclear and military targets.

They're not threatening us. We're threatening them with this. Then we call for a showdown in the Strait of Hormuz in section C.

Now look. We've been through this before. I led this Congress in October of 2002 to challenge the Bush administration's march towards war against Iraq, and it proved that it was wrong to do that. There were no weapons of mass destruction. This is Iraq all over again, and we should at least have a separate debate on whether or not we should be recommending an attack on Iran without including it in this bill.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of section 552 of H.R. 4310. In fact, I rise in favor of the entire National Defense Authorization Act but specifically of this provision which justly awards the victims of Fort Hood and the Arkansas recruiting station shootings with the Purple Heart.

Mr. Chairman, I have the distinct honor of representing Fort Hood, Texas. We call it the ''Great Place.'' The day after the attack at Fort Hood, I was there. At that point in time, I began working on legislation to award combat status to the victims so that they could all receive the appropriate benefits that they deserve.

The shootings at Fort Hood and in Little Rock left 14 dead and 44 wounded. These soldiers were at a deployment processing center in Fort Hood and at a recruiting station in Arkansas when they were fired upon. Many of them at Fort Hood were getting ready to go to war or were returning from war for the reassignment to other assignments. In my opinion, the shooters extended the battlefield from Iraq and Afghanistan to Fort Hood and Little Rock in order to claim their targets before they reached their destinations in Iraq or Afghanistan.

While I am pleased to see the victims receive the Purple Heart, we should continue to work towards awarding the victims combat status and the appropriate recognition that they may deserve, including recognizing the civilians who were killed. But make no mistake, at Fort Hood, they targeted soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I ask my colleagues to support this language but to continue to work towards awarding combat status for the victims as well. This is a bipartisan issue. I am very grateful to Chairman KING for getting on board with this issue and for driving the force, as are all of our soldiers, and I am very grateful for the bipartisan consideration this concept had on both sides of the aisle. I support the National Defense Authorization Act. It is good for our country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. To the ranking member and the chair of the committee, thank you for a long slog of hard work and for the production of a bill that has much good in it.

Certainly, we have to provide for our military. We need a strong, agile, smart, and deadly national defense program. That's certainly in this bill. We also need to provide for our soldiers—for the men and women—and those who serve this country, and that's in this bill. The issue of those who have served and who have come home remains an issue that we'll probably take up in other legislation.

Provisions in the bill also provide for the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance necessary for us to be smart, and the bill provides for us to be agile in air mobility. Those are good things. However, there are many parts of this bill that I find objectionable, which has led to my ''no'' vote on this legislation. Let me quickly list those:

Certainly, we've already talked about, here on the floor, the issue of due process. It needs to be addressed, and I want to congratulate the ranking member of the committee for his work in developing a very good proposal that deals with the due process issue, which provides that every person in this country has full access to the civil liberties in the Constitution;

The Afghanistan war is not taken care of in this bill. In fact, there are provisions in this bill that, in all likelihood, would increase the number of soldiers in Afghanistan by some 20,000 and leave them there in perpetuity. We cannot do this. We've got to bring this war to an end very, very quickly, and the bill does not go in that direction. In fact, it goes in the opposite direction. We just heard a discussion about Iran, and I will simply second that portion of the bill as being out of place and incorrect;

There are also things in this bill that are a vast waste of money: missile defense on the east coast, a missile system that doesn't work to protect us from a nonexistent threat. Why would you spend $100 million this year and up to $5 million to $7 million in the succeeding 2 years? We ought not do that;

Some things are also to be found at home. The Lawrence Livermore Labs need to be protected.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1920

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time that is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. Does the gentleman have further speakers?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. We do not have further speakers at this point, and I believe we're prepared to close.

Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, I want to again thank the chairman and thank the folks who worked on this bill. As you see from the debate, there are a lot of controversial issues that wound up in this bill, issues of enormous importance, from our policy towards countries like Afghanistan and Iran, to civil liberties and on. It takes a great deal of work on behalf of the staff and a great deal of commitment to a bipartisan spirit to work through that, have fair debates, have the votes, carry on, and always remember that underlying it all is

making sure that we fund the defense of this country, and we fund the troops who are tasked with protecting it. I think our committee and our staff do an outstanding job of dealing with those challenges.

I want to talk again about the indefinite-detention issue. The gentleman who spoke a couple of minutes ago raised some concerns, and I think it gives us a pretty good preview of what some of the opposition to that amendment is going to be tomorrow. I just want to counter those arguments.

The first notion that ''additional rights'' are being granted as a result of this is quite simply absurd. What this says is: the due process that's in the Constitution is what you get if you are arrested. What we have done in this body is empowered the President to get rid of those rights in certain cases and indefinitely detain people without charge in many instances and without trial. What we're saying is that it is an enormous amount of power to grant the Executive, and it is not necessary. President Bush did not use that authority for the last 5 years he was in the administration, President Obama has not used it, and yet we have protected this country. To give away that basic due-process right, if you are arrested—that you have the basic rights in the Constitution—is no small thing, and it is not necessary.

Lastly, I want to talk about this argument that somehow this will incentivize terrorists to come to the U.S. I've heard a lot of arguments. That has got to be the dumbest one I've ever heard. First of all, it is sad to say there are many terrorists affiliated with al Qaeda who are trying very hard to come here and inflict harm on us right now. That's why we have all kinds of efforts in this bill and in Homeland Security to stop them. They are not going to become any less incentivized to do that whether this bill passes or not. Sadly, we must deal with that.

Second of all, they are certainly not going to want to come here and operate as opposed to operating in someplace outside of the U.S. where we don't have as much reach. That argument has nothing to do with this amendment. This is a very straightforward argument I think we should have. Is this a power that the President needs to have to keep us safe? It is not. It is undeniably an enormous amount of power to go outside of the Constitution, to go outside of due process, and empower the executive branch to indefinitely detain somebody without the due process that we've developed over the course of 230 years. That is an enormous step for this Congress to take.

We have to ask ourselves the question: Is it necessary? It clearly is not. We have arrested, prosecuted, and stopped countless terrorist attacks over the course of the last 8 years. Over 400 terrorists were arrested, convicted, and imprisoned in this country, such as Abjulmutallab, who was the underwear bomber in Detroit in December of 2008. He was stopped, arrested, interrogated, prosecuted, convicted, and sentenced to life in prison.

We have a justice system and a law enforcement system in this country that is more than adequate to meet the threat. We do not have to undermine the Constitution to do that. That will be the core of the argument. I look forward to those who are opposed to it arguing why that doesn't keep us safe. I think it will be a great debate, and I'll urge people to vote for it. But I hope we'll have that public debate on the floor tomorrow. It is an incredibly important issue no matter which side of it you're on. It is an important issue that is worthy of this full House having a full and robust debate, and I look forward to doing that tomorrow.

Again, I recognize all of the important things that are in this bill. I'm confident when we come to the amendment process, we will have a bill worthy of support of this House, and I will then urge Members to support it so we can fund the defense of this country and fund the brave men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces, and make sure they have all the support they need to do what we ask them to do in defending this country.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of work done on this bill, and I want to thank my ranking member—my partner in this effort—and all of the staff who have put in countless hours to get us to this point for the work that they have done.

As you can see from the opening debate, we have many things that we agree on and some things that we disagree on. I feel good about that because I once heard that if two people agree on everything, one of them is an idiot. I think that there will be things that we have honest disagreements on, and we'll have much to talk about tomorrow. And I'm sure we'll have many hours to do that.

Mr. Chairman, for the second year, there have been misconceptions raised by the ACLU and others relating to last year's provision dealing with the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force. In 2012, we affirmed that the President is authorized to detain certain belligerents who are part of or substantially supporting al Qaeda, the Taliban, or associated forces. This interpretation was not a new creation. It has been used by both the Bush and Obama administrations and has been upheld by our Federal courts.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board has described the NDAA's affirmation as a ''modest law.'' Former Attorneys General Meese and Mukasey have noted that:

> Given the continuing threat posed by groups like al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, the affirmation was a critical step in reinforcing the military's legal authorities to combat terror.

Importantly, at no point did last year's bill detract from the rights of U.S. citizens. No one could possibly be in favor of the unlawful detention of innocent American citizens. And nothing could be further from the aim of the NDAA, which was to reinforce the protection of American citizens from terrorist attacks. While we felt confident that the NDAA in no way impacted this issue, we took the feedback we received seriously and analyzed the issue. In particular, I worked very closely with my colleague, Chairman SMITH of the Judiciary Committee, as well as numerous outside experts and former U.S. Government officials.

In acknowledgement of the concerns that have been raised, we felt that it was important in this year's bill to explicitly reaffirm that anybody detained in the United States, pursuant to the AUMF, can challenge the lawfulness of their detention in U.S. Federal court. The great writ of habeas corpus is a citizen's most fundamental protection against any unlawful depravation of liberty.

Some want to go further and have this bill prohibit military detention and interrogation of foreign terrorists in the United States. And for all the blood and treasure we have spent taking the fight to the enemy to prevent terrorists from coming to the United States, I find this astonishing. Why would we weaken our ability to fight foreign terrorists here at home? Why would we take lawful options off the table for our national security officials? We must not forget that it is, in fact, foreign terrorist organizations like the al Qaeda of the Arabian Peninsula who would like nothing more than to deprive us our life and liberty. We must have all lawful options available to us in order to effectively dismantle and defeat them.

My understanding is that the Rules Committee is meeting as we speak. There have been, I think, about 240 amendments submitted to be debated on the bill. Last year, I think they approved 150. I don't know how many or what amendments will be approved. We'll find that out as we go through the evening and tomorrow. But I know that we will have a good and healthy debate; and at the end of the day, the important thing that we must remember is that this committee's responsibility is to look out for the common defense of this Nation. We do so by supporting our troops, those who were on the battlefield and those who are stationed in various places around the world. We must see that they have everything they need to carry out their missions and to return home safely to their loved ones and that their loved ones that are left behind are given the things that they need, the support that they need to continue to support their loved ones who are out fighting for our freedoms.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the debate tomorrow. I encourage all the Members of our conference and our colleagues in the Congress to support this very important bill to help them carry out that important mission.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.*

Hon. HOWARD ''BUCK'' MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Budget Committee takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4310 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.*

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' MCKEON,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.*

Hon. HOWARD ''BUCK'' MCKEON,
*Chairman. Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in matters being considered in H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4310 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over certain sections of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House. I also ask that you support my request to name members of this committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.*

Hon. PETER KING,
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' MCKEON,
*Chairman.*

□ 1930

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## AN ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY STRATEGY

(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. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has often claimed that we have 2 percent of the world's proven oil reserves, which is nothing but an excuse for inaction when developing American-made energy. As The Washington Post's fact-checkers noted, the President's claim is ''true, but false.'' False because ''proven oil reserves'' is only one category of oil, a fraction of the overall oil in the ground. ''Proven reserves'' refers to amounts of oil where seismic studies have identified available resources.

Due to the long Presidential and congressional bans on Outer Continental Shelf development, the inventory of resources has not been tracked in over 30 years. The U.S. Geological Survey and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management estimate the U.S. has a 16 percent share of the world's undiscovered, technically recoverable, conventional oil resources. The Middle East also has a 16 percent share.

Rather than saying what we can't do, the President should be doing more to facilitate the safe discovery and development of U.S. resources.

Mr. Speaker, the President says he supports ''an all-of-the-above strategy for the 21st century that develops every source of American-made energy.'' The question now is whether he is willing to prove it.

## DOMESTIC OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I will be joined during this hour by my good friend and colleague from California, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI.

I would like to just begin this discussion on oil prices by recalling that in 2008, the constant refrain that was heard in this Chamber over and over again was ''Drill, baby, drill'' by my colleagues on the Republican side. And the good news is that's precisely what we've done. In fact, in USA Today, Citigroup analysts are quoted as saying in a recent report, Energy independence ''is no pipe dream. The U.S. is already the world's fastest-growing oil and natural gas producer. Counting the output from Canada and Mexico, North America is 'the new Middle East.' ''

So it's interesting to note that as much as we've been wringing our hands, there is oil being produced here in the United States. In fact, a lot of oil is being produced in the United States. And we're going to go over a few charts now to show how, in fact, things are looking a little bit better.

This first chart really shows what happened with oil production. When George Bush was still the President of the United States, the price of gas hit $4.10 a gallon. It was very high. And then gas prices hit rock bottom when President Obama took office because of the global financial crisis that hit. When President Obama took office, there were fewer than 400 oil rigs operating in the United States, falling below 200 rigs by mid 2009. Then, despite safety reviews after the BP spill, oil rigs operating in the United States quadrupled over the next 3 years. There are now more than 1,300—I repeat that, 1,300—oil rigs operating in the United States, more than all operational oil drilling in the rest of the world combined.

So in the last 3 years of the Bush administration, we were producing 1.78 billion barrels of oil; but in the first 3

years of the Obama, we have already produced 2 billion barrels of oil. The U.S. oil production has continued to increase under President Obama and is now at an 8-year high.

Jim Burkhard, who is Cambridge Energy Research Associates managing director, said in Senate testimony in February of this year, ''A 'great revival' in U.S. oil production is taking shape.''

So for all the hand-wringing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, talking about what isn't being done, the truth is a lot is being done, and we now have more oil rigs operating in the United States—some 1,300—than all the other places in the world combined.

BP projects that the U.S. will get 94 percent of its energy domestically by the year 2030. That's going to be a huge benefit for all of us. Economists at Citigroup argue that North America can be energy independent by 2020. That's only 8 years away. We could be energy independent by 2020. Citigroup says, if that happens, we will create 3.6 million new jobs, and we will see the unemployment rate cut by 2 percent.

An interesting example is that of North Dakota. Do you know what the unemployment rate is in North Dakota today? It's 3 percent. In California, it's 11 percent. In North Dakota, it's 3 percent. And North Dakota can now boast having the lowest unemployment rate in the country, and it is now the fourth-largest oil producer in the country as well.

So we create new jobs. We reignite manufacturing and chemical businesses. And guess what. American families see a lot of savings, too. In fact, the price of natural gas has dropped substantially. And if we keep going the way we're going, it will drop some 80 percent, giving the American family a $926 a year savings.

Georgia Power is another great example. Their fuel costs dropped 19 percent. And guess what. All of their utility customers saw a decrease in their electrical costs, in their utility bills, by some 6 percent. So there is some good news in all of that.

The second chart looks at U.S. oil production versus gas volatility. World market factors are really driving up oil prices. And if you look at this particular chart, you see that the oil production stays pretty much the same. It goes up a little bit in 2010, as you can see; but, for the most part, it stays pretty consistent. But what does change and changes dramatically up and down, as if you are reading an EKG, is the price of gas in this country. So gas prices are going up and down irrespective of the production of oil.

The Associated Press conducted an investigation over the past 36 years of U.S. oil production and gas prices and found that there is no statistical correlation between how much oil comes out of U.S. wells and the price at the pump. More U.S. drilling has not changed how deeply the gas pump drills into your wallet, and we know that.

□ 1940

The price of oil is determined on a global market. More oil production in the United States does not mean consistently lower prices at the pump. However, if we become less dependent on foreign oil, we will see some dramatic shifts take place in the country.

So why does more drilling have so little effect on gas prices? The answer is because oil is a global commodity. The United States owns less than 2 percent of the global reserves and pays the same world market price that everyone else does.

So, with that, let me introduce my good friend, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, from the great area of Sacramento and the Valley.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SPEIER, and thank you for bringing this very, very important issue to the attention of the American public this evening as we spend this hour talking about gas prices in the United States.

I was really struck by the charts that you put up. Wow. But they tell us that the story is we don't pump oil in America. Not so. We do. We really do. And they tell us that we're going in the wrong direction. But if you take a look at those charts, we're actually producing more and more energy. Today, in the Resources Committee, on which I have the honor of sitting, we had a debate about this. And our Republican colleagues were saying that we're not producing as much. And so we show them the energy institute's statistics, and they say they're wrong. That's an independent agency and they collect the statistics, and in fact they're right. And your charts clearly pointed out that we are in fact making it in America.

This is my favorite chart. This is what I'm often on the floor talking about: Manufacturing in America and making it in America. It's not often that we take this subject of making our energy in America, building an American energy machine, one that will supply the energy that our Nation needs to meet a growing economy and the needs of our society.

So very, very much what we're talking about here is making it in America. There are so many different pieces to this. I'm going to just bring up two of those, and then we'll carry on our dialogue here.

First of all, conservation. I think you're going to talk about this a little later—about automobile conservation, the gasoline in automobiles, which is very, very important, but there's so much other conservation that we must be doing in housing, in commercial buildings, in this building. This building is over 150 years old. We've got serious lack of energy conservation here within the Nation's Capitol.

But if we carry on a major effort on conservation, we will reduce our expenses and simultaneously make the available energy—the energy that is currently available—much more widely available and at a lower cost because of the market forces. So conservation is absolutely critical not only in oil and gas but in all of the other energy that we consume in this Nation.

Now the second thing, and then I'll circle back around quickly, is what I call substitution. We can substitute energy forms for oil, and in doing so, increase our domestic availability for oil—and that's diesel and gasoline. And in the substitution we also reduce our importation of oil. So substitution is really important.

So what is substitution? Well, substitution is going electric. We can go to electric cars, go to hybrids, which are a combination of electric and gasoline. There are many different ways on the transportation sector. But oil is also used in the production of electricity. Natural gas is the big thing today, and it is a wonderful substitution for coal. And we'll come back to that.

Finally, biofuels. The point I want to do here leads me to this little chart that I've used before, and it talks about where your tax money is going. Where is your tax money going? Well, I'll tell you that about $5 billion of your tax money every year goes to the oil industry. It goes to the oil industry to provide a subsidy that's now been in place for more than a century. And in doing so, it worked. That subsidy worked. It created one of the wealthiest—not one of—the wealthiest industry in the entire world. That's the oil industry. And, again, I know you're going to pick this up and carry it a little bit further.

But just here, our subsidies, our tax dollars handed over $5 billion a year to the Big Five, who earn billions and billions of dollars of profit every quarter. Why do we continue to do that when we really starve the substitutions?

You look at here, this is the biofuel area. This is the green technologies—wind, solar energy, biofuels. This is ethanol down here. You just compare this. The subsidies from $70 billion a year going to coal and oil, that's well beyond the Big Five. And over here on this side we're talking about some $12 billion. And down here, some $16 billion a year.

So what's happened is that your tax money continues to subsidize oil and coal and just a little teeny, tiny bit on the substitutions, where the opportunity for real energy independence will exist. So we should keep this in mind as we look at how we use your tax dollars.

Now there's a huge fight going on here in the Congress, appropriately so, about changing this substitution; that we ought to stop subsidizing the oil industry, put some of that money over here into the substitutes, that is the green technologies, and into paying off our deficit or taking care of our seniors and our sick. There's much, much more to be done on that.

I would love to see your charts and we'll get into this in some, hopefully, elegant way.

Ms. SPEIER. The next chart that we're going to put up is one that you'll find particularly interesting. This is the Big Five oil companies and how much money they made just in 2011. As can you see, $137 billion last year—a 75 percent increase in the profits over the year before. And as you can see each of them: ExxonMobil, 31 percent increase; Shell, a 54 percent increase; BP, 114 percent increase; Chevron, 42 percent increase; ConocoPhillips, 9 percent increase.

These companies are doing extraordinarily well and yet we're still giving them $5 billion in subsidies.

I guess the question I have for you, Congressman, is one of the things that we're told by the industry often enough is that if you take away our subsidies, the cost of gas at the pump is going to go up. And what is the answer to that question?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, you have another chart there that showed the oil that is pumped and the price of gasoline. Congresswoman SPEIER, you used this before. And you asked me: If we take away the subsidies, will it increase the cost of gasoline? The answer is, categorically: No.

First of all, it is an international market that sets the price of gasoline. I should add one little caveat to that. International market and speculation. And I'm going to come to the speculation in a little bit.

Anyway, the international market sets the price of gasoline that these Big Five companies buy and the value of the oil that they extract. So the barrel of oil is set internationally. Now if it's set internationally and you take out the speculation, it remains fairly constant. Here's the production. And it has gone up, but it's been rather steady over this period of time.

The subsidy is to encourage the production of oil. Well, they've had the subsidy and so the production has been rocking along here. The price of oil is set internationally. What explains this enormous variation in the price of fuel at the pump? Well, it's not production. That's from here. Is it the subsidies? The subsidies are a very, very small part. You're looking at a $137 billion total profit. The subsidy is $5 billion. So it's inconceivable that the subsidy has much to do with the bottom line, other than adding $5 billion, which would be, I guess, if you took the subsidy out, it would be $132 billion. Oh, my, let's whine about that. I don't think so.

So the subsidy doesn't have much to do, if anything, with the price of gasoline. The price of gasoline, however, is set by those companies. And that leads directly to that bottom line there—this $137 billion. They choose to set that price.

Now what are we going to do about it? Well, take the subsidies back and begin to move away from dependence on oil, whether that's imported oil or oil that is pumped out of the ground here in the United States, and move to these alternatives.

□ 1950

Move to the alternatives, electricity and natural gas and the biofuels. All of those will further reduce the demand for oil which will bring down the cost of a barrel of oil within this country and around the world and, in so doing, allow us to have a lower gasoline price; and to do that, capture the subsidies. It's not going to increase the cost of a gallon of gasoline at all.

Ms. SPEIER. So we know that we're pumping more oil out of the ground in this country right now than ever before in our history, more than is being pumped anywhere else in the world—1,300 oil rigs. We know that we are still giving the industry a huge subsidy, and we know that they're making lots of money. Right? So what is going on? Is there, in fact, speculation? Is that driving the price of gas up?

Now, Bart Chilton, who is a Commodity Futures Trading Commission commissioner, recently said that consumers are now paying what amounts to a Wall Street premium every time they fill up their car with gas. In fact, he said every time you fill up your Honda Civic, you're paying a $7.50 Wall Street tax, in effect. You're paying that because of the speculation that's going on in the market. If your car is a Ford Explorer, you're actually paying an extra $10.41. So over the course of a year, it turns into real money. You're now talking about $700 more a year that we're paying because Wall Street speculation is driving this price.

Now, we've asked the Justice Department on three different occasions, the President of the United States has asked the Justice Department on three different occasions to look into, to investigate the speculators. And we're waiting. We're waiting for that particular review to take place because what we do know is that if we can get oil down to $70 a barrel, we're going to bring gas down to $3 a gallon, which will be a huge benefit to the consumers in this country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The speculation issue, this morning we had a fellow from the Connecticut Petroleum Retailers Association come in and talk to us about speculation. You and I didn't have enough time to put this together, we talked about this beforehand, because we were both taken by the information he provided. It is really not new information, but it is very interestingly put on the issue of speculation. Forgive me, general public and forgive me, Ms. SPEIER, but I just decided to put this together on the back of this Make It in America chart because America was taken to the cleaners in 2008.

This is what happened to the price of a barrel of oil in 2008. Now keep in mind in 2008 the wars were going on, but there was no real change in the wars. In March of 2008, a barrel of oil cost $70 a barrel in the United States, and I guess worldwide also. So March of 2008, it was $70 a barrel. Nothing happened, no big change. The Straits of Hormuz were not shut down; Venezuela and Nigeria and other countries continued to pump oil, as they had before.

But between March of 2008 and July of 2008, what's that, 4 months, 5 months, the price went from $70 a barrel to $147 and gasoline was very close to $5 a gallon. So oil went from $70 to $147—doubled, doubled in price—in just a period of time from March, April, May, June until July of 2008. And then the speculators broke and the price plummeted between July to November to $32 a barrel.

Now this has nothing to do with the production of oil around the world. It has nothing to do with major international crises of any kind. Obviously, we had a problem in the United States with our economy; but the consumption of gasoline remained about the same, but the price of a barrel of oil doubled and then in the same year, July to November, plummeted to $32 a barrel.

If there is ever, ever a situation that says somebody is speculating in this market, it's this extraordinary change that occurred over a period of time from March to July to November. And there's no supply and demand, no international crisis that could even begin to explain this extraordinary shift in prices. It is, I think, beyond a doubt that all of this, this was the great gasoline crisis of 2008, was caused by speculation. Now, we need to do something about that.

Here is an issue before the House of Representatives, and every day somewhere in the buildings here in Washington there are a group of Republicans that are doing their level best to eliminate the one law that we have been able to put in place to control speculation. This is the Dodd-Frank legislation. The Dodd-Frank legislation has very powerful tools to control speculation. And you can draw your own conclusions why our Republican friends would try to torpedo, to end, to eviscerate the Dodd-Frank legislation so that the speculators can continue this kind of activity.

Now, keep in mind that this is not ending. If we go to 2010, 2011, the current period, my guess is that we would see something similar to this kind of speculation. So the Dodd-Frank legislation is the only tool we have available today to deal with speculations such as occurred in 2008 and is in all likelihood continuing today.

Ms. SPEIER. An interesting point along the same lines, maybe 4 or 5 years ago, the percentage of speculation in the oil market was 30 percent. The speculators were involved in about 30 percent. About 70 percent were end-users that were in the market. But interestingly enough today, those numbers have just flipped so that the end-

users of gas, of gasoline, that are betting on the future are 30 percent, and it's the speculators that are 70 percent.

The other thing that the experts said this morning, I don't know if you were there at the time, they were talking about Katrina. When Katrina hit, it blew out all of those oil rigs in the gulf. It shut down oil production for a period of time. And you know what happened to the price of oil? It went from $50 a barrel to $60 a barrel for about 4 months, not from $70 a barrel to $147 a barrel. So over 4 months, it went up ever so slightly, but significantly nonetheless; and then it came down.

So this, this is ripe for an investigation, I believe, because it would suggest that there is a lot of speculation going on in the market today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was there for that, and I was struck by the very same statistic. As you look at what happened then, $10 here, a doubling in price. Consider for a moment what it would mean to somebody that had purchased back here in March a million barrels of oil at $70 a barrel, and they come up to July, that million barrels of oil has doubled in value. So this is why speculation occurs. It occurs because somebody by playing the market, by speculating, is able to make a vast sum of money.

There's the other side of that coin—somebody lost a vast sum of money coming down here. But the American public, however, was the single biggest loser in all of this because as that went up, the price at the pump also went up, and Americans paid more and more for the price of gasoline. It was about $5 a gallon when it came up here. And it didn't go down from $147 to $32; that proportion didn't happen. It did drop from near $5 down to $3.50, in that area.

So the American public was stuck with an exceedingly high price which continues to this day, which leads to those extraordinary profits which you were showing just a few minutes ago. Now, I'm not saying the oil industry was involved in the speculation; but I will say this, the oil industry benefited from the speculation that left a very high price for oil into the future. This didn't last very long. This went back up to $70, and today it's over $100 a barrel.

So we need to consider all of these things about what's going on in the oil market. The bottom line of this is we need to change. And this is, I think, where you want to go. You want to talk about conservation. You're the leader here, take us where you want and I'll follow.

Ms. SPEIER. So let's talk about what the solution is to protect Americans from volatile gas prices and to kick our dependence on foreign oil. That becomes the secret.

□ 2000

I mean, by every focus, if we kick our dependence on foreign oil, we are going to be so much better off.

So let's look at this next chart. In 2005, America's dependence on foreign oil peaked at about 60 percent. Then it dropped down in 2010 to 49 percent. Then last year, it dropped down even more to 45 percent. 2010 marked the first time U.S. dependence on foreign oil fell below 50 percent in 13 years, and our dependence on foreign oil is now at the lowest level in 16 years. At this rate, the Energy Information Administration predicts that the U.S. will slash its dependence on foreign oil to as low as 36 percent in the year 2035.

The U.S. transportation sector consumed nearly 5 billion barrels of petroleum in 2009, accounting for over 70 percent of the consumption in the United States. The lion's share of that—45 percent of total consumption—was in passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks.

So, what do we do about that gas guzzling that's going on? Well, the thing we do about that is to look at how we can change how many miles to the gallon we get. To the President's credit, his administration has put in place these new corporate average fuel economy standards—known to all of us as CAFE standards—that will nearly double the efficiency of the U.S. fleet of automobiles, achieving a fleet-wide average of 54.5 miles per gallon by the year 2025.

So what does that do once we get there at 2025? Well, it means that we, as consumers, will save $1.7 trillion at the pump over the life of the program. A family that purchases a new vehicle in 2025 will save $8,200 in fuel costs when compared with a similar vehicle in 2010. So over the life of the program, the standard will save 12 billion barrels of oil and eliminate 6 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution.

So the solutions are really there for us. The solutions are that we move to these CAFE standards, that we address the issues around speculation, and that we keep the robust drilling that is going on in this country right now so that we can continue to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I took a look at that before we began this hour, and I go, Oh, my, do I have to wait until 2025 to buy that vehicle? No, not really. There are pure electric vehicles that are available today that get not 54 miles per gallon but like infinite, by using electricity only. You can buy those. Unfortunately for me, in my district where a Saturday run around the district is 600 miles, it doesn't make much sense yet, but it's coming.

The battery technology is improving for automobiles. You can store that energy or take down that energy at night. This is part of the electric grid and the changes that are occurring in the electric grid all across this Nation. Given the low price of natural gas today—just over $2 per 1,000 Btus—we're seeing the electric utility industry shifting from coal to natural gas. As they do that shift, we get an enormous reduction in the carbon emissions—which is good for the environment and good for the climate change issue—and, simultaneously, we're able to then see a path to an electric vehicle, or at least a hybrid plug-in, hybrid electric vehicle. All very, very good. Biofuels will be part of that also.

So it's very, very powerful that we continue to increase. And let's keep in mind that there had been no increase until the Obama administration came in. I think it was over 20 years that the standards had been in place, and then President Obama came in and said, Listen, we need to move to conservation. And the result is the incredible savings.

I don't want to wait until 2025. Let's do something about it today.

Ms. SPEIER. Well, we can certainly try to encourage it.

I don't know if you have any more thoughts.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have a couple more things that I'll pick up along the way. Let me just share one of them, since we're on the gasoline issue.

You and I go back to our district every weekend. A month ago, 2 months ago, the rage was the price of gasoline. I was doing town halls. I knew you were also, and so I was doing some research about where the gasoline is and what it's being used for and what the cost was.

I came across a statistic from the Energy Information Institute that was absolutely surprising to me. The talk on the radio and on television and the talk radio and talk television was that we have this enormous shortage of gasoline, that the threat of a war in Iran was responsible for driving it up, and somehow problems in Nigeria or Venezuela—or wherever—were somehow shorting the market and that gasoline was in short supply. But the information, the statistics were exactly the opposite. There was a glut of gasoline in the United States, so much so—get this—so much so that the oil industry—Chevron, Exxon, BP, all of the rest—were exporting 28 million gallons of gasoline a day. At the same time they were exporting, they were driving the price up towards $5 a gallon.

And we go, wait a minute. What's this all about? You're telling me we have a shortage? If we have a shortage, why are you exporting 28 million gallons of gasoline a day? And from the information I've been able to obtain, it appears as though that export continues to this day—an export of 28 million gallons of gasoline a day out of the United States at the same time that the industry is saying, Oh, woe is us. We have a short supply. Well, if it's short supply, it's because they are creating it to the deficit and to the harm of the American traveling public who has to buy that gasoline.

Now, one other thing—and check me on this; I was trying to recall all of the information this morning—that in the last quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of this year, the United States, for the first time in—help me here, 40 years?

Ms. SPEIER. Sixty years.

Mr. GARAMENDI. —60 years was a net exporter of oil, a net exporter. We had achieved energy independence. We were exporting more than we were importing for the last quarter of last year and the first quarter of this year. I don't know if that's going to continue, but it flies right in the face of what the oil industry was telling us as the fake, false crisis of the spring occurred. My guess is it was speculation. My guess is it was greed on the part of the oil industry.

My solution is to end the subsidies, bring that money back and use it on the green technologies and conservation. My solution is to enforce the Dodd-Frank laws and to make certain speculators are not robbing the American people day in and day out. Those are two things we can do. And as you said earlier, we will continue to produce energy in the United States, and we'll Make It In America.

I thank you so very much. I do have another meeting. I'm going to have to run, but this is good. It's good to get the information out there. Thank you for bringing us together tonight.

Ms. SPEIER. Well, thank you, Congressman, for your great presentation and your passion around making it in America, which should be underscored, because one of the great things that happens in my district is a lot of innovation.

Tesla, which is an electric car company that is making it in America, building it right there in Fremont, has a showroom right outside my district. And a gentleman came in to test-drive the sports—the Roadster, which has a hefty price associated with it, but very fast.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Is this the one that goes a gazillion miles an hour in 5 seconds?

Ms. SPEIER. Yes. It goes very fast, and it's all electric.

So he took it for a little spin, came back and said, I want to buy it. The salesperson says, Well, you're the first person who has ever come in here and literally bought it after just a test-drive. The purchaser said, Well, my neighbor on one side and my neighbor on the other side have already bought one.

Now, the funny thing about that story is not the keeping up with the Joneses so much, but the fact that in terms of the grid, having three electric cars on the same block charging overnight is going to create a little indigestion. So that's one of the good problems that we're going to get as more people are driving electric cars.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was going to head out the door, but your Tesla story caught me as I was about to leave.

The grid, we need to have a smart grid. This is one of the things that is in contention here. This is about energy research. Now, we need to understand, how can we make that grid smart enough and robust enough that we will be able to charge, on any given block, one, two, three, four, five, or six more homes at night?

□ 2010

To do that, we need to have research and understanding, not only on how we produce the energy in an environmentally sound way that reduces the carbon emissions, but we also need to know how to distribute that power and when it's going to be needed. That's called the smart grid.

Now, to do that requires research. It requires us to invest in research to understand how the grid works, how it can be improved, how we can create the efficiency in the grid, how that power can be distributed to where it is needed when it is needed. That takes money. The Federal Government has, over the last several years, provided that research money in the budget that we're debating here now. Well, we're not debating it. It actually passed.

The blueprint for the current budget from this House reduces the energy research in the United States. So it may be some time, if our Republican colleagues have their way about the energy research, before those three people will be able to plug that thing in at the same time at night.

Ms. SPEIER. Well, let's hope we do it sooner than later so that they can be driving their Tesla Roadsters.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much.

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you. And I think at this point we have covered all of the issues we wanted to cover during this Special Order tonight. And I just want to leave my colleagues with this message. Again, this was quoted in USA Today. Citigroup analysts declared in a recent report, energy independence in the United States is not a pipe dream. The U.S. is already the world's fastest growing oil and natural gas producer. Counting the output of Canada and Mexico, North America is the new Middle East.

We've got many exciting things happening in the oil and gas industry.

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

## HONORING THE LIFE OF CHARLES COLSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUNYAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I come to this body tonight and will have many of my colleagues joining me over the next hour to remember someone who has had a huge impact, not only on this city and on this Nation, but on our world, a gentleman who had a very personal impact on my life, who passed away on April 21, 2012, Charles W. Colson.

Chuck Colson, as many of us knew him, was a very intelligent man, a very well-spoken man, a passionate man who served people, who looked for ways to honor them, recognizing the value of every single person. His life dramatically changed through a circumstance that he went through by going to prison. And I'm going to pull out some information here.

We were honored to have a service today, a memorial service at the National Cathedral that was a memorial and remembrance of Charles Colson's life. Charles Colson was born on October 16, 1931, in Boston, Massachusetts. He graduated from Brown University. He served in the Marine Corps, went to law school at Brown, and then went on to practice law.

At a very young age, in 1969, while he was under 40, he was selected by President Nixon to be Special Counsel to the President, and served directly under the President from 1969 until 1973. During that time, he was known as a very tough guy. He was known as Richard Nixon's hatchet man, and was very intelligent, understood policy, understood politics, understood how to get things done, very driven, very focused, very tough. So he used his Marine Corps background, his tough upbringing in Boston, and his sharp intellect to be a huge impact for President Nixon.

Well, he was also, in that time, involved peripherally with Watergate, and through that, he felt that he was called to be honest with his involvement in there and pled guilty and entered a plea of obstruction of justice and was sentenced to serve time in prison. And it was really as he was preparing for that time in prison that he started to examine his own life and to see what he had done, why he had done it, and what life was all about.

It was really through a writer that he had read, a book that had been given to him, a book by a great author and great thinker, C. S. Lewis, ''Mere Christianity.'' And through that book, and through the testimony of one of Chuck's good friends, that Chuck Colson came to see his own failings, his own sin, his need for a Savior and his need for a change. And it was really in the friend's driveway, as they were talking, that he heard his friend's testimony of what Jesus Christ had meant to his friend, and the floodgates just opened up.

All of a sudden Chuck Colson understood what the fact of his need for a Savior, the fact that he needed to turn his life around, that he was going to have to pay a heavy price for his involvement in Watergate, that he was

going to have to leave his friends and family, his young children, his wife, to go to prison for a long period of time. He wasn't even sure how long it was going to be. But it was that night, in that driveway that he gave his life to Christ. And from that time on, before he entered prison in the early seventies, through his death here in 2012, Chuck Colson was an incredibly faithful servant of his Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

But more than that, he also was a servant to the least among us. He never forgot that service, that time in prison, while he was there, and seeing the conditions that prisoners suffer under, the fact that we are all of incredible value, not because of what we've done, not because of what we know, not because of how much money we can earn, but because of how we have been created and the sacrifice that has been given for each and every one of us. He saw that, and he never forgot that.

So through this time we're going to talk about much of his life since that time of going to prison and coming out of prison. As he came out of prison he had opportunities where he could have gone immediately back into the private sector after being one of the chief people in the White House. He certainly had many connections, could have had a seven-figure income coming out of prison, but he decided not to do that.

Instead, he decided to start a ministry to fellow inmates. And it was from that start that literally, hundreds and hundreds of thousands of inmates, millions of inmates around the world, have been impacted by the ministry of Chuck Colson and Prison Fellowship Ministries, and many, many other ministries that have come out of that.

Angel Tree is another one that I'll talk about a little later on, of serving the victims of crime that we don't talk about very often, and that's children of inmates, unintended victims. Angel Tree is a service, a ministry that provides gifts to kids whose parents are in prison, a wonderful ministry that's provided gifts to millions of young children around the world.

I am so honored tonight to be able to recognize, to honor, to talk briefly and to share this time with some good friends of mine and to be able to talk about someone who had a huge impact on my life, Chuck Colson. I am going to hand it over to my friend STEVE PEARCE in a few minutes here.

But very personally, let me talk about the impact and my connection. I had known about Chuck Colson for the last 25 years or so, 30 years, through many of his books. He's written well over 25 books. He's been a speaker around the world. He had a weekly radio show called BreakPoint that would talk about issues that were going on in the world and, really, a Christian world view to addressing issues that we were facing here.

But throughout all of his books, all of his speaking, all of his literature, every time that he was talking, it was a connection that he cared for people. He loved people.

One of my favorite stories that I hear over and over and over again about Chuck Colson is, as he would travel around the world and travel into the worst of the worst prisons, that he would go in there and meet with prisoners. Oftentimes the warden wouldn't even go into some of these areas and meet with prisoners. The wardens of these prisons would be afraid. And yet Chuck Colson would go in, unarmed, without guards right with him, but would go up and meet with the prisoners, talk with them, touch them, hug them, and just interact with them and let them know that he was going to continue to be thinking about them, praying for them, caring for them, loving them, and that he would be back. That made a huge impact on my life.

Reading many of his books, he often talked about what is our role in government, and how should we view the challenges sometimes that we see? As Christians, how should we be involved in government?

□ 2020

He talked very clearly about that—of the respect of government but also of the importance of everybody from all faiths to be involved in government—and to recognize that this is our responsibility as citizens to be engaged and involved in the political process. So I had learned much about Chuck Colson through his readings, through hearing him speak.

I had a wonderful opportunity a couple of years ago when I had heard about a program that he did, that he had started up about 10 years ago, called the Centurions Program. What this is is a program that Chuck Colson and Prison Fellowship Ministries puts on. It's a yearlong program of study—of seminars, of training—of really talking about how to be involved in our country, to be involved in our government, to make an impact in our communities. It involved dozens of books that we read in a year: going through what impacts our culture, looking at movies, looking at music, looking at government, looking at education—every single sector.

Then we would come from all over the country out to Washington, D.C., three times during that year, to spend a long weekend together. Chuck Colson personally led those seminars, along with wonderful speakers from around the country who had come to train men and women from all over the Nation to be more effective in their communities, to be more effective in their families, to be passionate about using their gifts to impact others for good.

I was privileged to be selected to be a part of this Centurions Program in 2009, and I went through that yearlong process. Little did I know at that time, honestly, that I would have the opportunity to serve in Congress. This was before I even considered the idea of running for Congress, but it was really through that program and through much that I had learned that I was brought to start thinking about this, to pray about it, to talk to my wife, to talk to my family, to talk to my kids of how important this is and what a pivotal time in our Nation this is right now. So it was much through the impact that Chuck Colson had on my life and that the ministry had on my life that I decided to run for Congress.

I was so excited to have Chuck Colson here in the Cannon Caucus Room just several months ago to be able to meet with Members of Congress and to make the connection again. I had spent so much time with him in that year but hadn't had a chance to really connect with him since I had been elected to Congress. He came up to me and gave me a big hug and said, I am so proud of you. He wrote me a little note just saying, again, of how excited he was and how he wanted me to continue to be faithful in all that we had been studying together and learning together. He continued to challenge me, and we talked about how we were, hopefully, going to work together for many years to come.

Unfortunately, there was his untimely death. It was a very sudden death. He was speaking before a group of people and had a dizzy attack. Within a short period of time, he had a blood clot in his brain, which had an impact there. Over weeks, they tried to do everything that they could to save him and weren't able to. Unfortunately, we won't be able to continue to work with him, but his legacy lives on in me and in so many others, in literally millions of others around the world whom he touched. So that is why it is such a privilege for us to be able to honor him tonight as to the direct impact that he had on us.

Really, before I had the chance to get to know him more personally, part of the impact that he had was on the studies that I was doing when I was involved in our State legislature back in Illinois. My wife and I had had our fourth child, and we were trying to think of a good name for our new son. We decided together that we would name him Koleson. We call him Kole, but his name is Koleson, named after Chuck Colson. So it is such a privilege and a reminder all the time as I'm now with my 8-year-old little boy, Koleson, of the legacy that he has, of the big shoes that he has to fill and, really, of the power that his name means to me of a man who had a huge impact on my life.

So, again, we will take this time over these next minutes to honor a man we could spend days talking about. I am so privileged to have my colleagues here tonight, and I am going to turn it over to my good friend from New Mexico, STEVAN PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue before the House.

It is rare that a person can impact your life in a very strong way. It is almost never that a person can impact your life in a very strong way on different ends of the spectrum.

In 1970, I graduated from college. I had drawn a very low draft number earlier in my college career. I had joined the Air Force ROTC in order to avoid going to Vietnam in the middle of my college career; but, as an ROTC graduate, I then had an obligation to go to pilot training. I attended pilot training and then went overseas. I was assigned to the C–130s. We were stationed at Clark Air Base in the Philippines, but most of our missions were in Vietnam. For the next year and a half, that's where I was.

On one particular mission there in that time of 1971 and 1972, I was a copilot who was flying into Cambodia. Now, at that time, we were supposedly not going into Cambodia, and we were supposedly not going into Laos, but we were in and out on several trips that day. That evening, when I got back to the BOQ, to the quarters there at Korat Air Force Base, which I think is where we were stationed at that time for 2 weeks, I was interested to see that President Nixon was on TV. The camera zoomed in very close to him, and he described that American soldiers were not in or around Cambodia, that that mission was not one that we as soldiers were fulfilling.

Now, having just been in and out around Cambodia the entire day, that struck me as unusual that a President would say things that were completely untrue, that I knew to be untrue. In my heart, I began to believe that he could have said, I don't think the American people have a right to know. He could have said, It's secret, and that's classified information. But he came out with the camera looking him square in the face, and he said that we were not there. Now, maybe he did not know. I'll give him that.

Yet, when I got back to the U.S. and had found out about Watergate—that was beginning to unravel—the idea of who to vote for in those 1972 elections was ever present on my mind. His opponent, there was no chance I would vote for him. His opponent was Eugene McCarthy. I would not vote for him, but I ended up filling my ballot out that neither man was qualified or deserved this office. I did not vote for a President that year simply because of my personal experience. Then in watching this whole problem with Watergate, Chuck Colson, Haldeman, those guys who were inside—the Plumbers—it began to give me a sense that this was a very bad point in my life and that Mr. Colson was a part of that group that was willing to mislead a Nation, that was willing to say things that weren't true. At the end of the day, President Nixon, as you know, stepped down. He gave up his office because of misdeeds that a small group of them pulled together.

Now, it was with that background that I knew Chuck Colson for most of my life. Then in 2003, when I arrived here at the Capitol when being first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, I started going to just a very small lecture series, and it was hosted by a gentleman named Chuck Colson. It didn't take long to make the association; but he was bringing in some of the best Christian worldview thinkers in the entire country, and I was able to experience Mr. Colson in a far different way than that remote acquaintance I had made in the early seventies.

In this way, he was one of the most compelling thinkers in the country. It was he who said that he lived in the dark until he saw the light. It was he who committed himself to a different view of the world, one that said that we must have redemption, that we must have a savior, that there is no hope for us as human beings if we are not to deal with those problems that each one of us faces in our lives. As he began to develop his insights and began to be one of the premier organizers of the Christian worldview, bringing in literally people from around him, he established his pillars for glorifying God through the works that we do.

Those pillars are: One, prepare well; two, keep an eye on the horizon rather than up close to you; three, engage and enlist others; four, run assessments; five, seek the abiding fruit, not just that that is temporary; and, finally, have guidelines that you have applied.

It is in those principles of glorifying God that Mr. Colson really developed a presence that affected the world and affected my life significantly. He began to compel those of us attending this lecture series in this House of Representatives, in one of the rooms beneath us, to enlist those around us, to be a light that shines out to others, to let our lives be different, to let our lives be the equivalent of salt and light, which are rubbed, so to speak, into the fabric of the American mindset so that those around us will know that they have embraced a lie.

□ 2030

It was Mr. Colson who told me the most dramatic thing. His perception was—and I believe it is still—''The greatest problem facing America,'' he said, ''is truth.'' We don't know the truth in this country anymore. It's not revered. As we don't know the truth, then we see the fragments of society beginning to come loose around us.

I hear my own daughter and grandchildren say: Which side is right? They're all saying different things. When we as a Nation walk away from the concept of truth, when we as elected officials fail to honor our obligations to speak the truth as we know it, when our courts declare that there is no truth, then the Nation truly does suffer.

He made that extraordinarily clear and lived it in his life. It's at that point that I began to be compelled that I should be more honest and transparent in my own faith. Not that I would go out and be interrupting people and thrusting myself into their consciousness, but that they would look and see there's something different. They would say: Maybe we can trust that viewpoint.

So it is with sincere appreciation to my friend who is honoring Chuck Colson with this time tonight—because I believe that the Nation has lost one of the premier thinkers, one of the premier people who would guide us along a path, who would give us a wake-up call saying that we must find that salvation, we must find that way back when things have gone wrong. He was speaking from his experience of having gone so desperately wrong at a young age, being upheld and lifted into the very White House in this country, and having stumbled so badly.

He could speak with experience saying we all have to come back. There are things that every single one of us slip into that eventually we're going to want to change course. It's through his example, through his words, through his values, through his ideas that I know there are many here in this Congress who have lived a different life because of those ideas.

He came to New Mexico a couple of years ago. They had a large conference on the weekend. Again, I remember the same clarity, the same professionalism, the same looking toward the horizon there at that conference in New Mexico as we heard in this building here. He was a constant. He was refreshing to speak so openly about his problems. He was never able to let them loose, never get them away from him, never get that stain off of him. But he embraced that, yes. That's who he was and now he was different, that he had lived in the dark until he had seen the light.

Each one of us, if we were to make those same understandings and give those same acknowledgements, I believe, would live better and more transparent lives with truth being a greater part of that life. And I think the Nation would be better off for us living, as it is for him having lived.

We mourn his passing, but we also glorify God that he was placed into our midst that he might truly shine the light of truth into the darkness that he found around him.

My friend, I will stay around to hear what else we have. Thank you very much.

Mr. HULTGREN. I want to thank my colleague from New Mexico. I thank you so much.

Now I want to yield to my good friend from North Carolina, MIKE MCINTYRE.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, I share with these dear friends today marking the passing into glory of Mr. Charles Chuck Colson. We new Chuck as a dear friend and Christian brother, author, radio commentator, and also one who challenged us all to think more about our world view.

With his passing, our Nation has lost an uncommon leader, a true example of

the transformative power of Jesus Christ, and a reminder of the beauty of second chances in life. While some will forever remember Mr. Colson for his role in the Watergate scandal, I will remember and honor him for the grace and perseverance with which he advocated for the least of these in our society: those that were marginalized, those who were seen as helpless.

With his work through Prison Fellowship, the world's largest organization for outreach to prisoners and former prisoners and prisoners' families, and through his inspirational books and commentaries, Chuck Colson touched thousands of lives and advocated tirelessly for programs that would not only address the physical needs of those in our Nation's prisons, but also their spiritual needs, as well.

In addition, Mr. Colson's daily radio show ''BreakPoint,'' during which he would share a commentary on the life of Christ and also on the Christian world view on the issues of the day, was such a challenge and an inspiration to me that as a young lawyer in southeastern North Carolina, in my hometown of Lumberton, I actually put copies of his ''BreakPoint'' commentaries out on the coffee table so that those clients and prospective clients who came to our law office would take time to hear from this lawyer, Chuck Colson, whose life had been so transformed by the experiences he had gone through.

When I think about his insights, it's because they were so challenging and so clear in their wisdom that they were so touching. His books challenge you to think deeply about your own calling in life: What was God calling you to do, and how could you take even the worst of experiences? I remember him describing looking out on the south lawn of the White House thinking he was just one door down from the President and the neatly manicured lawn. I remember Chuck two or three times in different testimonies describing that experience and thinking, You know, I've made it.

But then Chuck Colson went from the White House to the very depths of understanding what it meant to be in prison. But instead of letting that ruin his life after the Watergate scandal, he came out of that with his life being changed. His great book, ''Born Again,'' was a bestseller back in the 1970s when I was in college. And I still remember when my own father, who passed into glory last year, read that book. Along with other experiences that happened to my own father, that book, ''Born Again,'' told a story that my dad could identify with and that helped to change his life.

Having heard Chuck Colson speak at Montreat, where my own dad made his own Christian commitment, and hearing Chuck Colson speak at other events with the late Dr. D. James Kennedy down at Coral Ridge Ministries down in Florida, and being with Chuck so many times here on Capitol Hill, being part of the lecture series that my good friend mentioned just a moment ago—that I still remember he organized here on Capitol Hill and would invite Members of Congress to come and to think more deeply and challenge us to go beyond the politics of the issue.

Then in his monthly newsletter called ''Jubilee,'' he would have an editorial at the back that I regularly read and made sure that often I ripped that out and put it in a file because his thoughts were so provocative and challenging in terms of our own world view.

I also had the opportunity to get to know Chuck Colson and count him as a brother in Christ and as a friend, participating not only in the lecture classes here on Capitol Hill, but when he rewrote the book that he had written in 1982, ''Kingdoms in Conflict,'' which greatly touched my life as I thought about the possibility of one day maybe coming to this place. He rewrote that book on ''God and Politics,'' and challenged us to think about where we are in our faith as we deal with the tough times in the political world, so much so that my wife, Dee, asked me if for our 25th wedding anniversary that instead of a gift or going on a trip, could we be in the Centurion Program that Chuck Colson had where he had 100 citizens from around this Nation participate and spend an entire year studying the Christian world view on issues ranging from health care to business, from medicine to education, from law and government to issues within religion itself, and challenging us to study the biblical perspective and the Christian world view, and to think how we deal with those issues as Christians in the everyday world.

□ 2040

So with those 100 citizens from across the country, my wife and I spent a year studying under Chuck Colson's guidance and went to three different seminars that he hosted not too far from here in Washington. What an inspiration this man was because he didn't just teach and he didn't just talk, but he walked the walk and he changed lives by God's power in the process.

I know some of you here with us today—so often, we shared the night before the National Prayer Breakfast. Before we came and led the spiritual heritage tours here at the Capitol that so many hundreds of people have now done over the years, that we made it a regular habit to go to Chuck Colson's annual Prison Fellowship dinner that he had on the Wednesday night before the Thursday National Prayer Breakfast in February. And we looked forward as much to that as being central to the celebration of what the National Prayer Breakfast was all about because we knew the night before, Chuck Colson was having his annual dinner, usually honoring some great religious leader or reformer in society before we had our spiritual heritage tour back here at the Capitol.

He often also talked about his experience as a United States Marine at Camp LeJeune, just on the edge of my congressional district. And he also talked about the practical ways that faith can change your life. That's the great legacy I know Chuck Colson would be pleased with today. We're talking about a man not only who was a great author and speaker but a man whose life changed lives and made a difference.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HULTGREN. I want to thank my good friend and fellow Centurion. Thank you so much, MIKE. I appreciate you being here.

I yield to my other good friend, ROBERT ADERHOLT from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, along with my colleagues, to honor the life and legacy of Charles Colson, better known as Chuck Colson.

Many people remember Chuck Colson as the hatchet man for President Richard M. Nixon and also the first member of the administration under Richard Nixon to go to prison.

But Chuck Colson is probably known better as a central figure in the Christian community since his conversion to be a follower of Jesus Christ. Some at the time of his conversion may have said it was a jailhouse conversion. However, if you knew and you looked at the life of Chuck Colson and saw the life that he led following his release from Maxwell Federal Prison Camp in Alabama, you would come to a far different conclusion.

Chuck Colson emerged from prison with a new mission, and that mission was to mobilize the Christian Church to minister to prisoners. This would perhaps be his greatest contribution to the church and to the world.

Chuck Colson was someone who rose to high places in the eyes of the world during his time here in Washington and in his political career. But it actually wasn't until Chuck Colson hit rock bottom that really his life was turned around. It wasn't until he realized that he was living in darkness, that he was in need of a savior, and that he was powerless to earn God's favor that his life actually turned around.

If he were here with us tonight, I think Chuck would unashamedly say that placing his trust in Christ, recognizing that Christ had paid the penalty for his sins was the best decision that he ever made in his life. And I can say these things about Chuck Colson because I had the opportunity to get to know Chuck Colson personally over the last several years, and I am honored to call him a friend.

Chuck Colson made many friends over his life and, of course, he will be missed greatly by so many around the world. And of course to Patty and his children, he will be sorely missed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that Chuck has heard the words, Well done, my good and faithful servant.

So I thank you again, Mr. HULTGREN, for the time you have yielded to me to honor Chuck Colson.

Mr. HULTGREN. Thank you, Mr. ADERHOLT.

Now it's my privilege to recognize a good friend from Iowa, Congressman STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to also offer my most appreciative words for the life and the gift to all of us that was the life of Chuck Colson.

A lot of us got to know Chuck Colson as he came before our conference on occasion, the Republican Study Committee on occasion and professed his conversion. And when one listened to Chuck Colson talk about how his conversion took place, how he hit rock bottom, as the gentleman from Alabama just said, how he accepted Jesus Christ as his personal savior, and accepted a new direction in life that had lasted for 40 years, a man that was at the pinnacle of power in the world found himself in prison for about 8 months in Alabama.

And out of that prison, he came back and hit bottom and was launched not at the pinnacle of this world power, but he was at the center of the voice of the real power in the universe. And his inner voice, the spirit within Chuck Colson, spoke to all of us.

Upon learning of his death, I sent out a tweet in those days, and it read like this:

> Chuck Colson, from Watergate to evangelical Christian to Prison Fellowship to heaven in 80 years. Rest in peace, Chuck. How now shall we live?

How now shall we live, Chuck Colson, who lived by the model that he had. It was a blessing to all of us that he went through the difficulty that he did. If he hadn't been formed and shaped in that way, I don't know that we would have seen the Chuck Colson that we knew that we're saying good-bye to here tonight whose life we honor so much.

His activities in Prison Fellowship set a standard that had not been seen in this country or in the world. And the recidivism rate of prisoners that didn't take part in the Prison Fellowship was extremely high. I haven't committed that number to my memory; but it seems to me that those who went through the Prison Fellowship, those who accepted Jesus as their savior—and I have met with them in the prisons in Iowa that were part of the Prison Fellowship effort—the recidivism rate—by memory, not by research—was only 8 percent.

It was a tremendous thing to mentor so many prisoners in and out of prison and the families of prisoners. He went to the place where he had known despair and gave hope in the very heart of the place where Chuck Colson had known despair. And I think that the testing of Chuck Colson turned him into a man that was a gift to this country and a gift to the entire world.

I remember a prayer that I offered for years and years throughout the farm crisis, the years of the eighties, the difficulties in the nineties. And it was:

> Lord, please be finished testing me and start to use me.

I don't know if Chuck Colson ever offered that prayer, but I think he would agree with me that there was a time that he was tested; there was a time that he went through that test in the pinnacle of power and through that test in prison, and there's no question that the Lord used Chuck Colson, tested him for 40 years, used him for 40 years. Chuck Colson was a gift to America and a gift to the world.

I saw a little quote in an article written about him that I thought was useful and informative: The light just emanated from Chuck Colson. You knew that he understood. He wrote eloquently about the depth of his faith and the meaning in our lives in this life and in the next and the power of redemption. And this quote was written about him. I will note the author because it's useful.

The author is Michael Gerson, who wrote an article about him on April 22. He said, Chuck spent the last 40 years of his life dazzled by his own implausible redemption. He knew it was a gift. It was implausible that a person as humble as Chuck Colson could be the recipient of this gift of grace, yet that gift shined from him like a lamp on a lamp stand, not under a bushel basket. It was a light that shined across this whole country, and it shone into this United States Congress over and over again. He was a core for the values of our faith. He was a core for the values of our morality. He brought our thoughts together on the meaning of our service, our service here in this Congress and our service to the world.

And I think he gave hope to many in despair, many of those that served their time in prison or had been given hope and inspiration, grace and salvation because of their exposure to Chuck Colson, the inspiration that he was. His life dazzles by his own redemption. We are dazzled by the life of Chuck Colson.

□ 2050

Mr. HULTGREN. I want to thank my colleague from Iowa.

It's now my privilege to yield to my good friend from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's such an honor to pay tribute to such a great man as Chuck Colson. I first read about Chuck Colson, of course, after the Watergate event occurred and all of the events surrounding it. And then I was in law school when I read his book, ''Born Again.'' It sounded like this was a brilliant man who really and truly had had a conversion experience. Life had been materially changed. Then, again, there are those who as a judge I saw that would get in trouble and grab a Bible and say, I'm changed, so go easy on me. Things like that. But this really appeared quite genuine with Chuck Colson. And I knew, as the Bible teaches, we'll be known by our fruits. What incredible fruits this man produced. Amazing.

So over the years I stayed in touch. He didn't know me personally during those years, but I listened to cassettes of his sermons, his lectures. That tells you how far back it goes—they were cassettes. Then I listened to CDs of him speaking and his lectures and sermons, and I would read his books. Thank God he was so prolific that he was moved to write such extraordinary books.

In fact, I came to realize with this kind of brilliance—and others have pointed this out, but it struck me back in the eighties—this is a modern-day Apostle Paul. He has that kind of intellect, that kind of ability. And yet he's able to discuss anything with anybody on any level. But his life is a living, breathing, walking testimonial.

I love the quote that Steven Curtis Chapman used in Chuck Colson's own voice in ''Heaven and the Real World,'' where you hear Chuck's voice say these things. Chuck said:

> I meet millions who tell me that they feel demoralized by the decay around us. Where is the hope? The hope that each of us has is not in who governs us or what laws are passed or what great things we do as a Nation. Our hope is in the power of God working through the hearts of people. And that's where our hope is in this country. That's where our hope is in life.

As he pointed out on more than one occasion, our hope—the Kingdom of God—will not arrive on Air Force One. And any hope of that happening is just misplaced.

Well, I have a brother about 8 years younger, now a Baptist pastor near Richmond, and Bill had acquired Chuck Colson's new novel called ''Gideon's Torch.'' And as a man who had worked in the White House, to have him write a novel which, as you read it breathlessly, you realize these things could easily happen, every one of them, just as he spells out. It was an incredible book.

When I met Chuck Colson, I asked him, Are you going to write any other novels? That was just a fantastic novel. And he said, My publisher tells me people are not buying my fiction. They want my nonfiction. And I want God to use me however he can use me. If it's more productive, more helpful to people to write nonfiction, I'll write nonfiction.

He also said writing ''Gideon's Torch,'' a novel, was far more difficult than writing the nonfiction, which he does. I'm not sure that it's still in print, but I would hope that after his passing there would be a resurgence of requests and people would get that book and greatly grow and benefit from it.

I just wanted to share a couple of things from his book ''God and Government.'' He came to the Hill to provide this to many of us. As my friends here know, one of the benefits of being in Congress—and there are plenty of things that aren't benefits—but one of the benefits is getting to become friends with people you have as heroes. And Chuck Colson was one of my heroes. He was someone I truly looked up

to and I benefited from. And even before he knew me, he was a mentor.

At page 69 he says:

> Whether or not God's existence can be proved, the evidence can be rationally probed and weighed. (Author C.S.) Lewis does so compellingly, and he cites moral law as a key piece of evidence. Clearly it is not man who has perpetuated the precepts and values that have survived through centuries and across cultures. Indeed, he has done his best to destroy them. The nature of the law restrains man, and thus its very survival presupposes a stronger force behind it—God.
>
> Or consider the most readily observable physical evidence, the nature of the universe. One cannot look at the stars, planets, and galaxies, millions of light years away, all fixed in perfect harmony, without asking who orders them.
>
> For centuries it was accepted that God was behind the universe because otherwise ''the origin and purpose of life would be inexplicable.'' This traditional supposition was unchallenged until the 18th century's Age of Reason, when Enlightenment thinkers announced with relief that the origins of the universe were now scientifically explainable.
>
> But in the past few decades, science has completely reversed itself on the question of the origin of the universe. After maintaining for centuries the physical universe is eternal and therefore needs no creator, science today has uncovered dramatic new evidence that the universe did have an ultimate origin, that it began at a finite time in the past—just as the Bible teaches.

Chuck Colson will be missed. But thank God and thank Chuck Colson that he has left us so much in the way of wisdom that we can draw from in the days ahead. We will be remembering his family and all of those who loved and miss Chuck in our prayers.

With that, I appreciate being yielded to on behalf of Chuck Colson.

Mr. HULTGREN. Thank you, Congressman GOHMERT. I appreciate it.

I do thank my friends that have been here. There's many others that wanted to be here tonight and weren't able to. One of those was our colleague Congressman MIKE PENCE from Indiana, who was unable to be here but wrote a letter. Many others also over the last couple of weeks have paid tribute to the life of Chuck Colson. I would like to recognize just a couple of them.

One was Reverend Billy Graham, evangelist. He said:

> For more than 35 years, Chuck Colson, a former prisoner himself, has had a tremendous ministry, reaching into prisons and jails with the saving gospel of Jesus Christ. When I get to heaven and see Chuck again, I believe I will also see many, many people there whose lives have been transformed because of the message he shared with them. He will be greatly missed by many, including me. I count it a privilege to have called him friend.

Again, that was Reverend Billy Graham.

I do think it is amazing to look at some of the history of the impact and really the decisions that Chuck Colson made that we talked about. Before he went to prison, his conversion, many were skeptical about that, thinking it was a ploy to get a lighter sentence. Clearly, it wasn't, when you look at the fruits of what happened afterwards.

And I just want to go through a quick history of Prison Fellowship, something that, again, has had an impact on millions of people around the world.

In 1976, a Watergate crook found Prison Fellowship. In 1974, the Watergate scandal sent White House Special Counsel Chuck Colson to Federal prison. A new Christian, he faced challenges and adversities that tested his faith and self-respect. Paroled in 1975, Chuck could easily have opted to close that book on that dark time and move on with his life as inconspicuously as possible. But Chuck knew that God wanted him to hold on to his ties to prison and continue to identify with his fellow prisoners, despite the skepticism and scorn of Chuck's critics.

□ 2100

So in 1976, with little more than a vision and the support of a few friends, Chuck began Prison Fellowship to proclaim to inmates the love and power of Jesus Christ.

In 1977, the next year after the founding, Prison Fellowship goes behind bars. At first, through the support of the director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Prison Fellowship began transporting dozens of Christian prisoners out of prison for intensive training through Washington Discipleship Seminars held in the nation's capital. Those prisoners then were returned to prison to evangelize and teach their colleagues. But in 1977, Prison Fellowship ran into a hurdle when a warden from Wisconsin refused to furlough one of his prisoners to attend the Washington Discipleship Seminars. Instead, he challenged: If your program is so good, why don't you bring it inside the prison?

Chuck and his team were up for the task, and 3 weeks later, 93 inmates attended Prison Fellowship's first ever in-prison seminar in Oxford, Wisconsin. That seminar paved the way for hundreds of thousands of prisoners across the country to receive biblically based teaching through in-prison seminars and Bible studies over the past 33 years. That first in-prison event also reinforced the importance of training local volunteers to go inside prisons and build relationships with inmates. Today, Prison Fellowship ministry relies on a volunteer network of well over 20,000 volunteers.

In 1979, Britain catches the vision. Prison Fellowship International takes off.

In 1982, ex-bank robber reaches out to prisoners' kids and starts Angel Tree. The same year that Chuck started Prison Fellowship, a former bank robber named Mary Kay Beard was released from prison in Alabama. And, as in Chuck's life, God graciously transformed the shame of prison into a golden opportunity for ministry. In anticipation of Christmas 1982, Mary Kay organized Angel Tree, a ministry to provide gifts to prisoners' children on behalf of the incarcerated parents. Beginning with 556 children that first year, Angel Tree has since exploded into a geyser of ministry opportunities reaching more than 400,000 American children of prisoners every single year, and their families, with the transforming message of Jesus Christ. Over 6 million children have received gifts from Angel Tree from their parents donated by someone else in the name of their parent. Again, the lost victim oftentimes of crime.

In 1983, Justice Fellowship hits the stage. As Prison Fellowship was expanding its ministry inside prisons, its leadership saw firsthand all of the signs of a justice system in chaos: overcrowded and violent prisons, neglected crime victims, communities shattered by crime. In 1983, Justice Fellowship was formed to promote biblical standards of justice in our Nation's justice system.

Justice Fellowship volunteers successfully implemented reforms across the country: victim-offender reconciliation programs; alternatives to incarceration for nonviolent offenders; victims' rights legislation, and more. In 1995, former California legislator and ex-prisoner Pat Nolan took the helm of Justice Fellowship and has since spearheaded efforts to pass the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000, the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, and the Second Chance Act of 2007.

In 1992, Operation Starting Line sweeps North Carolina. In 1991, North Carolina's Secretary of Correction Aaron Johnson was pondering the condition of his prisons and saw only one solution—spiritual transformation. In an unprecedented move, he invited Prison Fellowship into every prison in North Carolina to lead a contemporary version of an old-time revival meeting. So in the fall of 1992, using teams of professional athletes, musicians, comedians, and powerhouse speakers, Prison Fellowship's inaugural Starting Line evangelistic campaign swept through all of North Carolina's 90-plus prisons, sharing the life-changing message of Jesus Christ. Since North Carolina, similar evangelistic events have spread to prisons all across the country. And in 1999, Prison Fellowship joined other Christian organizations to launch Operation Starting Line, now an affiliation of 37 ministries committed to prison evangelism.

In 1997, a new kind of prison ministry is born, Interchange Freedom Initiative, a values-based reentry program founded upon the teachings of Christ. With the full endorsement of then-Governor George W. Bush, Prison Fellowship and the State of Texas partnered to launch the very first IFI program in a prison unit near Houston. Interchange Freedom Initiative immerses its inmates-all volunteer participants in spiritual, educational, vocational, and life skills training from an unmistakably Christian perspective. Today, IFI is active in both men's and women's prisons in five states: Arkansas,

Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, and Texas, and many other States are seeing the value of this, of really turning around recidivism. That we've got to provide all of this for our inmates for them to really have true life change.

After God parted the Jordan River, allowing the Israelites to cross on dry land into their new home, He commanded them to erect a memorial of stones. These would stand as a reminder of the miracles God had done for them, Joshua explained. Today we seldom use stones as reminders of God's provision. Instead, we preserve God's works in written accounts and photographs. But the reason remains the same: to remember ''the hand of the Lord is powerful''—that was from Joshua 4:24—''and by His hand, He leads us.''

Since this time, Prison Fellowship has continued to minister around the world, but Chuck Colson also had other activities I've already talked about, and Congressman MCINTYRE talked about the Centurion program, the impact it had on our lives, a hundred citizens each year going through the Centurion program.

He also started the Colson Center for Christian Worldview, which again had a huge impact and has been directly involved in BreakPoint, which is a weekly radio program that is on.

He also was awarded 15 honorary doctorate degrees. And in 1993, Chuck Colson was awarded the Templeton Prize for progress in religion. This is a very prestigious award. It's given to a person who has made an exceptional contribution to affirming life's spiritual dimension. With the Templeton Prize is a $1 million cash award. Chuck Colson could have taken that and spent it on his family. Instead, he donated it to prison ministry to impact prisoners' lives. He also continued to donate throughout his entire life all of the royalties that he received from his books along with royalties from speaking.

In 2008, President George W. Bush honored Chuck Colson with the President's Citizen's Medal.

So again, tonight we have taken just a few minutes to honor a man who had a huge impact on our lives. Many of us in Congress have been impacted by him through his writings and teachings and through our friendship with him. He has also had a huge impact on prisoners around the world and the plight of prisoners, and recognizing that all human life is valuable and needs to be respected and honored and treated with that respect that it deserves.

From the service today, there were a couple of different things. There were a couple of different readings that were done at the service, and I would like to close with this.

First, one of the readings was from Philippians, chapter 3. This was a very important passage for Chuck Colson:

> Yet whatever gains I had, these I have come to regard as loss because of Christ. More than that, I regard everything as loss because of the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and I regard them as rubbish in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him. Not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but one that comes through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God based on faith. I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by becoming like him in his death, if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead. Not that I have already obtained this or have already reached this goal, but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own.

My friend STEVE KING had talked about this radical transformation in his life, and this first pointed to that radical transformation where he could have had everything in this world, was right there next to the seat of power in the Presidency and saw how fleeting that was. He could have had money and resources when he got out of prison and a career in law or so many other things, but instead decided to give back to prisoners and to others as well.

Many would ask: Why would he do that? Well, there was another passage that was read today. This was read by one of his grandchildren. This is from Matthew 25:

> Jesus said, Then the king will say to those on his right hand, ''Come, you that are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was in prison and you visited me.'' Then the righteous will answer him, ''Lord, when was it that we saw you hungry and gave you food or thirsty and gave you something to drink? And when was it that we saw you a stranger and welcomed you, or naked and gave you clothing? And when was it when we saw you sick or in prison and visited you?'' And the king will answer to them, ''Truly I tell you, just as you did it for one of the least of those who are members of my family, you did it for me.''
>
> Then he will say to those on his left hand: ''You are the accursed. Depart from me into the eternal fire prepared for the devils and his angels, for I was hungry and you gave me no food. I was thirsty and you gave me nothing to drink. I was a stranger, and you did not welcome me; naked, and you did not give me clothing; sick and in prison, and you did not visit me.''
>
> Then they will also answer: ''Lord, when was it that we saw you hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison and didn't take care of you?''
>
> Then he will answer them: ''Truly I tell you, just as you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me.''

□ 2110

Chuck Colson saw what his God had done for him, the incredible power of his redemption and transformation that happened in his life, and wanted to share that with those of greatest need. He saw that as the weakest, the poorest, those in prison.

He was also dramatically impacted by his grandson Max. Max is diagnosed with autism. Again, Chuck saw the incredible value of every single life. Chuck was a hard driver, a type A personality to the maximum, but he learned from his grandson Max patience and understanding and love.

So I am so grateful again for the relationship that I've been able to build with Chuck Colson and with his family. We will miss him so dearly.

I want to end this time again by reading from one of Chuck Colson's books. I think this is so powerful. This, again, was part of the ceremony today, the memorial service over at the National Cathedral. This was from Chuck Colson's book, it's him talking in his book, ''Loving God'':

> Easter, 1980. As I sat on the platform waiting my turn at the pulpit, my mind began to drift back in time to scholarships, to honors earned, cases argued and won, great decisions made from lofty government offices. My life had been the great American Dream fulfilled. But all at once I realized that it was not my success God had used to enable me to help those in this prison or in hundreds of others like it. My life of success was not what made this morning so glorious. All my achievements meant nothing in God's economy. No, the real legacy of my life was my biggest failure, that I was an ex-convict. My greatest humiliation, being sent to prison, was the beginning of God's greatest use of my life. He chose the one thing in which I could not glory for his glory.
>
> Confronted with this staggering truth, I discovered in those few months in the prison chapel that my world was turned upside down. I understood with a jolt that I had been looking at my life backwards. But now I could see, only when I lost everything I thought made Chuck Colson a great guy, had I found the true self God intended me to be and the true purpose in my life.
>
> It is not what we do that matters, but what a sovereign God chooses to do through us. God doesn't want our success; he wants us. He doesn't demand our achievements; he demands our obedience. The kingdom of God is a kingdom of paradox, where, through the ugly defeat of the cross, the Holy God is utterly glorified. Victory comes through defeat, healing through brokenness, finding self through losing self.

Chuck Colson truly was one of my heroes, someone I will miss dearly, someone who impacted my family. I will think of him all the time when I look at my own son, Koleson, named after Chuck Colson. But I just want to thank my friends for joining me tonight to honor this great man, honor this great life, and be challenged together to follow the example that he left for us.

Thank you, Chuck. We'll never forget you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to a man we remembered just a few short hours ago at the National Cathedral here in Washington, DC.

The Good Book says, "Render therefore to all their due . . . honor to whom honor." Charles W. Colson is certainly worthy of honor and esteem.

The earthly life of this consequential American has come to an end and I mark this occasion with a sense of profound personal loss.

Chuck Colson rose to the heights of political power and fell to the depths of disgrace. But in his fall, he found redemption in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Given a second chance, Chuck Colson devoted his life to carrying the

Christian message of second chances to those in prison, and he saw countless lives changed by his compassion and example.

His voice of moral clarity was an inspiration to millions of Americans and made him an invaluable counselor to leaders in government and business. I will always count it a privilege to have been able to call him my dear friend and mentor. His dedication to moral integrity, serving his fellow man and his steadfast faith have always and will always be an inspiration to me and my family.

Karen and I offer our deepest condolences to Patty, the whole Colson family and to all who mourn the loss of Chuck Colson.

## CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first let me suggest that I join with my colleagues in honoring the memory of Chuck Colson, a man who also meant a lot to me as an individual. Those of us who come from California and remember Richard Nixon coming out there over the years and remember the great work that Chuck Colson did for our prison community in California, we're very grateful for that. He taught us really the true meaning of Christian compassion. I personally was a beneficiary of that knowledge and that spirit that he helped us understand and develop within our own hearts. So I would like to join my colleagues in that.

But today I rise to call attention to the hundreds of millions of public dollars we have spent and continue to spend in the form of foreign aid to the People's Republic of China—better known as Communist China to those of us who have spent years trying to fight that oppressive regime.

Our national debt is over $15.7 trillion and is growing. We are spending $1.5 trillion more every year than we are taking in. Forty-three cents out of every dollar we spend is borrowed money, and Communist China is the single largest foreign holder of United States debt.

The interest we pay on this ever-growing debt is increasingly squeezing out spending on other worthwhile programs. Why, then, are we borrowing money from the Chinese Communist Government—to be repaid, of course, with interest—and then using that borrowed money to finance programs in which we are giving money to these various programs that go to China, the country from whom we are borrowing?

Remember, the government of this aid recipient considers the United States its enemy. They are happy to loan us the money and they are happy that we are stupid enough to give it back to them in terms of aid and, yes, other types of programs, including giving it back to them in investments.

We are strengthening the government that considers us an enemy. As we look into this situation, we know that they see the U.S. as their enemy, just as Japan saw us as their enemy before World War II—the Japanese militarists—just as Nazi Germany saw the American people as their enemy, and just as the communist governments that threatened the world for over four decades after World War II, just as they saw the United States as their enemy.

Yes, we are the enemy of tyrants and vicious regimes that are expansionary and threaten the peace and the freedom of the world. We can be proud of that. The Chinese know that. The Communist Chinese know that. That's why they don't like us. That's why they consider us their enemy.

China is the world's largest human rights abuser. China's Government smashes those who advocate freedom of the press, freedom of religion. Those who, of course, suggest that the Chinese Government should be accountable to its people are arrested and thrown into jail, or murdered.

It arrests Chinese practitioners of Falun Gong, for example. Falun Gong is a Chinese religious movement which stresses yoga and meditation. Beijing has these devout and passive people, practitioners in a simple religion that is meditation and yoga. These people are arrested and they're thrown into prison where they are murdered. And then the Chinese Government, after murdering these people for their religious convictions, sells their organs and body parts. It doesn't get much more ghoulish than this.

On the international scene, China is responsible for promoting and facilitating the proliferation of nuclear technology between North Korea, Pakistan, Iran, and others. China is responsible for empowering the Burmese junta that imprisoned Aung San Suu Kyi for years. It has allied itself with rogue regimes all over the world, like Sudan and Venezuela and other regimes that are tyrants in their own country and threaten the security of their neighbors and of the United States.

China's aggressive foreign policy and hostile naval actions are threatening the sovereignty of American allies like Japan and the Philippines. It is Communist China that has stolen and is currently stealing most of our prized military and commercial secrets. China has stolen the designs for every one of our nuclear warheads.

Chinese cyberspies have stolen all of our trade secrets. All of the money we put in to invest in research and development they steal and utilize. No wonder they're as far ahead in their rocket program as they are when they took the technology from us; they stole it from us. They have infected our critical electronic technology infrastructure with malicious viruses and then they, of course, break into our classified systems.

It is China which has embarked on the most significant arms buildup since the Cold War. And I ask: Who do they think is their enemy? Who do they think is their enemy? The United States of America. While we not only become susceptible to them, not only do we put ourselves in an inferior position by borrowing money from them, but we also end up giving that money back to them in aid programs.

□ 2120

And that is what I would like to talk about tonight, the fact that how can we possibly borrow money from the world's worst human rights abuser, a country that looks at us as their enemy. Then we become vulnerable to that country. But at the same time while we are becoming vulnerable, we then increase our investment in the private sector of that country. But also we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in aid programs to the communist Chinese regime.

Well, with that in mind, I asked the Congressional Research Service to assemble a list of programs that the Congress funds that go directly to supporting development and the economy of China. It is a partial list because there are so many programs that, after weeks of work, they could not even find them all. This list that I am about to read is of projects that are funded and have been funded over the last 3 years, at the same time, while the Obama administration was spending $1.5 trillion more annually than we're taking in.

So while we're spending more than we're taking in by $1.5 trillion, we are spending on programs that are going to China, and it's China who's lending us the money in order to spend that extra $1.5 trillion. This is an insane policy.

And this spending on China is ongoing. I'm just giving you the facts from the last 3 years, and it is ongoing.

To make sure we all understand exactly where we are spending or sending our taxpayer money, I am going to read a list of programs that we have funded in China, and ask, as we are going through this list, after every time I go through the money, couldn't we have spent this money better in the United States? Or wouldn't it have been better not to borrow it in the first place and add this to $1.5 trillion every year for the last 3 years that we've been putting our people into debt?

So every one of these things that I read, ask yourself that question: Is this in the best interest of the United States? Is it in the best interest of our children who we're putting more in debt by borrowing and giving it to China and having to pay the interest? They're going to have to pay off the loan and the interest to China in the future.

So here's a partial list, and I'm going to round off the figures to an understandable number. And many of these deal with ''environment.''

Why are we trying to make the environment in China better so that the people of China can basically out compete us in our business dealings? That

should be part of the cost of production in China. But, no, we are picking up that cost. Not only that, our people are investing in China and building their factories.

Why did the EPA give, for example, $141,000 to the Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development in Agriculture to reduce greenhouse gases in China? In China.

Why did the EPA give $125,000 to the Eastern Research Group that reduces greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the National Science Foundation give $63,000 to Siena College for Neutrino Physics at Daya Bay in China?

And let me add, some of these will be repeats because we did this, this is over a 3-year period, because we have several programs over the years where we're giving money to the same group in China; and that spending continues, let me add.

Why did the EPA give $150,000 to China for Coal Information Institute for reducing greenhouse gases?

Why did the EPA give $100,000 to Guizhou International Corporation Center for Environmental Protection for reducing greenhouse gases? That's in China, of course.

Why did the EPA give almost $300,000 to the Ministry of Environment Protection in China for reducing health risks? Don't we have health risks in the United States? Don't we have some needs of our own? Why are we giving this money to China?

Why did the EPA give $150,000 to Tsinghua—I'm sorry I can't pronounce this right—University Department of Building Sciences for Environmental Governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Asia Foundation almost $2 million, it was $1.7 million, to build environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give $500,000 to the American Bar Association to build environmental governance in China? Don't we have some things in the United States where we could use a $500,000 grant for some of our local communities? Couldn't they use some help? Instead we sent it to China. But first, of course, we borrowed it from China. So to give it to them, we'll have to repay China and the interest in order to give it to them.

Why did USAID give $300,000 to the University of Massachusetts to improve the quality of judicial education in China? We're giving them $300,000 in order to improve judicial education in China?

Why did USAID give $200,000 to the University of the Pacific to advance the rule of law in China?

Why did USAID give $55,000 to Nexant, an NGO, to be an administrator of China program evaluations?

Why did USAID give $2 million to Winrock International Institute for Agriculture for sustainable livelihoods in China? I guess we don't need any help in our farm belt. I guess our farmers don't need my help in California where they're going broke because the water has been cut off to them in order to protect some delta smelt. Our guys are going crazy and going broke, our farmers are, but we're going to find $2 million borrowed from China in order to give back to China in order to aid the Institute of Agriculture so that they can have sustainable livelihoods in China.

Why did USAID give $2 million to the Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, an NGO, for sustainable livelihoods in China? Think there are any Americans that need sustainable livelihoods?

Why did USAID give $2 million to the Institute of Sustainable Communities to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Oh, yes. We need to make sure we pay all of China's environmental expenses; otherwise, they won't accept global government like our government expects us to accept.

Why did USAID give $749,000, almost $750,000, to the ICF International to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did USAID give $500,000 to the Asia Foundation for humanitarian assistance to China?

Why did the USDA give $10,000 to Texas Agriculture Experiment for biological control of forest insects in China? Do our forests not need this?

Why are we borrowing money when we can't afford to do these things in our own country?

Why did the USDA give almost $100,000 to Rutgers State University for climate change adaptation in China?

Now isn't that great? We're paying for them to adapt to climate change. Then, of course, they'll join the global government which these same people are trying to force on us. But then we are under a mountain of debt, our children, in order to pay for their adaptation to climate change. Not, of course, to say that anybody in the United States, our farmers or any other industry, doesn't need to adapt to the different changes that go on in the climate, even if they are natural changes in our climate.

Why did the Department of Energy give $2.5 million to the University of Michigan for the U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center? Shouldn't we be developing our own clean energy in the United States? Instead, we borrow money from China in order to spend it in China, and then we have to pay debt, interest on that debt, and pay back the debt. Our children will, of course, be doing that.

Why did the Department of Energy give $2.5 million to West Virginia University for a U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center? Again, a research center, perhaps the same research center, but the next year. So that makes it $5 million that we've given to that research center in China.

Why did the Department of Energy give $1.2 million to West Virginia University for Long-Term Environmental and Economic Impacts of Coal Liquefaction in China? That's $1.2 million to, yes, spend through West Virginia University. Don't we have coal liquefaction environmental studies going on in the United States that could use that money for research to make sure that our coal burns more cleanly and effectively here, rather than giving that money and information to China's benefit and borrowing it from them in order to give it to them?

□ 2130

Why did the Department of Energy give $5.3 million to Brookhaven National Laboratory in the Daya Bay nuclear project in China? That's over $5 million. By the way, that's $5 million to this nuclear facility.

Let me just note that, in my district, we have a problem with a nuclear power plant that's going through some very serious problems right now, San Onofre. We maybe could have used that $5 million to help us correct the problems at the San Onofre plant. But no. We borrowed the money from China to give it back to them to solve their problems while our children will be forced to pay that debt off. We get no benefit out of it except a load of debt on our children.

Why did the Department of Energy give almost $400,000 to the State University of Albany to study climate change in China? Oh, yes.

Why did the Department of Energy give $300,000 to the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory for the modeling of regional climate change in China? Again, it's using climate change as a vehicle to give them money that we are borrowing from them in the first place, which we will then have to repay.

Why did the Department of Energy give $256,000 to the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute for research at the Daya Bay nuclear project in China? Again, another $250,000 to this Daya Bay nuclear project. It could have been the next year because this is over a 3-year period. These are some of these. By the way, it's not anywhere near all of them over the 3-year period, but all of these are taken from a list over that 3-year period. Yes, we could have used some of that money to make sure that we didn't have a problem in our own districts.

Why did the Department of Energy give $210,000 to Rutgers State University for Site Science for the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Mobile Facility in China? Why are we doing that? Why are we providing them that type of a foundation, a scientific foundation, so that they can prosper and so that they won't have to spend their resources paying for that type of scientific infrastructure?

Why did the Department of Energy give $135,000 to the University of Maryland for the climactic effects of aerosols in China? There you go—aerosols. It's an issue from way back then, which some of us think was not entirely reported, but now we are still giving almost $150,000 to check out aerosols in China for their benefit.

Why did the Department of Energy give over $500,000 to the University of

Houston for a proposal to measure neutrino mixing at the Daya Bay nuclear experiment in China? Again, over a half a million dollars while we're having trouble with our own nuclear program.

We should be developing our own new generation of nuclear power which will be safe—and we can do it—but we don't have the money to do it. Why? We're giving millions of dollars to China and to others, money that should go to developing our own new technology here. Of course, we are borrowing the money from China in order to give it to them, which leaves our children in debt, and they'll have to pay it all off with interest.

Why did the Department of Energy give $70,000 to Colorado State University for the climactic effects of aerosols in China?

Why did the Department of Energy give $19,000 to Pennsylvania State University for factors influencing energy use and carbon emissions in China? Isn't that nice that we gave the University of Pennsylvania money to study this for China so they will have the information in China and will be able to use it for their benefit rather than studying things in the United States to help us so we can do better here.

Why did the EPA give over $500,000—$550,000 to be exact—to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost a half a million dollars to the Research Triangle Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China? This is basically making equipment more efficient. Why aren't we making our equipment more efficient? The Chinese should buy it from us rather than our having to relocate our manufacturing plants in China. Yes, let them buy it from us—how about that?—and give our own people jobs rather than borrowing money so that they could have the technology. We are going in debt so that they can have the technology, and our children will have to pay the debt back with interest, and they will sell us the equipment. The Chinese will sell it to us in a generation.

Why did the EPA give $300,000 to the Energy and Environmental Development Research Center to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost $250,000 to the Research Triangle Institute again—probably a second year of their grant—to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost $200,000 to the China University of Petroleum in Beijing to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Can't any of our people use this research money to help our country and our technology become cleaner and more efficient? No. We're giving it to China, and then they will sell that technology back to us after they manufacture it years ahead of us because we subsidize their R&D.

Why did the EPA give almost $200,000 to the China Urban Construction Design & Research Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Again, here we are spending money to help them design houses in China. Wonderful. None of our designers need any help.

Why did the EPA give almost $300,000 to the Eastern Research Group to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give over $100,000 to Guangzhou City, China, to reduce greenhouse gases?

Why did the EPA give $110,000 to the Guizhou International Cooperation Center for Environmental Protection to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Do we have no need for this money in the United States? Does our equipment not need to be more efficient? Should we not be investigating putting money into the development of cleaner energy sources here? With all this money we're giving away, we could be developing clean energy sources, if nothing else, for the new generation of nuclear power plants, which is starving for research money. No, we're giving it to China.

Why did the EPA give almost $100,000 to the China University of Petroleum in Beijing to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give $200,000 to California State University at Fullerton to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give $85,000 to ICF International to build climate change management capacity in China?

Why did the EPA give $135,000 to Information Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give over $50,000 to Advanced Resources International to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give $31,000 to the Energy and Environmental Development Research Center for biogas development?

Each and every one of these items I am talking about is an item on which we spent money out of the Federal budget. We took it out of the taxpayers' pockets—or actually, we borrowed it from China—and then left them with the debt in their pockets, the IOU in their pockets, and we gave it to China rather than taking that money, those resources, and spending it in the United States to develop the technology here.

Like I say, I've been struggling for years to get the new generation of nuclear power developed here. It has been starved—it has not been given what it needs—and we're giving away these hundreds of millions of dollars to the Chinese, which we, of course, are borrowing. In the end, we will pay them for the technology because they will be sending the manufactured items here.

Why did the EPA give $30,000 to the China Association of Rural Energy Industry to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost $800,000 to the China State Environmental Protection Administration to reduce transboundary air pollution? Well, that's great. We have to pay for everybody's air pollution in the world. We are borrowing money from China, but we have to pay for their reduction of transboundary air pollution.

Why did the EPA give almost $200,000 to the Chinese Ministry of Environmental Protection to build environmental management capacity?

Why did the EPA give $120,000 to the Tianjin Environmental Protection Bureau for water pollution management? Now, there is something we don't need any money for around our country—water pollution. I live in a coastal district. We could use that money for water pollution. We've got sewer pipes and water purification systems that need to be upgraded. But no. We're borrowing money from China to give it to China rather than having that money spent in the United States.

Why did the National Science Foundation give $62,000 to Sienna College for neutrino physics at, again, the Daya Bay nuclear project in China? Well, we're not spending the money here to develop our own clean nuclear energy.

□ 2140

Why did USAID give Management Systems International almost $500,000 to improve environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give Vermont Law School—get this—$1,725,000 for improved environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Institute for Sustainable Communities half a million dollars to save energy and reduce greenhouse gases in China? Can't we put this use in these structures in the United States?

Why did USAID give the University of the Pacific a half a million dollars for environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the American Bar Association $500,000 for environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the University of Massachusetts $420,000 for environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development $150,000 for development assistance in China?

Why did USAID give Management Systems International $50,000 for development assistance?

Why did USAID give the Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors $2 million for sustainable livelihoods in China? Don't we have people in the United States who need money like that? Don't we have people, indeed, here who need a sustainable livelihood? Why are we giving it to China and borrowing it from them in order to give it to them and leaving our kids in debt?

Why did USAID give Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors $400,000 for sustainable livelihoods in China?

Why did the USDA give the University of Science and Technology of China $150,000 for research? Don't our

universities need money for research for things that we can use here in the United States to make our life better?

Why did the USDA give the SB Group Consultants $25,000 for education in China?

Why did the USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International $40,000 to improve forest health in China? We don't need any help with our forests here, do we?

Why did the USDA give Yangzhou University $36,000 to improve biological controls in China?

Why did the USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International $8,000 for administrative purposes in China?

Why did the USDA give Utah State University almost $400,000 for biomass research in China? I happen to know American companies and people who are investing in biomass research. Why are we giving almost $400,000 to help the Chinese in biomass research, which will compete with our own companies that are trying to develop this very important and unique energy source? Which by the way for the environmentalists who are watching, who think that I may be making light of climate change, I support biomass and other clean-energy programs that make sense. This one makes sense. Our companies are investing in it, and yet we're borrowing money from China in order to give it to them to do biomass research to compete with our own people and put them out of business.

Why did the USDA give Tetra Tech EM $325,000 for administrative purposes for environmental programs in China?

Why did USAID give the Institute of Sustainable Communities—get this—another $500,000 to save energy and reduce greenhouse gases in China? Don't we have the need in our communities to do things in a sustainable way in the United States? No. They don't have that money now. It's in China. We borrowed it from China to give to them. Now we're going to have to pay the bill back after we've given it to them.

Why did USAID give the University of the Pacific $500,000 for environmental governance in China? Again a half a million dollars.

Why did USAID give the American Bar Association $500,000 for environmental governance?

Why did USAID give the University of Massachusetts $420,000 for Environmental Governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development $150,000 for Development Assistance in China?

Why did USAID give Management Systems International $47,484 for Development Assistance in China?

Why did USAID give Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors $2.4 million for Sustainable Livelihoods in China?

Why did USAID give The Asia Foundation $1,025,000 to improve Disaster Management in China?

Why did USDA give the University of Science and Technology of China $150,000 for Research?

Why did USDA give Guangzhou Dxcel Advertising $18,500 for Administrative Purposes in China?

Why did USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International $40,994 to improve forest health in China?

Why did USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International $7,973 for administrative purposes in China?

Why did USDA give Southern University $300,000 for improved Education in China?

Why did USDA give Colorado State University $300,000 for improved Education in China?

I will end my remarks tonight by suggesting that what we are doing is insane. America will never survive with such a mindset with these mind-boggling giveaway programs where we're giving away money, we're giving this type of support to a country and a government that is totalitarian, that kills Christians and other religious people, who hates the United States and is our biggest potential enemy. That is not the Chinese people. That's the Chinese Government.

The Chinese dictatorship has cover today, and the reason why these policies go on is they have cover from some of our most powerful corporations. We have permitted overly subsidized American corporations to set up manufacturing facilities in China, and now they need to stand in the good graces of the Chinese Government. When I come up and say things like this, corporations in the United States try to provide cover for the Chinese dictatorship. We should not be providing aid to the Chinese. We should not be encouraging our corporations to go there and become vulnerable to the Chinese in order to make a quick profit.

I would suggest over the last 10 years, since most-favored trading status has been given to China, we have put America in a very vulnerable spot. We at the very least should reassess our relationship with China, but at the very least cut off any aid programs that go to this communist regime, this totalitarian regime that looks at us as their enemy.

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

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4310, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–485) on the resolution (H. Res. 661) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 14, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2668. To designate the station of the United States Border located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the 'Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station'.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, May 17, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6021. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Pomegranates From Chile Under a Systems Approach [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0024] (RIN: 0579-AD38) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6022. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Pitaya Fruit From Central America Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0113] (RIN: 0579-AD40) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6023. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Clementines From Spain; Amendment to Inspection Provisions [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0036] (RIN: 0579-AD27) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6024. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John E. Sterling, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6025. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Ann E. Rondeau, United States Navy, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6026. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas in Massachusetts [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0128] received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6027. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevations Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6028. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Further Definition of ''Swap Dealer'', ''Security-Based Swap Dealer'', ''Major Swap Participant'', ''Major Security-Based Swap Participant'' and ''Eligible Contract Participant'' [Release No.: 34-66868; File No. S7-39-10] (RIN: 3235-AK65) received April 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6029. A letter from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6030. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicaid Program; Community First Choice Option [CMS-2337-F] (RIN: 0398-AQ35) received May 1, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6031. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a proposal for the reauthorization for the Medical Device User Fee Act (MDUFA); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6032. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief for Cybersecurity and Communications Reliability, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — The Proposed Extension of Part 4 of the Connected Voice Over Internet Protocol Service Providers and Broadband Internet Service Providers [PS Docket No. 11-82] received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6033. A letter from the Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Out Future; Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers; High-Cost Universal Service Support; Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Lifeline and Link-Up; Universal Service Reform — Mobility Fund [WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51, WC Docket No. 07-135, WC Docket No. 05-337, CC Docket No. 01-92, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 03-109, WT Docket No. 10-208] April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6034. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report for the period January 16, 2011 to January 15, 2012 on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and U.S. participation in that organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6035. A letter from the Presiding Governor, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting the Broadcasting Board of Governors' 2011 Annual Report, pursuant to Section 305(a)(9) of the U.S. International Broadcasting Act of 1994, Pub. L. 103-236, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6204; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6036. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2011 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6037. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Community Development Quota Program [Docket No.: 070718367-2061-02] (RIN: 0648-AV33) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6038. A letter from the Special Assistant, Alaska Rural Justice and Law Enforcement Commission, transmitting the January 2012 Report to Congress and the Alaska State Legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6039. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revised Jurisdictional Threshold for Section 8 of the Clayton Act received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6040. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials; Packages Intended for Transport by Aircraft [Docket No.: PHMSA-07-29364 (HM-231A)] (RIN: 2137-AE32) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6041. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — National Registry of Certified Medical Examiners [Docket No.: FMCSA-2009-0363] (RIN: 2126-AA97) received May 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6042. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's biennial report on evaluation, research and technical assistance activities supported by ''The Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6043. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and Claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 201 2-21) April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6044. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Extension of Certain Wage Index Reclassifications and Special Exemptions for the Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems (PPS) for Acute Care Hospitals and the Hospital Outpatient PPS [CMS-1442-N] received May 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6045. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Program; Regulatory Provisions to Promote Program Efficiency, Transparency, and Burden Reduction [CMS-9070-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ96) received May 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of justification for the President's waiver of the restrictions on the provision of funds to the Palestinian Authority; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

6047. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the National Security Education Program (NSEP) for 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1906; jointly to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and Education and the Workforce.

## 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. LUCAS: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1840. A bill to improve consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders (Rept. 112–482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 373. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to ensure that actions taken by regulatory agencies are subject to that Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–483, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3433. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide transparency and require certain standards in the award of Federal grants, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 112–484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

*[Filed on May 17 (legislative day of May 16), 2012]*

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 661. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–485). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 373 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

## 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. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA,

Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 5781. A bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum standards of visitability for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5782. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plastic device book style covers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5783. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain textile device book style covers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5784. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain textile device covers and stands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5785. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plastic device covers and stands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 5786. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on -Phenyl-7-(4,4,5,6-tetramentyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2-yl)-quinoline (OSIP-690520, quinolone boronate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5787. A bill to provide for congressional oversight of United States agreements with the Government of Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 5788. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the ''National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 5789. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a certain interim final or final rule regarding nutrition programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 5790. A bill to provide for the transfer of the United States Postal Service surplus with respect to certain retirement benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 5791. A bill to provide for reasonable and necessary access to Wilderness Areas for the restoration of water sources, supplies, or infrastructure during a state of emergency declared by the Governor of a State; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5792. A bill to require a report on implementation of a termination of the ground combat exclusion policy for female members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BASS of California (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 659. A resolution recognizing the goals and ideals of National Foster Care Month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 660. A resolution expressing support for designation of December 12, 2012, as Foster Children's Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

206. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 104 requesting that the President and the Congress reverse and reject the HHS regulation so that those who sponsor, purchase and issue health insurance plans should not be forced to violate their deeply held moral and religious convictions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

207. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 103 urging the Congress to endorse and enact a Community Forest Trust pilot for Idaho; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

208. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 105 urging the Congress to reexamine, reform and reauthorize the Endangered Species Act; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and 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. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 5781.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5782.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5783.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5784.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5785.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 5786.

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

Article 1, Section 8, which states that, ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . .''

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5787.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11, and Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 5788.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

''The Congress shall have Power to establish Post Offices and postroads''

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 5789.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 5790.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 5791.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

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; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5792.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14, to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 451: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 595: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 639: Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 733: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 780: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 835: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 860: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 904: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 973: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1044: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1051: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 1066: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1085: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1283: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1327: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. REED, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1340: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1370: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 1394: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARINO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1404: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1410: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1418: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1426: Mr. JONES and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1478: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1498: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1546: Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1581: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROONEY, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1639: Mr. CLAY and Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 1653: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 1666: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1675: Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1697: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 1733: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1756: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1792: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1802: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1842: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1860: Mr. SCHOCK and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1955: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1956: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1957: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 1964: Mr. HURT.
H.R. 2030: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2051: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2065: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 2077: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 2104: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2123: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2139: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2238: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2299: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2310: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2359: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2492: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2514: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 2569: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2637: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2672: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2721: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2746: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2780: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2787: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2866: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 2874: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2888: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2902: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2978: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2985: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 3087: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3125: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3173: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3187: Mr. HALL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3200: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3238: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3288: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3308: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 3337: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3444: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 3497: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 3506: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 3541: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3591: Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 3596: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 3627: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3643: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3661: Mr. BACA, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3668: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. YODER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3679: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3785: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 3790: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 3803: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WEST, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 3839: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 3849: Mr. ADERHOLT and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 3985: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4051: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 4052: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. CHU, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4066: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 4070: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 4077: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4095: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4124: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
H.R. 4134: Mr. COSTA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4155: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4160: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4192: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4202: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4210: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4227: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4229: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 4235: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4256: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4269: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4271: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4295: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 4323: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 4327: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 4342: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4362: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 4367: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 4377: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4402: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4471: Mr. TERRY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 4480: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 4643: Mr. LONG and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4816: Mr. KEATING and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4818: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 4933: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 5303: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 5331: Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 5542: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5615: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 5646: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5684: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5707: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5710: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 5713: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5719: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 5738: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 5740: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 5741: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 5748: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 5750: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.J. Res. 45: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. HOYER.
H.J. Res. 81: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.J. Res. 108: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 25: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana and Mr. MATHESON.
H. Res. 134: Mr. KEATING and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H. Res. 282: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 298: Mr. COOPER.
H. Res. 568: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 604: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H. Res. 609: Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 618: Mr. NADLER and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 644: Mr. STIVERS.
H. Res. 647: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 650: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Res. 654: Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

## 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:

The amendment to be offered by Representative MCKEON to H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

## DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4103: Mr. BENISHEK.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. GRIJALVA.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Lauderdale Lakes, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2012-38 expressing condolences to the family of Trayvon Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

45. Also, a petition of the Town of New Shoreham, Rhode Island, relative to Resolution condemning in no uncertain terms Section 1021 of the 2012 NDAA; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.