The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Kim).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, April 3, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY KIM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Loving God, You are compassionate and merciful. We give You thanks for giving us another day. This morning the House welcomes Jens Stoltenberg, NATO’s Secretary General. When the world remembers the 70th anniversary of the alliance, may he find a welcome here, and may the cooperation of so many countries continue into a future of mutual respect and security among the community of nations.

There are many issues which press upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon.

J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, You are compassionate and merciful. We give You thanks for giving us another day. This morning the House welcomes Jens Stoltenberg, NATO’s Secretary General. When the world remembers the 70th anniversary of the alliance, may he find a welcome here, and may the cooperation of so many countries continue into a future of mutual respect and security among the community of nations.

There are many issues which press upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. C.L. CRUZ);

The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. JOHNSON);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES);

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK);

The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF);

The gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY);

The gentlewoman from California (Mr. McCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

Accordingly, (at 9 o’clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY JENS STOLTENBERG, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o’clock and 52 minutes a.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg into the Chamber:

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. SCHWARTZ)

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. CLARK);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY);

The gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, March 28, 2019, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The House rose subject to the call of the Chair.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1052 is 10:52 a.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. Cheney);

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Emmer);

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Palmer);

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Walker);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Smith);

The gentleman from California (Mr. Nunes); and

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McConnell);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Thune);

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso);

The Senator from Iowa (Ms. Ernst);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blunt);

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch);

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray);

The Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar);

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Manchin);

The Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin);

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez);

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin); and

The Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Shaheen).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Serge Mombouli, the Ambassador of the Republic of Congo.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker’s rostrum.

At 11 o’clock and 10 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk’s desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, have the privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Secretary General STOLLENBERG.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, honorable Members of the United States Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am truly really honored and grateful for the privilege of addressing you all today and to represent the 29 members of the NATO alliance.

Seventy years ago tomorrow, NATO’s founding treaty was signed in this great city. On that day, President Truman said: ‘‘We hope to create a shield against aggression and the fear of aggression; a bulwark which will permit us to get on with the real business of government and society; the business of achieving a fuller and happier life for all our citizens.’’

Our alliance was created by people who had lived through two devastating world wars. They knew only too well the horror, the suffering, and the human and material cost of war. They were determined that this should never happen again. And they were also determined that this should never happen again.

And then a sense of kinship with this nation, which was taking control over its neighbors, crushing democracies, and oppressing their people.

So they founded NATO with a clear purpose: to preserve peace and to safeguard freedom, and—with an ironclad commitment by all members of the alliance—to protect each other. They made a solemn promise: one for all and all for one.

This commitment has served us well. Peace has been preserved and freedom maintained.

Yes, allies have been involved in conflicts in different parts of the world, and allies have suffered the pain of terrorist attacks, but no NATO ally has been attacked by another country. The Cold War ended without a shot being fired in Europe, and we have experienced an unprecedented period of peace. So the NATO alliance is not only the longest lasting alliance in history, it is the most successful alliance in history.

Ever since the founding of our treaty, our alliance, in 1949, every Congress, every American President, your men and women in uniform, and the people of the United States of America have been staunch supporters of NATO.

America has been the backbone of our alliance. It has been fundamental to European security and for our freedom. We would not have the peaceful and prosperous Europe we see today without the sacrifice and the commitment of the United States.

For your enduring support, I thank you all today.

So NATO has been good for Europe. But NATO has also been good for the United States. The strength of a nation is not only measured by the size of its economy or the number of its soldiers, but also by the number of its friends. And through NATO, the United States has more friends than any other power. This has made the United States stronger, safer, and more secure.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, it is good to have friends. Yesterday, as I flew over the Atlantic, I looked out of my window at the ocean below, the great ocean that lies between our two continents. The Atlantic does not divide us; it unites us, and it binds us together.

For Norwegians like me, the Atlantic Ocean defines who we are. Indeed, it was a Norseman, Leif Erikson, who was the first European to reach American shores almost 1,000 years ago—a fact more people would know if he hadn’t left so quickly and decided not to tell anyone about it.

For adventurers like Leif Erikson, the Atlantic Ocean was never a barrier. Rather, it was a great blue bridge to new lands and new possibilities. For millions of Europeans, it was then a bridge to freedom, sanctuary, and hope.

My grandparents were among them. My mother was born in Paterson, New Jersey, and I lived part of my childhood in San Francisco. So, this has given me a sense of kinship with this wonderful country, a kinship that has only grown throughout my life.

For instance, I remember well during the Cold War, when I was a conscript in the Norwegian Army, our forces were trained and equipped to hold the line.

But we knew that we could not take on the might of the Soviet Union alone, and Norway is actually bordering the Soviet Union or was bordering the Soviet Union during the Cold War. But we also knew that we were not alone. We knew that, if needed, our NATO allies, led by the United States, would soon be there with us. We enjoyed a level of security that only our transatlantic alliance could provide.

So, thanks to NATO, as a young man during the Cold War, I felt safe. And that says something about the strength of our alliance.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, at the entrance to the NATO headquarters in Belgium, there are two monuments—one, a piece of the Berlin Wall. Designed to keep people in and ideas out, it failed. It failed because the ideas and the values of those who built it were less compelling and less powerful than ours, because we, as NATO, were resolute. We stood together and would not back down.

The other monument is a twisted steel beam from the North Tower of the World Trade Center, a memorial to the ordinary people going about their business on an ordinary day when the unthinkable happened, a memorial to the 2,977 people who lost their lives on
and to keep our people safe.

The men and women of our armed forces have fought together over decades. This includes, actually, also, many of you in this room, in this Congress, in my delegation. And I pay tribute to you and to all those who serve in the defense of freedom.

There is no higher cause than freedom. And in these two monuments, we see the challenges we have overcome as an alliance.

We deterred the Soviet Union during the Cold War, stopped wars and atrocities in the Balkans; fought terrorism from Afghanistan to the Middle East; welcomed the newly free nations of Central and Eastern Europe into our alliance, helping to spread democracy, peace, and prosperity.

And NATO’s door remains open. This year, the Republic of North Macedonia signed the accession protocol. And with your support, North Macedonia will soon become the 30th member of our alliance.

So, what started in 1949 with 12 members has proven a powerful force for peace, an alliance that others strive to join, showing the historic success of NATO.

But as you all know, success in the past is not a guarantee of success in the future. And we have to be frank. Questions are being asked on both sides of the Atlantic about the strength of our partnership.

And, yes, there are differences. We are an alliance of many different nations, with different geography, history, and political parties: Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and labor, independents, greens, and many more. This is democracy.

Open discussions and different views are not a sign of weakness, they are a sign of strength. So, we should not be surprised when we see differences between our countries.

Today, there are disagreements on issues such as trade, energy, climate change, and the Iran nuclear deal. These are serious issues with serious disagreements. But we should remember what we have had our disagreements also before: the Suez crisis in 1956; the French withdrawal from military cooperation in NATO in 1966; or the Iraq war in 2003, which was strongly supported by some allies and equally strongly opposed by others.

The strength of NATO is that, despite our differences, we have always been able to unite around our core task, to defend each other, protect each other, and to keep our people safe.

We must overcome our disagreements in the past, and we must overcome our differences now, because we will need our alliance even more in the future.
stopped this brutality, and millions of people have been liberated.

But our work is not done. That is why NATO is stepping up our training of Iraqi forces, so they can better defend their country and make sure that ISIS cannot return.

This is also why NATO supports our partners in the Middle East and North Africa, helping them to build up their intelligence services, border security, cybersecurity, and Special Operations Forces.

Training local forces and building local capacity are among the best weapons we have in the fight against terrorism. Prevention is better than intervention.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, some of you here today will have been directly affected by terrorism. You may have lost friends and loved ones. You know the reality of terrorism. I know it too.

I was Prime Minister of Norway on the 22nd of July 2011, a date that will live in infamy in the history of my country. That day, a terrorist detonated a bomb outside my office, killing eight people and injuring many more.

He then went to the island of Utøya, where we were enjoying a summer camp. He killed a further 69 people, most of them teenagers with their whole lives ahead of them. It was the darkest day in Norway since the Second World War. It was the darkest day of my life.

Terrorism comes in many forms. Some perpetrators misuse religion, others misuse political ideology. They claim to be different from each other, fighting for different causes, but they are all the same. They believe in hatred, violence, and killing innocent men, women, and children. They are nothing more than cowards.

Terrorists attack our freedom, our values, and our way of life. Our answer must always be more openness and more democracy. Our values will prevail.

Freedom will prevail over oppression, tolerance over intolerance, and love will always prevail over hate.

I see this in the flowers laid outside the mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand. I see this in the lives led by the young survivors of the attacks in Norway.

I see this in New York and Washington, two indomitable cities, cities that were intimidated, not defeated, but which rose stronger than ever from the horror of that September morning.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, NATO is a strong alliance, but to remain a strong alliance, NATO must be a fair alliance.

In an ideal world, we would not need to spend any money on defense. But we do not live in an ideal world.

Freedom has enemies, and they need to be deterred. And if deterrence fails, we need to fight it.

Hitler could not have been stopped with peaceful protests. Stalin could not have been deterred with words. ISIS could not have been defeated with dialogue.

Future enemies of freedom may choose violence again. Our desire for a peaceful world is simply not enough. We must act, and invest, to make it so. We are obligated to spend more on defense. This has been the clear message from President Trump, and this message is having a real impact.

After years of reducing defense budgets, all allies have stopped the cuts and have increased their defense spending. Before, they were cutting billions; now they are adding billions.

In just the last 2 years, European allies and Canada have spent an additional $41 billion on defense. By the end of next year, that figure will rise to $100 billion. This is making NATO stronger.

That money will allow us to invest in new capabilities our armed forces need; including advanced fighter aircraft, attack helicopters, missile defense, and surveillance drones. This is good for Europe, and it is good for America.

America’s NATO allies provide important capabilities; including tens of thousands of intelligence personnel and cyber experts, giving the United States better eyes and ears where they need them, from tracking submarines in the Arctic to taking down the cyber networks of ISIS.

Europe provides the U.S. with a platform to project power around the world.

Last year, I was in Fort Worth, Texas, and I saw how industries from many NATO allies are working together to produce next-generation strike-fighter aircraft.

NATO has always had a technological edge. To keep that edge, we must innovate and capitalize on the ingenuity of our industries and our best minds, on both sides of the Atlantic. This will continue to provide us with advanced capabilities and create jobs in the United States, Canada, and Europe.

So our transatlantic bond is not just about security, it is also about prosperity.

It is not by chance that Article 2 of the Washington Treaty encourages economic collaboration between our Nations.

Europe and America have long been, by far, each other’s largest trading partners, creating millions of jobs on both sides of the Atlantic, generating more than $3 billion a day in trade, injecting trillions of dollars into our economies.

There is more wealth, greater health, better education, and more happiness thanks to the bond between our two continents.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, the ultimate expression of burden-sharing is that we stand together, fight together, and sometimes die together.

I have visited Arlington National Cemetery to pay tribute to all those American soldiers who have given their lives, many of them in defense of Europe.

Two world wars and the Cold War made it clear how important America is to the security of Europe and, equally, that peace and stability in Europe is important to the United States.

Our alliance has not lasted for 70 years out of a sense of nostalgia or of sentiment.

NATO lasts because it is in the national interest of each and every one of our Nations.

Together, we represent 1 billion people. We are half of the world’s economic might and half of the world’s military might.

When we stand together, we are stronger than any potential challenger economically, politically, and militarily.

We need this collective strength because we will face new threats, and we have seen so many times before how difficult it is to predict the future. We were not able to predict the fall of the Berlin Wall, the 9/11 attacks, the rise of Crimea. Since we cannot foresee the future, we have to be prepared for the unforeseen. We need a strategy to deal with uncertainty. We have one. That strategy is NATO.

A strong and agile NATO reduces risks and enables us to deal with surprises when they happen. And they will happen.

NATO is the most successful alliance in history because we have always been able to change as the world changes, and because, despite our differences, we are united in our commitment to each other.

NATO is an alliance of sovereign nations, united by democracy, liberty, and the rule of law, by a person’s right to live their life in the pursuit of happiness, free from oppression—values that lie at the heart of the United States and at the heart of NATO.

As President Eisenhower, NATO’s first Supreme Allied Commander, said, “We are concerned not only with the protection of territory . . . but with the defense of a way of life.”

Europe and North America are not separated by the Atlantic Ocean; we are united by it. And just like the Atlantic, NATO unites our continents, our nations, and our people. It has done so for 70 years.

And today, we must do everything in our power to maintain that unity for future generations. Whatever comes our way, we are stronger and safer when we stand together.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, it is good to have friends.

Thank you.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o’clock and 56 minutes a.m., His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:
The members of the President’s Cabinet:

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York) at 12 o’clock and 26 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Dear Madam Speaker: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 3, 2019, at 12:00 p.m.:

The Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1585.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 281 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 281
Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(h) 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. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, 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. No amendment to 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. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendment to 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. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-9 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No Member may debate the bill shall be considered for amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text.

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the resolution is to provide for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, under a structured rule.

The rule self-executes a manager’s amendment that makes technical changes to reflect appropriate statute sections, corrects terminologies, and makes in order 40 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this year, we are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, a landmark piece of bipartisan legislation that has helped prevent innumerable instances of domestic violence and ensures that millions of survivors have access to the services they need.

VAWA was and is still a piece of legislation developed by the people who work closest to these issues in their communities. The bipartisan bill we will vote on this week reflects the ongoing commitment of Members on both sides of the aisle to ending domestic violence and abuse in all forms.

Before I get further into the components and details of the bill, I would like to share two stories about my constituents to illustrate why VAWA reauthorization is so critical and why we must continue to commit ourselves to preventing domestic violence at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, please keep in mind that each of these stories happened in the last week in my districts.

First, last week, a young woman was murdered by her ex-husband at a convenience store, where the two were meeting to exchange custody of their 6-year-old son. The ex-husband left their son at home and, instead, brought an AR-15 style rifle, which he used to murder the woman in the middle of the store.

He was caught by law enforcement after he fled the store, but as a result of these horrific actions, a young woman was murdered in cold blood and a child has, effectively, lost both parents.

This was not the first time the ex-husband had threatened to kill his ex-wife during a child custody exchange just like the one this past week. Following an incident 3 years ago, he was charged with harassment and making terroristic threats, and the woman was granted a protection-from-abuse order. But this didn’t prevent her or her family from living in fear of what her ex-husband might do next. Tragically, the very worst happened.

Before I get further into the components and details of the bill, I would like to share two stories about my constituents to illustrate why VAWA reauthorization is so critical and why we must continue to commit ourselves to preventing domestic violence at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, please keep in mind that each of these stories happened in the last week in my districts.

First, last week, a young woman was murdered by her ex-husband at a convenience store, where the two were meeting to exchange custody of their 6-year-old son. The ex-husband left their son at home and, instead, brought an AR-15 style rifle, which he used to murder the woman in the middle of the store.

He was caught by law enforcement after he fled the store, but as a result of these horrific actions, a young woman was murdered in cold blood and a child has, effectively, lost both parents.

This was not the first time the ex-husband had threatened to kill his ex-wife during a child custody exchange just like the one this past week. Following an incident 3 years ago, he was charged with harassment and making terroristic threats, and the woman was granted a protection-from-abuse order. But this didn’t prevent her or her family from living in fear of what her ex-husband might do next. Tragically, the very worst happened.

Before I get further into the components and details of the bill, I would like to share two stories about my constituents to illustrate why VAWA reauthorization is so critical and why we must continue to commit ourselves to preventing domestic violence at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, please keep in mind that each of these stories happened in the last week in my districts.

First, last week, a young woman was murdered by her ex-husband at a convenience store, where the two were meeting to exchange custody of their 6-year-old son. The ex-husband left their son at home and, instead, brought an AR-15 style rifle, which he used to murder the woman in the middle of the store.

He was caught by law enforcement after he fled the store, but as a result of these horrific actions, a young woman was murdered in cold blood and a child has, effectively, lost both parents.

This was not the first time the ex-husband had threatened to kill his ex-wife during a child custody exchange just like the one this past week. Following an incident 3 years ago, he was charged with harassment and making terroristic threats, and the woman was granted a protection-from-abuse order. But this didn’t prevent her or her family from living in fear of what her ex-husband might do next. Tragically, the very worst happened.

Before I get further into the components and details of the bill, I would like to share two stories about my constituents to illustrate why VAWA reauthorization is so critical and why we must continue to commit ourselves to preventing domestic violence at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, please keep in mind that each of these stories happened in the last week in my districts.

First, last week, a young woman was murdered by her ex-husband at a convenience store, where the two were meeting to exchange custody of their 6-year-old son. The ex-husband left their son at home and, instead, brought an AR-15 style rifle, which he used to murder the woman in the middle of the store.

He was caught by law enforcement after he fled the store, but as a result of these horrific actions, a young woman was murdered in cold blood and a child has, effectively, lost both parents.
her bedroom, and shot her. Her 5-year-old child witnessed the shooting. Had the gun not jammed when the ex-boyfriend fired a second time, the victim would be dead.

This victim, too, had a protection-from-abuse order against her attacker; hers being issued just 5 days before that attack.

These two attacks happened just miles apart from each other, just a few days apart. These stories are all too common when violence against women is all too common.

I am willing to bet that every Member of this body could point to similar examples of violence against women from their own congressional districts. Such acts of violence are not isolated incidents but are, instead, representative of the larger systemic problem.

According to the National Center on Domestic Violence, one in four women experiences severe intimate partner physical violence, intimate partner sexual violence, or intimate partner stalking, with impacts such as injury, fearfulness, post-traumatic stress disorder, and more.

The same organization found that one in three women has experienced some form of sexual violence by an intimate partner, and one in seven women has been stalked by an intimate partner during their lifetime, to the point they felt very fearful or believed that someone close to them would be harmed or killed.

Intimate partner violence accounts for 15 percent of violent crimes nationwide. Women between the ages of 18 and 24 are the most commonly abused by an intimate partner.

It is absolutely no wonder why domestic victimization is correlated with a higher rate of depression and suicidal behavior later in life.

Further, 19 percent of domestic violence involves a weapon of some kind. The presence of a gun in a domestic violence situation increases the risk of homicide by 500—that is 500—percent.

You don’t need to be a mathematician in order to see that guns in the hands of domestic abusers routinely leads to violence and death.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act recognizes this indisputable fact and takes active measures to correct and improve our laws.

In the United States, women are 21 times more likely to be killed with a gun than women in any other high-income country.

Mr. Speaker, 4½ million American women alive today have been threatened by intimate partners with firearms. One million of those have actually been shot or shot at by their abusers.

I have represented some of these women and have seen the fear that they live with and the impact it has on their children and families.

This bill finally closes the boyfriend loophole. While Federal law prevents gun possession by people convicted of, or under a restraining order for, abus-
abuse, law enforcement, and community organizations to prevent and address the impact of domestic violence. Using those tools to represent survivors of such abuse, I have seen both clients and constituents find safe havens, rebuild their lives, protect their families, and develop emotionally and financially productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to reauthorizing this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LÉSKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative SCANLON for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am a survivor of domestic violence. I also serve on the advisory council of a domestic violence shelter in my district, and I am the co-chairwoman of the congressional Bipartisan Working Group to End Domestic Violence.

That is why having a strong Violence Against Women Act, commonly known as VAWA, that works for the American people is so very important to me.

Ending violence against women and protecting women and children should not be a partisan issue. However, we find ourselves living in a VAWA reauthorization act that is literally a Christmas tree of progressive, liberal policy objectives rather than an honest approach to reforming and updating such an important law for millions of women and children.

VAWA has lapsed, putting millions of women and children at risk, when it didn’t need to. I, along with 194 other Republicans, voted to reauthorize VAWA through the end of the fiscal year on February 14, 2019. I sponsored the Protecting Women Act, which would reauthorize VAWA until September 30, 2019. This would have allowed the program to stay in place while we worked in a truly bipartisan fashion to update and reauthorize this critical program.

Further, H.R. 1585 includes provisions that would result in a permanent prohibition on owning or possessing firearms by anyone convicted on a misdemeanor. Permanently losing a fundamental civil right for a misdemeanor conviction is virtually unheard of. The bill uses the legitimate and serious issue of domestic violence as a way to limit legitimate gun rights.

When coupled with the bill’s expansion of the definition of “domestic relationship” to include “former dating partners,” a subjective term that could be easily abused, the bill expands power to permanently remove someone’s right to own firearms to an untenable degree.

This legislation also advances policies that could reduce criminal prosecutions by tying States’ grant eligibility to policies that ensure that compelling victim testimony is discouraged.

Further, it permits the use of VAWA funds for new “alternative justice” models, under which funds could be granted to programs that force mediation between an abuser and the victim of the abuser.

Finally, H.R. 1585 rolls back protections for sex trafficking. The bill deprioritizes the use of grant funding to protect victims of sex trafficking and would only allow this funding to go to grantees if their program is primarily focused on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

These are just a few of the hyperpartisan provisions that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have injected into this VAWA reauthorization. We all want to protect women and children, and VAWA has typically received wide-ranging bipartisan support; however, this legislation fails to do that.

We should be focusing on common-sense, bipartisan reforms to VAWA instead of on a bill that is a nonstarter in the U.S. Senate and a bill that will not be signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is not the first time that I have heard my colleagues misgender trans women as biological males, and I need to point something out. Beyond this terminology, an executive order shows how disingenuous their concern for the safety of women is, and they are showing their hand.

The use of the term “biological male” is a dog whistle to transphobia that runs rampant in society and seems to on the other side of the aisle. It is not rooted in concern for women but, rather, a manifestation of their disdain for the trans community.

Also, my constituents are not the Senator. My constituents are not Mr. MCCONNELL. My constituents want VAWA reauthorized, and we are going to do what we can to pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. PINGREE).

H.R. 1585 is a treasure trove of liberal policy objectives that will put women, girls, and children at risk. This bill, as written, forces shelters and service providers—under the power of Federal law—shelters that may not even be equipped—to place males in the same sleeping and showering quarters as women and children purely based on how that individual “identifies.”

These gaping holes in the law will put women and children at risk to predators, who may have experienced trauma from male predators themselves. Based on this bill, the shelter would be required to house a biological male even if the shelter is not equipped to separate males and females, forcing vulnerable women who have been abused and maybe sexually assaulted to shower with and sleep next to males.

We hear constantly from the other side of the aisle that this is all conjecture, what I am saying is all conjecture and completely hypothetical, and that this just does not happen. However, we know this is not true, and I have stated this before in the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee.

Nine women in Fresno, California, are suing a shelter for being sexually harassed in a shelter by a biological male.

The Hope Center in Alaska is another example, where a woman was quoted as saying she would rather sleep in the woods than have to be in close quarters with a male and relive her trauma.

Further, this legislation requires—requires—prisons to place biological males who identify as women in women’s prisons. We have seen how this played out in Britain, where a biological man who identified as a woman raped two females.

Those on the other side of the aisle have accused those of us who want to preserve sex-segregated spaces based on biology as discriminatory and demonizing transgender individuals. This is completely false.

Nothing in the amendments that I have offered would discriminate against anyone. Any shelter could still take anyone in, but I don’t want government forcing the shelters to take someone in if they are not equipped to do so.

What we are pointing out are gaping holes in this legislative proposal and potential for predators to take advantage of the law. We must give those who are sheltering and serving women the tools to keep them safe.

H.R. 1585 also seeks to eliminate due process and infringe on Second Amendment rights. I agree that we need to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals, but expanding laws to prohibit individuals from exercising their Second Amendment rights without them even being present to defend themselves, as is the case in ex parte orders of protection, is a dangerous precedent.

Further, H.R. 1585 includes provisions that would create a tenuous relationship. For instance, it establishes a new definition of “domestic relationships,” which the courts would have to interpret.

I rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Act of 2019. I want to thank the chair of the Judiciary Committee, and I want to commend the chair of the Subcommittee...
on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security for her leadership and quick action to get this reauthorized in the 116th Congress.

I also want to thank the chair of the Rules Committee for his effort to bring this to the floor today and to have a strong debate.

The Violence Against Women Act is a success story. Since its groundbreaking passage in 1994, this bill has been an example of Congress working in a bipartisan manner to address an intolerable problem, the problem of domestic violence. Today, we are here, over two decades later, making VAWA even better.

H.R. 1585 will improve services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It assists young victims of violence, and it extends programs to address bullying. It also updates current programs relative to dating violence and children exposed to violent acts.

Of particular importance in the State of Maine, the bill will further protect Native American women by expanding the provisions written in 2013. H.R. 1585 will include Tribal jurisdiction over non-Indian predators of dating violence and trafficking. At last, the Tribes of Maine and Alaska will have the same protections provided to Tribes nationwide.

According to the most recent data from the National Institute of Justice, four in five American Indian and Alaskan Native women have experienced violence in their lifetime. But, according to the way the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act has been interpreted by some, Maine has been left out of the law. Unfortunately, this has resulted in Tribal victims of domestic violence in Maine or Alaska losing out on protections that have been extended to Tribal victims of every federally recognized Tribe in the country.

The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Maine an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. Pingree. The benefits that other Tribes have seen from allowing Tribal jurisdiction over domestic violence cases include: increased public safety for all of those living on Tribal lands, increased community conversations about domestic violence, updates to Tribal criminal codes, and increased collaboration among Tribes and local and State governments—all of which have been elusive for the Tribes of Maine.

Today's bill will address this long overdue unfairness that has left Maine Tribes not only to be treated differently, but has also left them out of the benefits of the 2013 VAWA bill.

For every Member of this body, there are many reasons to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

Before I have my friend speak, I am going to address what Representative Scanlon said, that calling a transgender woman a biological male, she said, is offensive and it shows my disdain for transgender individuals. That is absolutely false. I have no disdain. I am just merely stating fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. Hartzler), my good friend.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation.

The Violence Against Women Act was originally enacted to strengthen law enforcement's ability to help women suffering from domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to bolster their efforts in preventing future violence. I fully support VAWA's original intent; however, this rule and the bill under consideration no longer focus on the women suffering from violence. Instead, H.R. 1585 has been politicized.

This bill was written to use women to overhaul several unrelated areas of law, such as unemployment benefits, housing requirements for nonwomen populations, and the Second Amendment.

In short, the original intent of this measure, to protect women from abuse, has been hijacked. Not only does this legislation lose focus on the matter at hand, which is women suffering from violence, it fails to prioritize a woman's right to privacy, to safety, and to healing from sexual violence.

Specifically, H.R. 1585 continues a misguided policy adopted under President Obama, forcing domestic violence survivors to share female-only shelters with men. Unfortunately, we have already seen litigation in shelters caused by this type of problematic policy.

For example, as was mentioned by my friend from Arizona, the Naomi's House women's shelter in California is facing lawsuits from half of nine women who were sexually harassed by a transgender individual. Staff at the shelter did not take any disciplinary action due to the fact that, as a Federal grantee, they are required to take in transgender men who identify as females.

The women suffering from sexual violence were not only subjected to additional sexual harassment, but were threatened to be removed from the shelter if they refused to share a shower and coexist with the transgender individual.

In a similar case in Alaska, the city of Anchorage is investigating the Downtown Hope Center, which is a faith-based, nonprofit organization. These reasons? They are allegedly violating a local law because they provide shelter to only women.

Anchorage is trying to force the Hope Center to house transgender-identifying men alongside women in its overnight, shared-sleeping facility. However, part of the Hope Center's mission is to provide women suffering from rape, physical abuse, and violence a safe place to sleep at night without the presence of men.

I would ask my colleagues: How does this policy advance our goal of helping women suffering from abuse when it denies them a safe place to heal? The answer is: it does not.

There are many other concerns with the VAWA language, I will mention one more.

A 2018 Government Accountability Office report found that Planned Parenthood affiliates have not been reporting when clients are victims of statutory rape, child prostitution, or sex trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, while I fully support increased protections for battered women, this bill is not the answer. It further victimizes women, and it uses them to advance other political causes.

We need to send this bill back to all seven committees of jurisdiction to address these concerns so that a VAWA law can once again focus on alleviating suffering from violence.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard this allegation over and over again based on one case in Fresno where the facts have not been established. It is still in litigation.

As a former trial lawyer, I know that a lot of allegations can be made, but the fact that what has been stated as facts in this case, that men were in a shelter, is not true. Transgender women were in the shelter.

It has been stated that a transgender man couldn't be excluded from the shelter and that the staff at the shelter failed to take action. That actually is under dispute.

So we have one isolated instance that is being misrepresented to continue this line of argument. What we are really seeing is this tactic of trying to pit one minority group, one group in need of services, against another to convince us that the rights and protections of one group come at the cost of another. They have done it with people of color, with immigrants, and now with women and members of the trans community.

Mr. Speaker, I have a clear message: this country is better than that. They both need help. It can be done under this law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. Norton).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.
Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

The world has changed, my friends, since our last reauthorization of VAWA. This bill updates VAWA to cover new victims of domestic violence that were not covered in our prior bill and desperately need protection.

In addition, the #MeToo movement has made women more determined concerning their rights than ever before.

Perhaps the most desperate need of victims of domestic violence is for sanctuary, shelter, emergency housing, and affordable housing, all in short supply.

Victims who stay with an abuser risk everything: homelessness, loss of custody of children, more abuse, and even injury and death.

Victims who remain with an abuser in 40 to 50 percent of cases also see their children abused.

Forty to as high as 70 percent of female homicide victims were murdered by their husbands or boyfriends in a relationship where there had been ongoing abuse.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the most serious issue confronting victims is no alternative place to live or even to shelter. One-third of survivors become homeless immediately after separating from partners.

Our bill bars the eviction of the victim until suitable housing or a termination of a lease without penalty can occur. Grants to help homeless victims achieve stability are necessary to prevent recurrent bouts of homelessness from domestic violence.

This reauthorization is desperately needed without delay. I strongly urge its passage.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I have one comment before I introduce my friend from Oklahoma.

It is said that there has only been one incident where a biological male threatened the women, and that is just simply not true. There have been several incidences. Quite frankly, the question is, how many women have to be put in a potentially unsafe situation or have their privacy violated by males before you realize that this concern is really legitimate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule, and to offer conditional support for the underlying legislation, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

I continue to oppose simply because my friends didn’t make in order quite a number of proposals that we had that we think ought to be debated on today, but in fairness, I want to thank Chairman McGovern for making in our other quite amendments that related particularly to VAWA in Indian Country, and I look forward to supporting those amendments.

I have always tried to consider legislation within its full context and look at the overall benefit of the bill, and I will certainly do the same with respect to VAWA.

Certainly there are provisions in this bill that I will not support with which I profoundly disagree. Those are particularly related to the Second Amendment; this includes a misguided provision to strip someone of the right to possess a firearm following a misdeemeanor conviction.

Frankly, I hope not to expect that these provisions will change as the bill progresses through the legislative process.

To enact VAWA, to actually achieve the objective, my friends are going to have to do something they haven’t done so far; that is actually compromise. They will have to compromise with a Republican Senate and a Republican President, or this important legislation will not come into law.

However, there are compelling things about this bill, Mr. Speaker, believe them particularly to be consistent with my own views and my own voting record on Tribal sovereignty and protection of native women, and I want to be supportive where I can be.

In 2013, I co-sponsored the Tribal Court’s jurisdiction over non-Indian offenders that are arrested for committing domestic violence or assault against women Tribal members on Indian land.

The legislation we are considering today expands this jurisdiction to include not only women, but also Tribal children. Further, it extends critical protection to Tribal police officers.

There are several important amendments that will be debated related to Indian Country, and I urge the adoption of all of them.

I support the right of Tribes to enact their own definition of domestic and sexual violence, rather than replacing it with Federal Government’s definitions. States already have this flexibility; Tribes should as well.

In addition, I also believe Tribal law enforcement should have the authority to have access to the National Crime Information Systems.

Mr. Speaker, more than four out of five American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced violence in their lifetime. More than half of the American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced violence in their lifetime. American Indian and Alaska Native women are almost twice as likely as White women to have experienced violence in the past year. Native women face murder rates more than ten times the national average in some parts of the country. They are also more than twice as likely to have experienced rape than non-Hispanic white women over the course of a lifetime.

Given these statistics of acts of violence, 96 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women who are victims of sexual violence experience violence at the hands of non-native perpetrators.

To reiterate, nearly all the violence committed against native women is committed by non-natives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the protection of all women and children is or should be treated as a partisan issue. Tribal governments, through trust and treaty obligation, have the same authority as States to protect women and children in vulnerable situations. All States, Tribal, and local law enforcement authorities should have access to the use of the same tools to prevent these crimes on or off reservations.

As I have said before, hunters know where to hunt, fishermen know where to fish, and predators know where to prey.

The passage of a reformed Violence Against Women Act gives Tribes badly needed tools to combat the epidemic of violence and abuse in Indian Country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House of Representatives to work together in a bipartisan manner to create, in the end, a bill that can pass both chambers and be enacted into law.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FRANKEL).

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of what I consider, and many consider, one of the most important pieces of legislation should protect the families of America, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, because no woman or man or child should ever be afraid to walk into their own home because of fear from violence from a spouse or a dating partner.

So today, I rise on behalf of one of my constituents named Olga, from Florida, who on her wedding day thought she was entering into a dream marriage for herself and her two children. But this marriage turned into a nightmare when her husband became aggressive, violent, and controlling, imprisoning Olga and her two children in their own home, not even letting the children go to school.

Olga fled to my hometown and was nurtured back to emotional and financial health by a local domestic violence organization in my community.

The Violence Against Women Act helps tackle the epidemic of domestic violence, stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence.

Since it was first passed in 1994, serious victimization by an intimate partner has dropped by 72 percent for women and 64 percent for men. However, it is estimated that as many as 45 million adults will still experience physical violence, rape, or stalking by an intimate partner sometime in their lives.

I urge authorizing and strengthening this legislation, expanding protections, increasing funding, and improving services to survivors will save lives across America and help protect women like Olga.
Olga and let her children be spared from horrific violence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this great bill.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us have heard, in some way, paraphrased: While Rome is burning, much fiddling is going on. I am grateful for all of the Members of Congress who helped construct this legislation.

I want to remind my friends, as the authorizations proceeded in the 1990s into the 2000s of the Violence Against Women Act, the last authorization was technically supposed to be in 2010, but it took 3 years working with advocates who represent almost 200 groups. Republicans and Democrats, organizations who deal with women impacted by domestic violence and other sexual assault issues and acts, granted that they wanted to see this bill expanded to cover Native American women, they wanted to protect immigrant women who are left vulnerable, they wanted to make sure it was gender-neutral in many instances. In 2010, it was Native American and immigrants; so it took 3 years. And all the bill wanted to do was to simply protect people who are vulnerable.

In this bill, that has been 3 years in writing—with every opportunity with the preceding chairman of this committee, preceding Congress, and members on the Judiciary Committee to sit with us to work—I, for one, remember constant meetings with staff and members interested, Democratic members, in how we can work together.

This bill is long in waiting for prosecutors and law enforcement. They are waiting on the $291 million for stock grants and resources for women’s shelters.

This bill is a bipartisan bill. I thank Mr. FITZPATRICK for his work. And in this bill is a whole section on healthcare that Mr. FITZPATRICK’s bill allowed us to put in.

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

Ms. Scanlon. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It is an important contribution to this legislation.

There is an amendment by Mr. GUMMER, my friend from Texas, on female genital mutilation. It is an amendment that we worked on, in discussion about reporting on the incidences with Indian women, Native American women. My amendment was joined, supported, by Republicans in the Judiciary Committee.

This bill is bipartisan, but, most of all, it is a response to desperation of need. The Violence Against Women Act is long overdue for being reauthorized. This is a strong product that covers so many issues to protect women and to ensure that those who have convictions with gun violence do not allow them to come and kill an innocent mom with her children.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this bill. The rule is a good rule. Support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rule and the underlying bill of H.R. 1585.

The Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”) is landmark legislation which—through policy reforms, interstate cooperation and grant allocation—has been pivotal in providing a national response to protecting half of the population.

Equally important, it has ushered in a seismic transformation on how society perceives violence against women.

The law has enhanced and improved the lives of girls and women, boys and men.

There are many similarities between the year that VAWA initially passed in 1994, and the moment in which we all find ourselves today.

When it was first passed, the country was experiencing reverberations to yet another polarization battle to fill a seat on the Supreme Court.

Then the courageous victim sharing her truth was Anita Hill.

Today, as VAWA is yet again scheduled to expire, the country is assessing the ripples created by the #MeToo movement.

But despite the passage of over a quarter-century since its first enactment, the malignant treatment received by a courageous person willing to share her story unfortunately endures.

The need to create a safe space for victims of violence, especially women, supported with substantial resources to address this scourge has taken on a new urgency in this era of the #MeToo movement.

When discussing VAWA, we cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Brittany Smith, who was 23 years old and was gunned down last year in Houston, by her boyfriend and San Diego-based Marine; nor can we forget Charlene Caldwell, a mother and grandmother beaten to death last year by a baseball bat at the hands of her boyfriend in Houston.

Domestic violence was alleged in both of these horrific events.

Unfortunately, there are too many stories like Charlene’s or Brittany’s.

The stories of these two women remind us of the urgency to protect survivors now, before it is too late, because many of these deaths are preventable.

Despite the experiences of #MeToo survivors or victims like Ms. Smith or Ms. Caldwell, all is not for naught.

Since VAWA’s codification in 1994, more survivors report episodes of domestic violence to the police and the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by almost two-thirds.

VAWA has also led to a significant increase in the reporting of sexual assault.

For example, the percentage of victims of rape and sexual assault who report the assault to the police increased from 28.8 percent in 1993—the year prior to VAWA’s initial passage—to 50 percent in 2010.

In the first 15 years of VAWA’s validity, rates of serious intimate partner violence declined by 72 percent for women and 64 percent for men.

Research suggests that referring a victim to a domestic violence or sexual assault advocate has been linked to an increased willingness to report a sexual assault by an advocate filed a report with law enforcement 59 percent of the time, versus 41 percent for individuals not referred to a victim advocate.
This progression cannot be allowed to stop.
Congress must continue sending the clear message that violence against women is unacceptable.

Prior to VAWA, law enforcement lacked the resources and tools to respond effectively to domestic and sexual assault.
Each reauthorization of VAWA has improved protections for women and men, while helping to change the culture and reduce the tolerance for these crimes.
The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019 improves current law in several important respects, and takes a holistic approach to the goal of eliminating the harm faced by victims of violence, and making vital services accessible to victims of this scourge.
For example, this iteration of VAWA contains guidance on the use of grants to activate judicial and law enforcement tools to develop and enforce firearms surrender policies; expands permissible use of grant funding for programs focused on increasing survivor/law enforcement/community safety; and provides legal assistance for dependent children in appropriate circumstances.
It also updates programs designed to reduce domestic violence, help children exposed to violence and engage men in preventing violence against women.
Additionally, the bill improves services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.
It provides policies, protection, and justice for young victims of violence, including extending the Rape Prevention and Education grant program, addressing bullying of young people, improving grants on prevention education for students, and expanding relevant training for school-based and campus health centers; and reauthorizes and updates programs designed to reduce dating violence, help children exposed to violence, and engage men in preventing violence.
This bill also recognizes the cascading ills associated with identifying, eliminating, and preventing the reemergence of domestic violence.
This bill expands grants under the Public Health Service Act to support implementation of training programs to improve the capacity of early childhood programs to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking among the families they serve; preserves and expands housing protections for survivors; provides economic security assistance for survivors, by reauthorizing the National Resource Center on Workplace Responses; protects employees from being fired because they are survivors of sexual assault or domestic violence; and protects survivors' eligibility for Unemployment Insurance.
Recognizing that many women are victimized at the hands of intimate partners, this iteration of VAWA helps prevent "intimate partner" homicides, by including provisions expanding firearms laws to prohibit persons convicted of dating violence from possessing firearms, expanding the list of persons considered to be disarmers and prohibiting firearms to disarm push possessors convicted of misdemeanor stalking from possessing firearms, and prohibiting individuals subject to ex parte protective orders from possessing firearms.
Accordingly, the bill helps protect Native American women, by including provisions to improve the response to missing and murdered Native American women, improving tribal access to federal crime information databases, and reaffirming tribal criminal jurisdiction over non-Indian perpetrators of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, and trafficking for all federally recognized Indian tribes and Alaskan Natives.
Additionally, this bill protects the Office on Violence Against Women in the Department of Justice from being terminated, or consolidated into any other DOJ office.
VAWA is central to our nation's effort to fight the epidemic of domestic, sexual, and dating violence and stalking.
This work did not happen on its own.
It was the product of a collaborative effort of stakeholders, including victim advocates.
It was the product of those who were willing to share their stories of the abuse suffered at the hands of those who were entrusted to love, but instead harmed.
The courage, strength, and resilience displayed by survivors has reminded all that we must continue to foster an environment for victims of violence to come forward and expose episodes of violence against women.
This bill represents the good that can come when we use a stampede of one story at a time to tell come forward with the belief that through their pain, the lives of others can be helped.
Having listened to concerned stakeholders from all pockets of the country, we have put pen to paper and produced a bill that is entrenched in the bipartisan National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), which is a national collaboration comprising a large and diverse group of 35 national, tribal, state, territorial, and local organizations, advocates, and individuals that focus on the development, passage and implementation of effective public policies to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.
Indeed, there is no reason our work on this bill cannot be bipartisan, as has been the custom of prior Congresses in authorizing this critical piece of legislation.
The love for a spouse, the comfort of a mother and the best wishes for a sister know no political allegiance.
Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Roy, has 10 1/2 minutes remaining.
Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roy), my good friend.
Mr. Roy. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding time.
Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act we are voting on this week is nearly unrecognizable from the legislation originally passed in 1994. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to politicize and expand the legislation far beyond the original scope by adding controversial provisions that undermine the constitutional rights of Americans.
In the name of protecting women, Democrats are exploiting this bill as an opportunity to attack the Second Amendment rights of American citizens. It is despicable that anyone would seize on this as such an opportunity to weaponize a measure that was intended to protect victims.
This body is not meant to fulfill campaign promises that have nothing to do with the legislation allegedly before us. And let's make no mistake, that is precisely the purpose of this legislation is today. It is being structured intentionally. They are structuring it intentionally to be able to run campaign ads in districts back home, because you have got a piece of legislation that is the Violence Against Women Act. So let's just bury stuff in a bill that sounds good to the American people, but which then attacks our fundamental God-given rights reflected in the Bill of Rights.

To be the gentlewoman from Texas who just spoke, my friend from Texas, just spoke about the fiddling that is going on on our southern border while women and girls are traveling miles up to our southern border being abused by cartels.
When Amnesty International and when organizations that are non-partisan are talking about a third of those women being abused, my friends on the other side of the aisle bury their head in the sand and don't seem to care.
When we are talking about violence against women, let's talk about the violence against women that is happening today, right now, just across the border in Reynosa. Just across the border in Mexico, some little girl and some woman is going to be raped and abused, while we sit and vote on legislation that is designed to be a political tool by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle against the GOP for political purposes.
I think we should not be fiddling while Rome burns. Well, let's talk about the fiddling that is going on on our southern border while women and girls are traveling miles up to our southern border being abused by cartels.
When Amnesty International and when organizations that are non-partisan are talking about a third of those women being abused, my friends on the other side of the aisle bury their head in the sand and don't seem to care.
When we are talking about violence against women, let's talk about the violence against women that is happening today, right now, just across the border in Reynosa. Just across the border in Mexico, some little girl and some woman is going to be raped and abused, while we sit and vote on legislation that is designed to be a political tool by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle against the GOP for political purposes.
I think we should not be fiddling while Rome burns. Well, let's talk about the violence against women that is happening today, right now, just across the border in Reynosa. Just across the border in Mexico, some little girl and some woman is going to be raped and abused, while we sit and vote on legislation that is designed to be a political tool by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle against the GOP for political purposes.
I think we should not be fiddling while Rome burns.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, the NRA has spent a lot of money to create this distraction, making this about their opposition to gun control, which then attacks our fundamen-
that this is about protecting women, and the addition that says that if you take away guns from convicted abusers or those who are being watched and being restrained, this will save lives. So this is an important part of protecting women.

VAWA is a law that literally, absolutely literally, saves lives, and this bill we are voting on today provides even more lifesaving resources to women and families, like closing the boyfriend loophole that she just mentioned and providing housing and beds for abused women.

It is important to point out that this landmark legislation was created in 1994 and has been reauthorized many times. But I would say that protecting women or providing lifesaving resources should be permanent law. We should not have to come back to this body and be subject to the whims of legislators who don’t think it is important to protect women, which this bill does.

One of the lifesaving resources in this bill is the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, which was created by legislation I first authored in 2004, and it is renewed in this bill through 2024. This legislation, which has been called the most important anti-rape prevention legislation ever signed into law, provides funding to localities to audit and process DNA evidence kits, including unprocessed rape kits. Each rape kit represents a life. If you could convict that rapist and get them off the street, you save the lives of other women and prevent rape. This is just one example of this important bill.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my good friend.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to speak against the rule for H.R. 1585. Domestic violence is a major problem in communities throughout our country. I am in complete support of providing all the resources needed to the victims of abuse and for the law enforcement that protects these vulnerable women.

What could have been an opportunity to work together as a unified House of Representatives and to provide a great bill that we can all be proud of, our colleagues across the aisle dismissed our input on during the legislative process, silenced our community and sentences women and children in areas that are supposed to be safe. It advances new gun control policies and the amendment to reduce religious freedoms, and even possibly cause further harm to victims.

As a woman, a wife, and a mother, as well as a grandmother, who represents a State where one in three women are victims of domestic violence, I say with assurance that my Republican colleagues are committed to reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act in a way that strengthens the law, provides the needed support for victims of domestic abuse, and strengthens our judicial system. We want to work together on this issue which affects so many people around the country. We can put forth a good bill together.

I have often said that good governance is finding the issues that we can all agree upon, Republicans and Democrats alike, and put aside our differences to come together, solve the problem, and make this country better. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. MILLER. So, put aside our differences to come together, solve the problem, and make this country better than before we got here. This could have been that chance. We can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and vote against the underlying bill.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and also for her tremendous leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1586, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. This critical bill will expand crucial protections for all Americans making very important enhancements to VAWA.

When I was in the California legislature, Mr. Speaker, I authored the VAWA. I think there are a lot of things that the Republicans and Democrats can agree on, and I would like to come up with a bipartisan bill.

During the Rules Committee, my colleague, Representative WOODALL, asked the Democrat witness if the majority would consider moving on a short-term extension if the U.S. Senate does not take this bill up. The witness could not answer the question.

This is a dangerous gamble the Democrat majority is willing to play. We have received no indication that the U.S. Senate will use this bill as a starting point or move quickly on this liberal proposal, leaving VAWA unnecessarily expired during the meantime.

The Democrats are in control and have the votes to pass their bill; however, they are putting the lives of millions of women in jeopardy by gambling on what the Senate will do. We should not be gambling.

The Democrat majority has already passed up a short-term extension once via a vote, and the program has lapsed. There is no reason why we should not send an additional option that the Senate can take up quickly to keep the program functioning.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we all—Republicans and Democrats—want to protect women and children and stop violence against women, but, unfortunately, this particular bill advances a separate policy agenda other than that.

The long history of bipartisanship of VAWA collaboration with a short-term extension with this bill. This bill leaves gaping holes for potential predators to victimize women and children in areas that are supposed to be safe. It advances new gun control policies to permanently restrict people from exercising their Second Amendment rights or does so without that person even being able to defend themselves in court.
It de prioritizes funding to combat sex trafficking and includes various new forms of criminal justice policy that could let perpetrators walk or have opportunities to revictimize women and children.

As a survivor of domestic violence, I want to see a VAWA reauthorization that focuses on women and children and keeps our country safe. We should be voting on legislation which all women of this Chamber could support; however, this bill is not that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have to rebut my colleague’s repeated assertion that this iteration of VAWA would violate the Second Amendment because it fails to offer an opportunity for abusers to protest having their guns taken away—and the gentlewoman said this several times in the course of debate—on the basis that all parts of order against provisions in the bill are waived by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to reconsider. 

Sect. 3. Clause 10 of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1741.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sect. 2. Immediately upon adoption of the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1741) to reauthorize Department of Justice programs that combat violence against women, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to reconsider.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The(material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sect. 2. Immediately upon adoption of the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1741) to reauthorize Department of Justice programs that combat violence against women, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to reconsider.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sect. 2. Immediately upon adoption of the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1741) to reauthorize Department of Justice programs that combat violence against women, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to reconsider.
Mr. VISCOSKY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea.

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMN THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION’S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS’ HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore, pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 271) condemning the Trump Administration’s Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans’ Health Care, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 186, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—240

Adams

Aguilar

Allred

Alpine

Amice

Armstrong

Arrington

Baker

Baker

Barr

Barrara

Bass

Beatty

Berman

Beschloss

Boustead

Brown (MD)

Brownley (CA)

Bustos

Byrne

Cassidy

Case

Castor (IL)

Castor (FL)

Carter (TX)

Chapman

Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Clark

Clay

Clayburn

Cohen

Connolly

Cooper

Correa

Costa

Courtney

Craig (CA)

Craig

Westerman

Williams

Wittman

Womack

Young

Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Demings

McEachin

Rutherford

Stivers

Wilson (SC)

Woodall

Yoho

NOT VOTING—6

April 3, 2019
The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, will not only reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, also known as VAWA, but will also strengthen and expand the act’s critical programs.

VAWA’s grant programs provide communities across America the crucial assistance they need to combat crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. H.R. 1585 builds on this foundation by enhancing the services available under these programs and by expanding their reach to include vulnerable populations who are victims of these crimes.

The range of individual VAWA helps is broad and should be as diverse as our communities around the country. I am pleased that this reauthorization continues our commitment to this important principle.

This bill reauthorizes a wide variety of grant programs, including programs to help protect violent crimes against sexual assault victims. It also strengthens VAWA’s nondiscrimination provisions, provides greater protections for survivors during the prosecution of perpetrators, expands services for older survivors of abuse, authorizes programs specifically targeted toward rural areas, strengthens protections against gun violence in domestic abuse situations, and expands the jurisdiction of some Tribal authorities over non-Indians who commit certain crimes on Tribal lands.

I want to thank Ms. Bass, the chair of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security and the sponsor of this legislation, for her outstanding leadership in the effort to reauthorize VAWA.

I also want to thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her longstanding and tireless efforts over the years to protect and strengthen the act.

Thanks to their efforts and the efforts of many others, this bill will not only continue the progress enabled by VAWA as originally enacted, but it will also make the act an even more effective tool in addressing the horrible scourge of domestic violence.

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

Hon. Frank Pallone, Jr., Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Pallone: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.”

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1585 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matter contained in H.R. 1585.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

Jerrold Nadler, Chairman.


Hon. Jerrold Nadler, Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing concerning H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.” Because you have been working with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our jurisdiction, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I do so based on my understanding that the Committee on the Judiciary will work to ensure that the text of H.R. 1585 that will be considered by the House of Representatives will include changes that are being discussed between the two Committees with respect to certain provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, provided that the relevant texts are submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary in a timely manner.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.R. 1585 with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 1585 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and to request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and, while I understand that your letter to the Committee and my response will be included in the Committee report on H.R. 1585, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1585.

Sincerely,

Maxine Waters, Chairwoman.


Hon. Maxine Waters, Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairwoman Waters: I am writing to acknowledge your letter dated March 21, 2019 responding to our request to your Committee that it waive any jurisdictional claims over the matters contained in H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019,” that fall within your Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee on the Judiciary confirms our understanding that your Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within your Committee’s jurisdiction.

I will ensure that this exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

Jerrold Nadler, Chairman.


Hon. Richard Neal, Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Neal: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.”

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1585 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 1585.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

Jerrold Nadler, Chairman.

House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC, March 18, 2019.

Hon. Jerrold Nadler, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing concerning H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.” Because you have been working with the Committee on Energy and Commerce concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our jurisdiction, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I do so based on my understanding that the Committee on the Judiciary will work to ensure that the text of H.R. 1585 that will be considered by the House of Representatives will include changes that are being discussed between the two Committees with respect to certain provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, provided that the relevant texts are submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary in a timely manner.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.R. 1585 with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 1585 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and to request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and, while I understand that your letter to the Committee and my response will be included in the Committee report on H.R. 1585, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1585.

Sincerely,

Maxine Waters, Chairwoman.


Hon. Maxine Waters, Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairwoman Waters: I am writing to acknowledge your letter dated March 21, 2019 responding to our request to your Committee that it waive any jurisdictional claims over the matters contained in H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019,” that fall within your Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee on the Judiciary confirms our understanding that your Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within your Committee’s jurisdiction.

I will ensure that this exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

Maxine Waters, Chairwoman.


Hon. Richard Neal, Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing concerning H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.” Because you have been working with the Committee on Energy and Commerce concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our jurisdiction, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I do so based on my understanding that the Committee on the Judiciary will work to ensure that the text of H.R. 1585 that will be considered by the House of Representatives will include changes that are being discussed between the two Committees with respect to certain provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, provided that the relevant texts are submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary in a timely manner.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.R. 1585 with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 1585 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and to request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and, while I understand that your letter to the Committee and my response will be included in the Committee report on H.R. 1585, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1585.

Sincerely,

Maxine Waters, Chairwoman.


Hon. Maxine Waters, Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairwoman Waters: I am writing concerning H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.” Because you have been working with the Committee on Energy and Commerce concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our jurisdiction, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I do so based on my understanding that the Committee on the Judiciary will work to ensure that the text of H.R. 1585 that will be considered by the House of Representatives will include changes that are being discussed between the two Committees with respect to certain provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, provided that the relevant texts are submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary in a timely manner.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.R. 1585 with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 1585 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and to request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and, while I understand that your letter to the Committee and my response will be included in the Committee report on H.R. 1585, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1585.

Sincerely,

Maxine Waters, Chairwoman.
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Hon. BOBBY SCOTT, I am writing to acknowledge your letter dated March 18, 2019 responding to your Committee's request that it waive any jurisdictional claims over the matters contained in H.R. 1585, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019." That fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee on the Judiciary confirms our mutual understanding that your Committee does not waive any jurisdictional claims over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within your Committee's jurisdiction.

I will ensure that this exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER, Chairman.


Hon. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I am writing to acknowledge your letter dated March 18, 2019 responding to our request to your Committee that it waive any jurisdictional claims over the matters contained in H.R. 1585, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019." That fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee on the Judiciary confirms our mutual understanding that your Committee does not waive any jurisdictional claims over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within your Committee's jurisdiction.

I will ensure that this exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER, Chairman.


Hon. JERROLD NADLER, Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1585, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019." This bill was primarily referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, for all purposes, by the Committee on Education and Labor. As a result of your having consulted with me concerning this bill generally, I agree to forego consideration of this bill by your Committee so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1585, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will, appropriately consult and involved as the or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issues within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Additionally, I respectfully request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor should this bill or similar language be considered in a conference with the Senate.

Finally, I would appreciate a response confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1585.

Respectfully,

ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Chairman.

Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIR: I write concerning H.R. 1585, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019," which was additionally referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

I allow the Committee on Natural Resources to be discharged from further consideration of the bill. I do so with the understanding that the Committee does not waive any jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of this Committee on Natural Resources to any conference committee to consider such provisions. Finally, please include this letter in the record on the bill and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

RAÚL GRIJALVA, Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TAKANO: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1585, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019." I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1585 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 1585 which fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER, Chairman.

Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

Hon. MARK TAKANO, Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR: I write concerning H.R. 1585, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019," which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER, Chairman.


Hon. JERROLD NADLER, Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Chair, I support reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. I believe the intent of this legislation is commendable, and many of the programs it authorizes are critical.

This is a bill that should be and should have broad bipartisan support. It is a bill that should transcend the political games which we see too often in Washington, and we should approach it methodically and wholistically.

Unfortunately, instead of good faith collaboration, my colleagues across the aisle have doubled down on partisan politics at the expense of good policy. They have sought, at every turn, to make this bill into a political weapon rather than a critical resource for victims and tools to support law enforcement.

I tried to meet with my Democratic colleagues to negotiate a meaningful reauthorization of VAWA. We tried to engage with other Members in bipartisan, bicameral negotiations, although our efforts were rebuffed, and we were handed the flawed bill that is before us today. My colleagues across the aisle informed us H.R. 1585 would be the bill. This is particularly unfortunate because this bill is dead on arrival in the Senate.

There are areas where both sides can agree, areas where we can strengthen existing law. Instead of seeking out those areas and negotiating in good faith, they have decided a highly partisan bill with zero chance of moving forward in the Senate was the best way to approach reauthorizing crucial VAWA programs.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Chair, I support reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. I believe the intent of this legislation is commendable, and many of the programs it authorizes are critical.

This is a bill that should be and should have broad bipartisan support. It is a bill that should transcend the political games which we see too often in Washington, and we should approach it methodically and wholistically.

Unfortunately, instead of good faith collaboration, my colleagues across the aisle have doubled down on partisan politics at the expense of good policy. They have sought, at every turn, to make this bill into a political weapon rather than a critical resource for victims and tools to support law enforcement.

I tried to meet with my Democratic colleagues to negotiate a meaningful reauthorization of VAWA. We tried to engage with other Members in bipartisan, bicameral negotiations, although our efforts were rebuffed, and we were handed the flawed bill that is before us today. My colleagues across the aisle informed us H.R. 1585 would be the bill. This is particularly unfortunate because this bill is dead on arrival in the Senate.

There are areas where both sides can agree, areas where we can strengthen existing law. Instead of seeking out those areas and negotiating in good faith, they have decided a highly partisan bill with zero chance of moving forward in the Senate was the best way to approach reauthorizing crucial VAWA programs.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act.
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We were trying to—we just never were able to get together before the Judiciary Committee markup on the bill, in the attempt to talk with her, to see if she would listen to my concerns.

Then, in the Judiciary Committee, I offered an amendment that basically would make sure that domestic violence shelters could protect the victims and keep their privacy private. And that amendment was rejected, and I was told that it was too broad, and those types of things.

So in that Judiciary Committee hearing I asked Representative Bass if she would be agreeable to meeting with me, so I could work with her to do an amendment in a bipartisan fashion to protect women and children, and she said absolutely, yes. And, again, I reached out to her office on at least two occasions and never got a response.

So I have really tried to work on this in a bipartisan fashion, because there are some concerns I have. And let me tell you the reason why I am going to vote “no” on this bill, even though I am a survivor of domestic violence.

First of all, the bill forces domestic violence survivors under penalty of Federal law, this house to biological males in with women. And often those women have been abused themselves, and they may not—this may violate their privacy, and it may have risks.

The second reason is this bill forces prisons to take in biological males, under penalty of Federal law, and put them in women’s prisons. In the United Kingdom this happened, and a male identifying as a woman was placed in a woman’s prison and ended up raping women.

The third reason is this bill takes away gun rights. The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield the gentlewoman from Arizona as much time as she may consume.

Mrs. LESKO. This bill, thirdly, also takes away the right of women to decide. One with ex parte orders of protection: that is when a woman, like myself, would go in to see a Justice of the Peace; we would get an order of protection. Under this bill, the perpetrator’s gun rights would be taken away, even though they weren’t there in court.

Also, it would take away someone’s gun rights if they were convicted of a misdemeanor, which is very rare.

So, again, I don’t think this bill is going to get heard in the U.S. Senate, which, I hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle—this is an important issue to all of us, and I hope that we can work together so it is something that I can support, something that doesn’t happen, but because it is a really important issue.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the urgent need for Congress to update the Violence Against Women Act and the lifesaving programs it supports.

I have a great deal of respect for my co-chair of the Domestic Violence Task Force, but we disagree very strongly on what this bill does.

No woman, no child, and no family should fear for their life because of domestic violence. Without updates and support for the critical programs in VAWA, we are moving backwards. Good programs that are there to help victims are now threatened, and it is one more stress being added on to the pile of those victims and one more fear that we just add to them.

In one 24-hour period in Michigan, domestic violence programs answered 498 hotline calls of people in immediate danger, and served 1,239 victims with emergency shelter, transitional housing, counseling, and legal advice.

The bill before us today is landmark legislation that will respond to our Nation’s crisis of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It will equip our State and local partners to provide compassionate care and support to women, families, and, yes, men, too. We need to admit that sometimes they are victims who need to rebuild their lives.

VAWA also includes my Zero Tolerance for Domestic Abusers to close the loopholes that make it easy for domestic abusers and stalkers to purchase weapons without passing a background check.

This isn’t a poison pill. This will save a life. Shouldn’t we be doing that?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak against H.R. 1585. I stand before you as a woman, a wife, a mother, and a grandmother. I represent a State where one in three women experience domestic violence. This is a scourge on our society and must stop.

The Violence Against Women Act should have one clear goal, to protect women from domestic abuse. Any solution put forward must provide law enforcement and the justice system with the tools to do this to the best of their ability, and to keep this objective free from partisan manipulation, dilution of resources, or political games. Unfortunately, this bill does not do that.

My Republican colleagues, under the leadership of Ranking Member COLLINS and Mrs. Lesko, who has been a recipient of domestic violence, have sought to come together with our friends across the aisle to find a bipartisan solution to help women, to no avail.

Now is not the time to play politics. This is an issue where we can and should find common ground. It is not right that I have to hold the safety of women as a bargaining chip against infringe- ments on religious liberty or weaken- ing of the Second Amendment. We can and must do better.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation and come together to pass a bill that protects women, instead of trying to use it as a political pawn.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am a proud sponsor of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Violence against women is one of our country’s greatest shame. For over 20 years, VAWA has provided critical protections for survivors of violence, while also helping them rebuild their lives.

VAWA grants help survivors to access vital resources such as legal assistance, safe housing, and counseling. VAWA also facilitates important partnerships between advocates, law enforcement, and the courts, which further helps survivors in times of crisis and reduces future violence.

In 2018 alone, because of VAWA grants, the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence served over 8,000 individuals victimized by domestic violence, assisted over 2,900 victims in obtaining a restraining order, and answered over 13,000 crisis line calls.

H.R. 1585 improves upon VAWA by prohibiting persons convicted of dating violence or misdemeanor stalking from possessing firearms. And it’s a honest. This is the principal objection of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because the powerful gun lobby is scoring this bill because of that proviso.

This bill protects employees from being fired because they are survivors of sexual assault or domestic violence and ensures survivors’ eligibility to receive unemployment insurance.

Survivors of violence and their families cannot wait any longer as VAWA continues to stay lapsed.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill in a bipartisan way so that the American people can see action by Congress. Republicans and Democrats who are standing up, loudly condemning violence against women, and reauthorizing VAWA in a new and improved way so that we can really take on the issue of domestic violence and all the pernicious consequences of violence against women in this country.

Stand up to the gun lobby. Do what is right for women in America.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOH-MERT).

Mr. GOH-MERT. Mr. Chair, I rise out of concern for violence that has been done against women.

As someone who has prosecuted such things and has sentenced many men to prison for such things, I want to be part of the solution toward mitigating and stopping the violence against women. But I can’t vote for this bill in its current form when politics, as my friends have said, have been played with it here, because I have heard the
Mr. Chair, I wish my friends would stop using their words to accept biological men, no matter how traumatic it is for the women who have suffered domestic abuse from men, sexual assault from men.

For heaven's sake, can't we compromise in the name of really helping women?

I understand the concern from my colleagues across the aisle is that we don't want to hurt the feelings of someone who is biologically a man who thinks they are a woman. We don't want to hurt their feelings; therefore, it is worth the risk of all the trauma that will be relived by women by forcing men into those confined situations. There are other alternatives instead of making women suffer more than they already have.

This Violence Against Women Act, the way it is currently written in its current form, will do additional violence to women. It is something that I just can't support.

Mr. Chair, I wish my friends would worry about the concerns for men who think they are women and suffering from gender dysphoria in some other bill. Let's use this one to protect women.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOJAN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. LOJAN. Mr. Chair, I want to share a story of one of my constituents, Rayen. Her story is hard to hear, but we cannot tune it out.

When Rayen first reached out for protection, her partner, Daniel, had strangled her with a wrench, raped her, and strangled her to the point of unconsciousness. But Tribal police had little jurisdiction over Daniel, who is not Native American. They were forced to turn the case over to Federal prosecutors.

Next, Rayen went missing. Her body was found several weeks later, beaten and strangulated.

Rayen's story is representative of the violence we have here today. Native women face every day. This violence is an epidemic in our country. Native women are 10 times more likely to be murdered than any other ethnicity.

We need to act. The Violence Against Women Act is a pillar of our Federal response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

Passage of H.R. 1585 will ensure that every survivor of domestic violence is given the protection they need to rebuild their lives after experiencing violence.

Mr. Chair, please join me in voting for this legislation in memory of Rayen and in memory of all the women who have faced domestic violence and assault.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am a cosponsor of the Violence Against Women Act, and I believe that this is the most important bill that this Congress will pass to protect thousands of women against violence and death. We closed the boyfriend loophole by prohibiting an abuser from getting their hands on a gun when a court issues a temporary order, be it a restraining order or a protection order, to prevent their partner were first stalked.

We closed the dating partner loophole by expanding restrictions on dating partners convicted of domestic violence from buying a gun.

We closed the temporary restraining order loophole by prohibiting an abuser from getting their hands on a gun when a court issues a temporary order, because this is when an abuser is most likely to lash out and retaliate.

When domestic violence kills three women a day, we have a moral responsibility to act.

Mr. Chair, we cannot let the gun lobby scare us into putting their interests above the lives of thousands of Americans. We must reauthorize VAWA now with these increased protections.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LOJAN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. LOJAN. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support it.
first enacted and signed into law by President Clinton in 1994. This was a direct response to the epidemic of violence against women that plagued our country at that time. While we have made significant progress, much remains to be done.

It is estimated that more than 2 million adults and more than 15 million children are exposed to domestic violence annually. These alarming figures make it imperative that we reauthorize VAWA now.

We concluded our celebration of Women's History Month in March, but our job to protect women is not complete.

Movements like #MeToo across this country demand Congress' attention to better deal with the gaping holes left unfilled in current law around the issues of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, harassment, and stalking.

These VAWA efforts will have the same profound effect on a victim survivor and their families no matter one's party affiliation. Hence, these are human problems, period.

This is our opportunity to respond to the basic needs of victims and survivors with meaningful, absent discrimination based on their race, sex, religion, or nationality.

That is why this law has been reauthorized three times since enactment, in 2000, 2005, and 2013, with strong bipartisan approval and overwhelming support from Congress, States, and local communities.

H.R. 1585 continues that tradition, which reflects a reasonable and compromised approach to reauthorize grant programs under VAWA. For example, this bill includes various pieces of bipartisan legislation, Republican amendments from our committee markup, and Republican amendments through the rules process.

H.R. 1585 is intended to make modifications, as Congress has done in the past to all previous reauthorizations of VAWA.

For example, in South Los Angeles, part of my district, the Jenesse Center helps hundreds of people every year. VAWA funding has supported the growth of Jenesse's legal department, which provides direct legal services that not only assist survivors in securing immediate safety, but also helps them achieve long-term stability and self-sufficiency.

VAWA funding is integral to Jenesse's transitional, or bridge, housing program for survivors. After overcoming the initial crisis phase, people need space and time to rebuild family bonds, secure education and vocational training, and receive the mental health counseling needed to heal from trauma.

H.R. 1585 is inclusive, sensible, and responsive.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. This is a persistent crisis in our country that requires Congress to act.

While a lot of progress has been made since VAWA was first passed in 1994, too many women still face violence. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, one in three women will experience some form of physical violence in their lifetime.

Protecting women from violence has been, and should always be, a bipartisan issue. Republicans and Democrats came together to pass VAWA. Since then, this act has been reauthorized three times, including in 2013, just after I became a Member of this body.

Because of this law, victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking have been able to access support, as well while offenders have been held more accountable by our criminal justice system.

Since VAWA first passed, the rate of intimate partner violence declined by 67 percent. This law works, and we can strengthen it with this action.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the Grijalva amendment No. 13, which deals with some of the issues we see in Tribal communities. This is an important bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Collins of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today, I stand here in proud support of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, which includes my bill, the Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act.

I introduced this bill when I read a shocking article last year about a teenager in New York who was raped by two police officers while in their custody in the back of an unmarked police vehicle. When she reported the rape, a loophole in New York State law allowed the officers to claim she consented to having sex with them, despite the fact that she was handcuffed and under their control.

I was appalled to learn about this and was concerned that that was a legitimate defense, at that time, in New York, and it remains an acceptable defense in 30 other States and for Federal law enforcement officers.

My bill has now been included in VAWA and will no longer allow for Federal law enforcement officers to use that consent defense as well.

There are also financial incentives for the 30 States that need to close their loopholes by providing additional VAWA grant funds to States that pass similar legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to protect the safety of our women. Closing this loophole puts us one step closer to achieving that safety.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a co-chair of the Bipartisan Women's Caucus.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in support of H.R. 1583, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

I would like to first thank Representative KAREN BASS, the sponsor of this legislation, for her support of this issue.

As important as the successes of this bill have been, they are at times insufficient. Every day, an average of three women are killed by a current or former intimate partner. Every year, 7.9 million women are victims of stalking, rape, or physical violence by an intimate partner.

The bill before us today provides important updates to the Violence Against Women Act that improves services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Mr. Chairman, as co-chair of the Bipartisan Women's Caucus and as co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus, I strongly urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support this passage of legislation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today, I stand here in support of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, which includes my bill, the Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act.

Mr. Chairman, today, I stand here in support of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, which includes my bill, the Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to protect the safety of our women. Closing this loophole puts us one step closer to achieving that safety.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, this bill is about preventing and responding to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. That is why I urge my colleagues to exert courage and stand with victims by supporting this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.
engaged, and we think we have come up with a product that recognizes that, as we speak here today, there are women who are dying from domestic violence. As we stand here today, law enforcement will tell you that the most difficult, one of the most difficult calls they have to make is a domestic violence call.

Maybe it is like my constituent, Candice, whose bill I introduced, who was laying in the bed with a little baby and her other children were moving around the house, and a significant other—a husband, a boyfriend—took his gun and killed Candice while that baby was lying next to her. The little children had to hear that, and they were scurrying. They had to run to another house to try to get help for mommy.

You see, ladies and gentlemen, this is not about a score of the National Rifle Association, because this is not a gun bill, this is a lifesaving bill. This is a bill that a Republican from Pennsylvania, Mr. Fitzpatrick, put a health provision in, he expanded the Public Health Service Act.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. His bill will allow more services to come for those children and those survivors of domestic violence like Charlene's or Brittany's. The store behind these two women remind us of the urgency to protect survivors NOW, before it is too late, because many of these deaths are preventable.

Despite the experiences of #MeToo survivors or victims like Ms. Smith or Ms. Caldwell, all is not for naught. Since VAWA's codification in 1994, more victims report episodes of domestic violence to the police and the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by almost two-thirds. VAWA has contributed to a significant increase in the reporting of sexual assault.

For example, the percentage of victims of rape and sexual assault who report the assault to the police increased from 28.8 percent in 1993—the year prior to VAWA’s initial passage—to 50 percent in 2010. In the first 15 years of VAWA’s validity, rates of serious intimate partner violence declined by 72 percent for women and 64 percent for men.

Research suggests that referring a victim to a domestic violence center or sexual assault advocate has been linked to an increased willingness to file a police report—survivors with an advocate filed a report with law enforcement 59 percent of the time, versus 41 percent for individuals not referred to a victim advocate. This progress cannot be allowed to stop.

The Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA") is landmark legislation which—through policy reforms, interstate cooperation and grant allocation—has been pivotal in providing a national response to protecting half of the population.

Equally important, it has ushered in a seismic transformation on how society perceives violence against women. The law has enhanced and improved the lives of girls and women, boys and men.

There are many similarities between the year that VAWA initially passed in 1994, and the moment in which we all find ourselves today.

When VAWA was first passed, the country was experiencing reverberations to yet another polarizing battle to fill a seat on the Supreme Court.

Then the courageous victim sharing her truth was Anita Hill.

Today, as VAWA is yet again scheduled to expire, the country is assessing the ripples created by the #MeToo movement.

But despite the passage of over a quarter-century since its first enactment, the malignant treatment received by a courageous person willing to share her story unfortunately endures.

The need to create a safe space for victims of violence, especially women, supported with substantial resources to address this scourge has taken on a new urgency in this era of the #MeToo movement.

When discussing VAWA, we cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Brittany Smith, who was 23 years old and was gunned down last year in Houston, by her boyfriend and San Diego-based Marine; nor can we forget Charlene Caldwell, a mother and grandmother to death last year by a baseball bat at the hands of her boyfriend in Houston.

Domestic violence was alleged in both of these horrific events.

Unfortunately, there are too many stories like Charlene’s or Brittany’s.
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Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, really, in closing, I would just reiterate the points that I have made. We are looking forward to a bipartisan, bicameral bill that we do believe will come back eventually. The Senate has said this.

There are many things, and I think the distinguished majority leader made it very clear. I think it was interesting that he said, why did this become a bill that was not—it should be as bipartisan as it should be. I think it is because of stuff that we did not talk about that had been added into this, which makes it much larger than what the bill actually should be about, and focused on those areas.

We can disagree about a lot of things, but I think, in this one, all of us want to make sure that the Violence Against Women Act is reauthorized in a way that does promote the very ideals of the original law, and we would continue to do that.

We look forward to a day in which the body can debate that bill. At this time, we cannot, because this bill does not feel like many of our Members may vote for it. They may vote against. But I think, at the end of the day, there will be a better product coming. I am looking forward to that.

I appreciate the hard work by both sides, but I do believe there is a better outcome and alternative, a bipartisan, bicameral bill in the future.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, every year approximately 7.9 million women are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner. An average of three women are killed every day by a current or former intimate partner.

These grim statistics underscore the crucial need for us to act without delay to reauthorize VAWA and to enhance and expand the act so that it is even more effective than it has proven to be in the past.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019 is comprehensive and inclusive legislation that I hope will earn bipartisan support in the long tradition of this important law. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for this critical legislation today.

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, a number of my colleagues who requested to be added as a cosponsor to H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019” were not listed as cosponsors due to a clerical error. I wish to thank all my colleagues for their enduring support of VAWA. The

This legislation was introduced by Representative KAREN BASS. It is a 5-year reauthorization. The gentlewoman from Texas, who just spoke, Ms. JACKSON LEE, did a lot of work on this bill in the Judiciary Committee as well. I thank her for her leadership in this effort.

Her bill—and I speak of Congresswoman. Her bill would improve on current law by expanding existing grants that make communities safer and protect vulnerable populations, including Native American women.

Why wouldn’t we do that? I can’t think of a reason.

It would also improve economic assistance and security for survivors struggling with unemployment or financial hardship due to an abusive relationship to which they had been exposed.

It would also ensure that the Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women remains open and is not merged into another office or de-emphasized.

And, very importantly, the bill closes loopholes in gun laws to help prevent intimate partner homicides, an all too frequent happening.

According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, on average, nearly 20 people every minute are physically abused by an intimate partner in the United States. That is a tragedy and a crisis.

One in four women experience severe intimate partner physical violence. And one in seven have been stalked by an intimate partner. The point at which she felt very fearful or believed that she, or someone close to her, would be harmed or killed.

The presence of a gun in a domestic violence situation increases the risk of homicide by 500 percent. That is why we aim to close gun loopholes by expanding the definition of intimate partners to include dating or former dating partners.

It is also why this bill has language protecting intimate partners convicted of a misdemeanor crime of stalking from obtaining a gun.

I am deeply disappointed that some Republican Members of this House are using the NRA as cover to vote against this reauthorization which has been overwhelmingly, in a bipartisan fashion, reauthorized over and over again.

These are commonsense protections that prevent domestic abusers from obtaining the guns that have, sadly, been used so frequently to harm or kill their partners.

Mr. Chairman, I urge every Member to vote for this reauthorization. Let’s make this renewal of the Violence Against Women Act as strongly bipartisan as the House’s support for the law used to be. Let’s send a resounding message that the House stands with the victims and survivors and law enforcement and will do its job to help them and to prevent domestic violence and abuse, which have no place in our society, but are, tragically, too often, perpetrated in our country.

Mr. Chairman, let’s make it safer for women, for families, and for the children they care for. Let’s pass this bill. Let’s reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for her leadership in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I was proud to be a cosponsor of the original Violence Against Women Act in 1994. It passed on a bipartisan vote in the House. It was reauthorized in 2000 with a vote—and everybody ought to note this—that passed 371-1. And in 2005, it was reauthorized and passed 415-4 and signed, of course, by President Bush.

Democrats fought hard to expand the law’s protections to immigrant women, Native Americans, and LGBT people, and we did so in 2013 with bipartisan support once more. We want to protect all of our women, whatever their particular differences.

I was disappointed that the law’s authorization expired at the end of fiscal year 2018. It is critical that we enact a long-term reauthorization of the law without further delay in order to provide that certainty that another short-term extension cannot.

This legislation was introduced by Representative KAREN BASS. It is a 5-year reauthorization. The gentlewoman from Texas, who just spoke, Ms. JACKSON LEE, did a lot of work on this bill in the Judiciary Committee as well. I thank her for her leadership in this effort.

Her bill—and I speak of Congresswoman. Her bill would improve on current law by expanding existing grants that make communities safer and protect vulnerable populations, including Native American women.

Why wouldn’t we do that? I can’t think of a reason.

It would also improve economic assistance and security for survivors struggling with unemployment or financial hardship due to an abusive relationship to which they had been exposed.

It would also ensure that the Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women remains open and is not merged into another office or de-emphasized.

And, very importantly, the bill closes loopholes in gun laws to help prevent intimate partner homicides, an all too frequent happening.

According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, on average, nearly 20 people every minute are physically abused by an intimate partner. The point at which she felt very fearful or believed that she, or someone close to her, would be harmed or killed.

The presence of a gun in a domestic violence situation increases the risk of homicide by 500 percent. That is why we aim to close gun loopholes by expanding the definition of intimate partners to include dating or former dating partners.

It is also why this bill has language protecting intimate partners convicted of a misdemeanor crime of stalking from obtaining a gun.

I am deeply disappointed that some Republican Members of this House are using the NRA as cover to vote against this reauthorization which has been overwhelmingly, in a bipartisan fashion, reauthorized over and over again.

These are commonsense protections that prevent domestic abusers from obtaining the guns that have, sadly, been used so frequently to harm or kill their partners.

Mr. Chairman, I urge every Member to vote for this reauthorization. Let’s make this renewal of the Violence Against Women Act as strongly bipartisan as the House’s support for the law used to be. Let’s send a resounding message that the House stands with the victims and survivors and law enforcement and will do its job to help them and to prevent domestic violence and abuse, which have no place in our society, but are, tragically, too often, perpetrated in our country.

Mr. Chairman, let’s make it safer for women, for families, and for the children they care for. Let’s pass this bill. Let’s reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.
reauthorization of VAWA is vital for domestic violence survivors. VAWA is a landmark piece of legislation first enacted in 1994 and signed into law by President Bill Clinton as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. This legislation was enacted in response to the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence, and the significant impact of such violence on the lives of women. It is estimated that more than two million adults and more than 15 million children are exposed to domestic violence annually. VAWA provides essential resources to those who need it most, which is why this piece of legislation is so essential.

For the record, the following Members have expressed their support for H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019 and would have been added as a cosponsor to H.R. 1585 but for a clerical error.

COLIN ALLRED
AMI BEBA
SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr.
G.K. BUTTERFIELD
ANDré CARSON
MATT CARWRIGHT
JOAQUIN CASTRO
EMANUEL CLEAVER
GERALD CONNOLLY
Jim Costa
TJ Cox
CHARLIE CRIST
SHARICE DAVIES
DANNY K. DAVIS
Rosa Delauro
MARK DeSaulnier
THEODORE E. DEUTCH
Michael F. Doyle
BRIOT ENGEL
Dwight Evans
abby finkenauer
JIMMY GOMEZ
ALCIEE L. HASTINGS
JAHANA HAYES
KENDRA S. HORN
Hakeem Jeffries
HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, Jr.
MARCY KAPTUR
DANIEL T. KILDEE
John Larson
AL LAWSON
Barbara lee
Mike Levin
John Lewis
tedlieu
NITA M. LOWEY
Ben Ray Lujan
ELAINE G. LUDLUM
Tom Malinowski
STEPHANIE N. Murphy
RICHARD E. Neal
JOE NEGUSE
MICHAEL SAN NICOLAS
DONALD NORCROSS
Bill Pascrell, Jr.
ED PERLMUTTER
SCOTT PETERS
Dean Phillips
Mark Pocan
DAVID E. PRICE
Harley ROUDA
Raul Ruiz
BOBBY RUSH
Mary Gay Scanlon

Robert C. “Bobby” Scott
Brad Sherman
MikeSheriRrill
Darren Soto
Abigail Davis Spanberger
Mark Takano
Bennie G. Thompson
Rashida Tlaib
norma J. Torres
Xochitl Torres Small
Maine Curtis Teasey
The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-9 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-22. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H. R. 1585
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.
(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019”.
(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:
Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Universal definitions and grant conditions.
Sec. 3. Reporting on female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision.

TITLE I—ENHANCING LEGAL TOOLS TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING
Sec. 101. Stop grants.
Sec. 102. Grants to improve the criminal justice response.
Sec. 103. Legal assistance for victims.
Sec. 104. Grants to improve the criminal justice response.
Sec. 105. Rape survivor child custody.
Sec. 106. Criminal provisions.
Sec. 107. Study conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS
Sec. 201. Sexual assault services program.
Sec. 202. Rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and child abuse prevention and education assistance program.
Sec. 203. Training and services to end violence against people with disabilities.
Sec. 204. Training and services to end abuse in later life.

TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS
Sec. 301. Rape prevention and education grant.
Sec. 302. Creating hope through outreach, options, services, and education (CHOICE) for children and youth.
Sec. 303. Grants to combat violent crimes on campuses.
Sec. 304. Combat online predators.

TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES
Sec. 401. Study conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
TITLE XIII—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

SEC. 1301. Short title.

SEC. 1302. Prohibition on engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.

SEC. 1303. Incentives for States.

SEC. 1304. Reports to Congress. 

TITLE XIV—OTHER MATTERS


SEC. 1402. Federal victim assistants reauthorization.

SEC. 1403. Child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners reauthorization.

SEC. 1404. Sex offender management.

SEC. 1405. Court-appointed special advocate program.

SEC. 1406. Rape kit backlog.

SEC. 1407. Sexual assault forensic exam program grants.

SEC. 2. UNIVERSAL DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.

Section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “In this title” and inserting “In this title, including for the purpose of grants authorized under this Act”;

(B) by adding paragraphs (11) through (13), renumbering paragraphs (14) through (45) as paragraphs (46) through (53);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (33) the following:

“INTERNET ENABLED DEVICE.—The term ‘internet enabled device’ means devices that have a connection the Internet, send and receive information and data, and maybe accessed via mobile device technology, video technology, or computer technology, away from the location where the device is installed, and may include home automation systems, door locks, and thermostats.”

(40) TECHNOLOGICAL ABUSE.—The term ‘technological abuse’ means behavior intended to harm, threaten, intimidate, control, stalk, harass, impersonate, or monitor, except as otherwise permitted by law, another person, that occurs using the Internet, internet enabled devices, social networking sites, computers, mobile devices, cellular telephones, apps, location tracking devices, instant messages, text messages, or other forms of technology.

(41) FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.—The terms “female genital mutilation,” “FGM,” or “female circumcision” mean the intentional removal or forbidding the complete, or partial, removal of the labia majora or labia minora, whether or not accompanied by cutting of the clitoris, or cutting of the clitoris, whether or not accompanied by incision, excision, or reduction of the clitoris.

(42) VICTIM.—The term “victim” means an adult

(43) USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—Grantees and subgrantees may use technology and communications technologies that are appropriate for the purpose of providing services, resources, information, support or referrals provided through electronic communications platforms and media, whether via the use of mobile telecommunication technology, or computer technology, including utilizing the Internet, as well as any other emerging communications technologies that are appropriate for the purpose of providing services, resources, information, support, or referrals for the benefit of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(44) ECONOMIC ABUSE.—The term ‘economic abuse’, in the context of domestic violence, dating violence, and abuse in later life, means behavior that is coercive, deceptive, or unreasonably controls or restrains a person’s ability to acquire, use, or maintain economic resources to which they are entitled, including using coercion, fraud, or manipulation to—

(A) restrict a person’s access to money, assets, credit, or financial information;

(B) unfairly use a person’s personal economic resources, family, assets, and credit, for one’s own advantage; or

(C) exert undue influence over a person’s financial and economic behavior or decisions, including forcing, or causing a person to fulfill financial obligations, including forcing default on joint or other financial and economic behavior or decisions, including forcing default on joint or other financial and economic behavior or decisions.

(45) FORCED MARRIAGE.—The term ‘forced marriage’ means a marriage to which one or both parties do not or cannot consent, and in which one or more elements of force, fraud, or coercion is present. Forced marriage can be both a cause and a consequence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.

(46) HOMELESS.—The term ‘homeless’ has the meaning given such term in section 113(a)(54) of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act. 

(47) MARRIAGE.—The term ‘marriage’ means a marriage to which one or more elements of force, fraud, or coercion is present. Forced marriage can be both a cause and a consequence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.

(48) ECONOMIC ABUSE.—The term ‘economic abuse’, in the context of domestic violence, dating violence, and abuse in later life, means behavior that is coercive, deceptive, or unreasonably controls or restrains a person’s ability to acquire, use, or maintain economic resources to which they are entitled, including using coercion, fraud, or manipulation to—

(A) restrict a person’s access to money, assets, credit, or financial information;

(B) unfairly use a person’s personal economic resources, family, assets, and credit, for one’s own advantage; or

(C) exert undue influence over a person’s financial and economic behavior or decisions, including forcing, or causing a person to fulfill financial obligations, including forcing default on joint or other financial and economic behavior or decisions.

(49) FORCED MARRIAGE.—The term ‘forced marriage’ means a marriage to which one or both parties do not or cannot consent, and in which one or more elements of force, fraud, or coercion is present. Forced marriage can be both a cause and a consequence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.

(50) HOMELESS.—The term ‘homeless’ has the meaning given such term in section 113(a)(54) of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act. 

(51) MARRIAGE.—The term ‘marriage’ means a marriage to which one or more elements of force, fraud, or coercion is present. Forced marriage can be both a cause and a consequence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.

(52) ECONOMIC ABUSE.—The term ‘economic abuse’, in the context of domestic violence, dating violence, and abuse in later life, means behavior that is coercive, deceptive, or unreasonably controls or restrains a person’s ability to acquire, use, or maintain economic resources to which they are entitled, including using coercion, fraud, or manipulation to—

(A) restrict a person’s access to money, assets, credit, or financial information;

(B) unfairly use a person’s personal economic resources, family, assets, and credit, for one’s own advantage; or

(C) exert undue influence over a person’s financial and economic behavior or decisions, including forcing, or causing a person to fulfill financial obligations, including forcing default on joint or other financial and economic behavior or decisions.
“(i) technologies or protocols that inhibit or prevent a perpetrator’s attempts to use technology or social media to threaten, harass, or harm the victim, the victim’s family, friends, neighbors, or co-workers, or the program providing services to them.”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “designed to reduce or eliminate domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking,” the following: “provided that the confidentiality and privacy requirements of this title are maintained, and that personally identifying information about adult, youth and child victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking is not requested or included in any such collaboration or information-sharing”;

(C) by adding at the end of paragraph (4), the following: “However, such disbursing agencies must ensure that the confidentiality and privacy requirements of this title are maintained in making such reports, and that personally identifying information about adult, youth and child victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking is not requested or included in any such reports.”;

(D) in paragraph (11), by adding at the end the following: “The Office on Violence Against Women shall make all technical assistance, training, or other assistance available to any State, Indian tribe, or unit of local government in violation of section 40002(b)(13)(A) of the Violent Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461) by recipients of grants under this part.”;

(E) by inserting after paragraph (20), the following: “(21) developing, implementing laws, policies, procedures, or training to ensure the lawful recovery and storage of any dangerous weapon by the appropriate law enforcement agency from an adjudicated domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and the return of such weapon when appropriate, where any Federal, State, tribal, or local government; and

(A)(i) issued protective or other restraining orders against such a perpetrator; or

(ii) found such a perpetrator to be guilty of misdemeanor or felony crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(B) ordered the perpetrator to relinquish dangerous weapons possessed or used in the commission of at least one of the aforementioned crimes. Policies, procedures, protocols, laws, regulations, or training under this section shall include the fastest means of recovery of, and best practices for storage of, relinquished and recovered dangerous weapons and their return, when possible. An individual to whom a weapon is no longer prohibited from possessing such weapons under Federal, State, or Tribal law, or posted local ordinances; and

(22) developing, enlarging, or strengthening culturally specific victim services programs to provide culturally specific victim services regarding, responses to, and prevention of female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision.”;

(2) in section 2007—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) proof of compliance with the requirements regarding protocols to strongly discourage compelling victim testimony, described in section 2017;

(6) proof of compliance with the requirements regarding civil rights under section 4002(b)(13) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291);”

(B) in subsection (i)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and the requirements under section 4002(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b));” and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A)(i) by inserting after “gender identity,” the following: “sexual orientation, gender identity;” and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) REQUIRING GRANTS TO DEVELOP AND STRENGTHEN VICTIM SERVICES AND JUSTICE RESPONSE.

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If allegations of discrimination in violation of section 4002(a)(46) of the Violent Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(13)(A)) by a potential grantee under this part have been made to the Attorney General, the Attorney General shall, prior to awarding a grant under this part to such potential grantee, conduct a review of the compliance of the potential grantee with such section.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF RULE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, the Attorney General shall by rule establish procedures for such a review.

“(3) REAL HEALTH AND SAFETY DETERMINATIONS.—(A)(i) issued protective or other restraining orders against such a perpetrator; or

(B) in paragraphs (9)—

(i) by striking “older and disabled women” and inserting “people 50 years of age or over and people with disabilities”;

(ii) by striking “older and disabled individuals” and inserting “people 50 years of age or over and people with disabilities”;

(C) in paragraph (19), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (20), the following:

“(21) developing, implementing laws, policies, procedures, or training to ensure the lawful recovery and storage of any dangerous weapon by the appropriate law enforcement agency from an adjudicated perpetrator of any offense of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and the return of such weapon when appropriate, where any Federal, State, tribal, or local government; and

(A)(i) issued protective or other restraining orders against such a perpetrator; or

(ii) found such a perpetrator to be guilty of misdemeanor or felony crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(B) ordered the perpetrator to relinquish dangerous weapons possessed or used in the commission of at least one of the aforementioned crimes. Policies, procedures, protocols, laws, regulations, or training under this section shall include the fastest means of recovery of, and best practices for storage of, relinquished and recovered dangerous weapons and their return, when possible. An individual to whom a weapon is no longer prohibited from possessing such weapons under Federal, State, or Tribal law, or posted local ordinances; and

(22) developing, enlarging, or strengthening culturally specific victim services programs to provide culturally specific victim services regarding, responses to, and prevention of female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision.”;

(2) in section 2007—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) proof of compliance with the requirements regarding protocols to strongly discourage compelling victim testimony, described in section 2017;

(6) proof of compliance with the requirements regarding civil rights under section 4002(b)(13) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291);”

(B) in subsection (i)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and the requirements under section 4002(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b));” and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A)(i) by inserting after “gender identity,” the following: “sexual orientation, gender identity;” and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) REQUIRING GRANTS TO DEVELOP AND STRENGTHEN VICTIM SERVICES AND JUSTICE RESPONSE.

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If allegations of discrimination in violation of section 4002(a)(46) of the Violent Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(13)(A)) by a potential grantee under this part have been made to the Attorney General, the Attorney General shall, prior to awarding a grant under this part to such potential grantee, conduct a review of the compliance of the potential grantee with such section.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF RULE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, the Attorney General shall by rule establish procedures for such a review.

“(3) REAL HEALTH AND SAFETY DETERMINATIONS.—(A)(i) issued protective or other restraining orders against such a perpetrator; or

“SEC. 102. GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSE.

(a) HEADING.—Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461 et seq.) is amended in the heading, by striking “GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES” and inserting “GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSE”.

(b) GRANTS.—Section 2001 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) GENERAL PROGRAM PURPOSE.—The purpose of this part is to assist States, State and local courts (including juvenile courts), Indian tribal governments, tribal courts, and units of local government to develop and strengthen effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women, and to develop and strengthen victim services in cases involving violent crimes against women.”;

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “proarrest” and inserting “offender accountability and homicide reduction”;

(B) in paragraph (6)—

(i) by striking “older individuals (as defined in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002))” and inserting “people 50 years of age or over”;

(ii) by inserting “individuals with disabilities (as defined in section 3(2) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(2)))” and inserting “people with disabilities (as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102))”;

(C) in paragraph (19), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including victims who are underrepresented populations (as defined in section 4002(a)(46) of the Violent Against Women Act of 1994)”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) To develop and implement an alternative justice response (as such term is defined in section 4002(a) of the Violent Against Women Act of 1994) ("alternative justice response") to develop and implement an alternative justice response (as such term is defined in section 4002(a) of the Violent Against Women Act of 1994)

(2) To develop and implement an alternative justice response (as such term is defined in section 4002(a) of the Violent Against Women Act of 1994)
“(ii) found such a perpetrator to be guilty of misdemeanor or felony crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and
“(B) ordered the perpetrator to relinquish dangerous weapons that the perpetrator possesses or has used in the commission of at least one of the aforementioned crimes.

Policies, protocols, laws, regulations, or training under this section shall include the safest means of recovery of and best practices for storage of relinquished and recovered dangerous weapons and their return, when applicable, at such time as the persons are no longer prohibited from possessing such weapons under Federal, State, Tribal or municipal law.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—
(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “encourage or mandate arrest of domestic violence offenders” and inserting “encourage arrests of offenders”;
and (ii) in clause (i), by striking “encourage or mandate arrest of domestic violence offenders” and inserting “encourage arrest of offenders”;
and (B) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:
“(F) certify that, not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, their policies or practices will include a detailed protocol to strongly discourage the use of bench warrants, material witness warrants, perjury charges, or other means of compelling victims to testify in the investigation, prosecution, trial, or sentencing of a crime related to the domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence or stalking of the victim; and

SEC. 103. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS.
Section 1201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12511(f)(1)) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after "no cost to the victim," the following: "When legal assistance to a dependent is necessary for the safety of a victim, such assistance may be provided.",
(2) in subsection (c)—
(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting after "stalking, and sexual assault!" the following: ": or for dependents when necessary for the safety of a victim;"
(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting after "stalking, and sexual assault!" the following: ": or for dependents when necessary for the safety of a victim;", and
(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting after "sexual assault, or stalking!" the following: ": or for dependents when necessary for the safety of a victim;"; and
(3) in subsection (f)(1), by striking "2014 through 2018" and inserting "2020 through 2024".

SEC. 104. GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.
Section 1201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12511(f)(1)) is amended—
(1) in subsection (b)—
(A) in paragraph (7), by striking "and at the end;"
(B) in paragraph (8)—
(i) by striking "to improve and inserting "improving";
(ii) by striking "the period at the end and inserting "; and "; and
(C) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:
"(d) develop and implement an alternative justice response (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994); and
(2) in subsection (e), by striking "2014 through 2018" and inserting "2020 through 2024".

SEC. 105. OUTREACH AND SERVICES TO UNDER-SERVED POPULATIONS GRANTS.
Section 120 of the Violence Against Women and Children’s Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 12201) is amended—
(1) in subsection (d)—
(A) in paragraph (4), by striking "or" at the end,
(B) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:
"(6) developing, enlarging, or strengthening culturally specific programs and projects to provide culturally specific services regarding, responses in and prevention of female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision; and
(2) in subsection (g), by striking "2014 through 2018" and inserting "2020 through 2024".

SEC. 106. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.
Section 2265 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—
(1) in subsection (d)(3)—
(A) by striking "restraining order or injunction; and
(B) by adding at the end the following: "The prohibition under this paragraph applies to all protection orders for the protection of a person residing within a State, territorial, or tribal jurisdiction, or a victim of a conviction order for a court of a State, territorial, or Tribal; and
(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following: "This applies to all Alaska tribes without respect to 'Indian country' or the population of the Native village associated with the Tribe.”.

SEC. 107. RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY.
Section 409 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (34 U.S.C. 21308) is amended by striking "2015 through 2019" and inserting "2020 through 2024".

TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS
SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

SEC. 202. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT AND PREVENTION PROGRAM.
Section 4025 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12341) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking "women" and inserting "adults, youth,"; and
(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking "2014 through 2018" and inserting "2020 through 2024".

SEC. 203. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES.
Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12202) is amended—
(1) in the heading, by striking "women" and inserting "people":
(2) in subsection (a), by striking “individuals” each place it appears and inserting “people”;
(3) in subsection (b)—
(A) by striking “disabled individuals” each place it appears and inserting “people with disabilities”;
(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “law enforcement” the following: “and other first responders”;
(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “providing advocacy and intervention services within” and inserting “to enhance the capacity of;
(4) in subsection (c), by striking “disabled individual” and inserting “people with disabilities”;
and
(5) in subsection (e), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

SEC. 204. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END ABUSE IN LATER LIFE.
(1) in the heading, by striking "ENHANCED TRAINING" and inserting "TRAINING";
(2) by striking subsection "(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
"(1) in paragraph (b) of subsection (b) and inserting the following: "The Attorney General shall make grants to eligible entities in accordance with the following:";
(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (3) of subsection (b) as paragraphs (1) through (4);
(4) in paragraph (1) as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection—
(A) by striking ", including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, exploitation, and neglect" each place it appears;
(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking after "elder abuse" the following: “and abuse in later life”; and
(ii) in clause (ii), by striking "encouraging or assisting victim advocates, victim service providers, courts, and first responders to better serve older victims;"
(C) in subparagraph (B)—
(i) in clause (i), by striking "or other community-based organizations in recognizing and addressing instances of abuse in later life" and inserting "community-based organizations, or other professionals who may identify or respond to abuse in later life;" and
(ii) in clause (ii), by striking after "victims of" the following: “elder abuse and";
and
(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking "subparagraphs (B)(ii)" and inserting paragraph (2)(B);

(2) in subsection (e), by striking "over 50 years of age" and inserting "50 years of age or over";

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "in later life" and inserting "50 years of age or over";

(6) in paragraph (4) as redesignated by paragraph (3), by striking "2014 through 2018" and inserting "2020 through 2024".

TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS
SEC. 301. RAPE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION GRANT.
Section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290b–16) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following “or digital services (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994);”;
(B) in paragraph (7), by striking “sexual assault and inserting “sexual violence, sexual assault, and sexual harassment”;
(2) in subsection (b), by striking "Indian Tribal" and inserting "Indian tribal;" and
(3) in subsection (c)—
(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024";
and
(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following: "Not less than 80 percent of the total amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year shall be awarded in accordance with this paragraph.";
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SEC. 302. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION (CHOICE) FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

Section 41201 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12451) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “stalking, or sex trafficking” and inserting “or stalking”;

(B) by striking the colon and the following: “Grants awarded under this section may be used to address sex trafficking or bullying as part of a comprehensive program focused primarily on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking” and inserting “target youth, including youth in underserved populations who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “stalking, and sex trafficking” and inserting “and stalking”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “sex trafficking” and inserting “or stalking”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking “stalking, and sex trafficking” and inserting “or stalking”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following “and disseminate”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “for all students” and inserting “for all students”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “sex, the following: sexual orientation, gender identity;” and inserting “sex, the following:”;

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$16,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”

SEC. 303. GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIMES ON CAMPUSES.

Section 304 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20125) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking the second sentence;

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows—

“(3) To provide prevention and education programming about domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including technological abuse and reproductive and sexual coercion, that is age-appropriate, culturally relevant, ongoing, delivered in multiple venues on campus, accessible, promotes respectful non-violent behavior as a social norm, and engages men and boys. Such programming should be developed in partnership or collaboratively with experts in intimate partner and sexual violence prevention and intervention.”;

(C) in paragraph (9), by striking “and provide,” and inserting “; and disseminate”;

(D) in paragraph (10), by inserting after “or adapt” the following “and disseminate”; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following—

“(11) To train campus health centers on how to recognize and respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including how to provide universal education to all members of the campus community on the impacts of violence on health and unhealthy relationships and how providers can support ongoing outreach efforts.”;

(2) in subsection (c)(3), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024.”

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “for all incoming students” and inserting “for all students”;

(B) in paragraph (4)(C), by inserting after “sex,” the following: “sexual orientation, gender identity;”;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$45,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”

SEC. 304. COMBAT ONLINE PREDATORS.

(a) In General.—Chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2261A the following—

“§2261B. Enhanced penalty for stalkers of children.

“(a) In General.—Except as provided in subsection (b), if the victim of an offense under section 2261A is under the age of 18 years, the maximum term of imprisonment for the offense is 5 years greater than the maximum term of imprisonment otherwise provided for that offense in section 2261.

“(b) Limitation.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a person who violates section 2261A if—

(1) the person is subject to a sentence under section 2261(b)(5); and

(2)(A) the person is under the age of 18 at the time the offense occurred; or

(B) the victim of the offense is not less than 15 nor more than 17 years of age and not more than 3 years younger than the person who committed the offense at the time the offense occurred.

“(c) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2261A the following new item:

“2261B. Enhanced penalty for stalkers of children.”

“(d) Conforming Amendment.—Section 2261A of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (2)(B) by striking “section 2261(b) of this title” and inserting “section 2261(b) or section 2261B, as the case may be.”

“(e) Report on Best Practices Regarding Enforcement of Anti-Stalking Laws.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress, which shall—

(1) include an evaluation of Federal, tribal, State, and local efforts to enforce laws relating to stalking; and

(2) identify and describe those elements of such efforts that constitute the best practices for the enforcement of such laws.”

SEC. 401. STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION REGARDING VIOLENT CRIME AGAINST WOMEN.

Section 402 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 20804) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following “(E) strategies within each of these areas addressing the unmet needs of underserved populations.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following “(C) include an focus on the unmet needs of underserved populations.”;

(4) in subsection (f), by striking “$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”

(5) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following—

“(3) Remaining Amounts.—Any amounts not made available under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be used for any set of purposes described in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b), or for a project that fulfills two or more of such sets of purposes.”.
"(1D) contracting with or hiring advocates for victims of domestic violence or sexual assault to provide such services; or

"(III) providing funding to State and local governments or agencies to improve the capacity of such coalitions to coordinate and support health advocates and other system partners;

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

(D) in subparagraph (B)(iv) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: "and evaluation of best practices, dissemination, and evaluation of best practices, information, and training materials for behavioral health professionals to identify and respond to domestic violence, sexual violence, stalking, and dating violence."

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(A)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE AND IN LATER LIFE" and inserting the following: "CHILD ABUSE AND ABUSE IN LATER LIFE"; and

(B) by striking "child or elder abuse" and inserting the following: "child abuse or abuse in later life";

(4) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(i), by striking "elder abuse" and inserting "abuse in later life";

(5) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iii), by striking "at the end;"

(6) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iv)—

(A) by inserting "mental health," after "dental"; and

(B) by striking "exams." and inserting "exams and certifications:";

(7) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

"(v) the development, implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of best practices, tools, and training materials for behavioral health professionals to identify and respond to domestic violence, sexual violence, stalking, and dating violence.";

(TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS

SEC. 601. HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Section 412 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 13401) is amended—

(I) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "brother, sister," and inserting "sibling,"; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking the following: "the direct loan program under such section;"

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "the program under subtitle A and inserting "the programs under subsections A through D;");

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the program under subtitle A and inserting "the programs under subsections A through D;"); and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking "the program under subtitle A and inserting "the programs under subsections A through D;"

(II) by striking "and" at the end;

(III) in subsection (b), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(IV) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE, TENANCY, AND OCCUPANCY RIGHTS PROHIBITED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A tenant shall not be denied assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program solely on the basis of the criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is engaged in by 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 or such domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(ii) CRIMINAL ACTIVITY ENGAGED IN BY PERPETRATOR OF ABUSE.—A tenant shall not be denied assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program solely on the basis of the criminal activity, including drug-related criminal activity (as such term is defined in section 301(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1338a(b)) engaged in by the perpetrator of the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(iii) REVIEW PRIOR TO DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE.—Prior to denying assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program to a tenant on the basis of criminal activity of the tenant, including drug-related criminal activity, the covered housing provider must conduct an individualized review of the totality of the circumstances regarding the criminal activity at issue if the tenant is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. Such review shall include consideration of—

"(I) the nature and severity of the criminal activity;

"(II) the amount of time that has elapsed since the occurrence of the criminal activity;

"(III) if the tenant engaged in more than one instance of criminal activity, the frequency and duration of the criminal activity;

"(IV) whether the criminal activity was related to a symptom of a disability, including a substance use disorder;

"(V) whether the victim was coerced by the perpetrator of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

"(VI) whether the victim has taken affirmative steps to reduce the likelihood that the criminal activity will recur; and

"(VII) any mitigating factors.

The covered housing program must provide the tenant with a written summary of the review and the tenant shall have the opportunity to invoke the covered housing program's grievance policy to dispute the findings.

(c) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the heading, by striking "BIFURCATION" and inserting "FAMILY BREAK-UP;"

(ii) as clauses (ii) and (iii) respectively;

(iii) by inserting before clause (ii) (as redesignated by clause (ii) of this subparagraph) the following:

"(5) CONTINUUM OF CARE.—The term "Continuum of Care" means the Federal program authorizes under subtitute title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 13101 et seq.).

"(6) INTERNAL TRANSFER.—The term "internal transfer" means a transfer to a unit of the same covered housing provider and under the same covered housing program except for programs under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

"(7) EXTERNAL TRANSFER.—The term "external transfer" means a transfer to a unit of a different covered housing provider under the same covered housing program;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting after "CRIMINAL ACTIVITY ENGAGED IN BY PERPETRATOR OF ABUSE:"

"(I) REVIEW PRIOR TO DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE; and"

(B) by adding after subparagraph (A) as follows:

"(c) in paragraph (1A), by striking "or health system" and inserting "or behavioral health;"

(8) in subsection (d)(2) by striking "mental" before "health";

(9) in subsection (d)(2)(C), by inserting after "behavioral health" after "physical or"; and

(C) by striking "mental" before "health care;"

(10) in subsection (d)(2) by striking "or health system" and inserting "behavioral health treatment system"; and

(11) in the heading, by striking "RESEARCH AND EVALUATION" and inserting "RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND DATA COLLECTION";

(12) in subsection (f)(1)(A), by inserting after "behavioral health care" the following: "or behavioral health;"

(13) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting after "RESEARCH" the following: "AND DATA COLLECTION;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "or data collection" before "authorized in paragraph (1);"
A tenant who is not in good standing retains the right to an emergency transfer if they meet the eligibility requirements in this section and the eligibility requirements of the program to which the tenant requests an out-of-jurisdiction transfer.

(2) POLICIES.--Each appropriate agency shall adopt an emergency transfer policy for use by covered housing programs. Such emergency transfer policies shall reflect the variations in program operation and administration by covered housing program type. The policies must, at a minimum--

(A) describe a process that--

(i) permits tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to move to another available and safe dwelling quickly through an internal emergency transfer and by receiving a tenant protection voucher, if eligible, pursuant to subsection (f);

(ii) provides that the tenant can choose between completing an internal emergency transfer or receiving a tenant protection voucher, whichever is the safest option for the victim; and

(iii) requires that an internal emergency transfer must occur within 10 days after a covered housing provider’s approval of a request for an emergency transfer;

(B) describe how to permit tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to complete an emergency external transfer;

(C) describe a process that allows a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to temporarily relocate, while maintaining eligibility for the covered housing program without the loss of their housing status, if there are no alternative comparable housing program units available, until a safe housing unit under the covered housing program or a tenant protection voucher is available;

(D) prioritize completing internal emergency transfers and receiving tenant protection vouchers over external emergency transfers, except for Continua of Care, which shall prioritize completing an internal emergency transfer or external emergency transfer prior to receiving a tenant protection voucher;

(E) mandate that emergency internal and external transfers take priority over non-emergency transfers;

(F) mandate that emergency internal and external transfers not considered non-applicants and take priority over existing waiting lists for a covered housing program;

(G) incorporate confidentiality measures to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of the covered housing provider do not disclose any information regarding a tenant who is victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including the location of a new dwelling unit to any person or entity without the written authorization of the tenant;

(H) mandate that if a victim cannot receive an internal transfer, external transfer, or tenant protection voucher, then the covered housing provider must assist the victim in identifying other housing providers who may have safe and secure housing for the victim;

(3) LOCAL SYSTEMS FUNDED BY CONTINUUM OF CARE.--In addition to adopting the policies as defined in paragraph (2) in an emergency transfer policy, each entity under the Continuum of Care must establish a policy to facilitate emergency transfers, and that entity shall also--

(A) coordinate emergency external transfers among all covered housing providers participating in the Continuum of Care;

(B) identify an emergency external transfer, if available, within 30 days of an approved request;

(C) coordinate emergency transfers with Continuum of Care in other jurisdictions in cases where the victim requests an out-of-jurisdiction transfer; and

(D) ensure a victim is not required to be reassessed through the local Continuum of Care intake and review process when seeking an emergency transfer placement.

(4) REGIONAL OFFICES.—Each regional office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this Act referred to as a HUD regional office) shall develop and implement a regional emergency transfer plan in collaboration with public housing agencies and the entities designated under paragraph (3). Such plan shall set forth how public housing agencies will coordinate emergency transfers with other public housing agencies regionally. The plans must be submitted to the Violence Against Women Director and be made publicly available. HUD regional offices shall defer to any additional emergency transfer policies, priorities, and strategies set by entities designated under paragraph (3).

(5) COVERED HOUSING PROVIDERS.—Each covered housing provider shall develop and implement an emergency transfer policy consistent with the requirements in this subsection (D).

(5) (j) TRAINING AND REFERRALS.—

(1) TRAINING FOR STAFF OF COVERED HOUSING PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in partnership with domestic violence experts, shall develop mandatory training for staff of covered housing providers to provide a basic understanding of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking to move to another available and safe dwelling quickly through an internal emergency transfer and by receiving a tenant protection voucher, if eligible, pursuant to subsection (f); and

(2) TRAINING AND REFERRALS.—The Secretary shall establish the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.''; and

(5) (k) by adding at the end following: "The Secretary shall establish the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.''; and

(5) (l) by redesigning subsection (g) as subsection (k); and

(5) (m) by inserting after subsection (l) the following:

(g) EMERGENCY TRANSFER VOUCHERS.—Provision of emergency transfer vouchers to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking is subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The head of each appropriate agency shall establish the policy required under subsection (e) with respect to emergency transfers and emergency transfer vouchers within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

(6) by redesigning subsection (g) as subsection (k); and

(7) by inserting after subsection (l) the following:

("(e) EMERGENCY TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking shall be transferred to another available and safe dwelling unit under a covered housing program if--

(A) the tenant reasonably believes that the tenant is threatened with imminent harm from the covered housing provider; and

(B)(i) the tenant reasonably believes that the tenant is threatened with imminent harm from the covered housing provider; and

(ii) in the case of a tenant who is a victim of sexual assault, the sexual assault occurred on the premises during the 180-day period preceding the request for transfer.

A tenant who is not in good standing retains the right to an emergency transfer if they meet the eligibility requirements in this section and the eligibility requirements of the program to which the tenant requests an out-of-jurisdiction transfer.

(2) POLICIES.—Each appropriate agency shall adopt an emergency transfer policy for use by covered housing programs. Such emergency transfer policies shall reflect the variations in program operation and administration by covered housing program type. The policies must, at a minimum--

(A) describe a process that--

(i) permits tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to move to another available and safe dwelling quickly through an internal emergency transfer and by receiving a tenant protection voucher, if eligible, pursuant to subsection (f);
SEC. 41410. ENFORCEMENT.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Each appropriate agency shall—

(1) conduct a review of the performance of the housing program administered under this subtitle and any covered governmental entity by that agency;
(2) provide technical assistance with respect to the performance of the housing program administered under this subtitle and any covered governmental entity complying with this subtitle;
(3) provide technical assistance with respect to the performance of the housing program administered under this subtitle to any covered governmental entity that is not found to be in compliance with this subtitle;
(4) implement a quality control system and a corrective action plan system for the covered housing providers; and
(5) coordinate the development of interagency guidelines and policies for the administration of the housing program administered under this subtitle.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Each appropriate agency shall—

(1) ensure that the regulations and guidelines issued by the agency or any other governmental entity are consistent with the regulations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission;
(2) coordinate the development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines; and
(3) coordinate development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to the implementation of this subtitle, at each agency administering a covered housing program;

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to limit any claim filed or other proceeding commenced, by the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, that might be available under Federal law, as in effect on the day prior to such date of enactment; or
(2) to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law, that provides greater protection than this subtitle for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

SEC. 41411. RIGHT TO REPORT CRIME AND EMERGENCIES FROM ONE’S HOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, and guests of, and applicants for, housing assisted under a covered housing program shall have the right to seek law enforcement or emergency assistance on their own behalf or on behalf of another person in need of assistance, and shall not be penalized based on their requests for assistance or based on criminal activity of which they are a victim or otherwise not at fault under statutes, ordinances, or policies adopted or enforced by covered governmental entities as defined in subsection (d). Penalties that are prohibited include—

(1) actual or threatened assessment of penalties, fees, or fines;
(2) actual or threatened eviction;
(3) actual or threatened refusal to rent or renew tenancy;
(4) actual or threatened refusal to issue an occupancy permit or landlord permit; and
(5) actual or threatened closure of the property or designation of the property as a nuisance or a similarly negative designation.

(b) REPORTING.—Consistent with the process provided for in section 104(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(b)), covered governmental entities shall—

(1) report any of their laws or policies, or, as applicable, the laws or policies adopted by subgrantees, that impose penalties on landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, guests, or housing applicants based on requests for law enforcement or emergency assistance or based on criminal activity that occurred at a property; and
(2) certify that they are in compliance with the protections under this subtitle or describe the steps they will take within 180 days to come into compliance, or to ensure compliance among subgrantees.

(c) OVERSIGHT.—Oversight and accountability mechanisms provided for under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) shall be available to address violations of this section.

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, ‘covered governmental entity’ shall mean any municipal, county, or state government that receives any Federal, State, or local program funds, or any other governmental entity, including a covered governmental entity under this title, that receives funds under any Federal, State, or local program.

SEC. 41412. COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.

(a) ANNUAL COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.—Each appropriate agency administering a covered housing program shall establish a process by which each year it will have an annual review of the performance of the housing program, the compliance of covered housing providers, the performance of the program in meeting the needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and the implementation of this subtitle.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Each appropriate agency shall—

(1) ensure that adequate technical assistance is available to covered housing providers regarding implementation of this subtitle, as well as other issues related to advancing housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including compliance with this subtitle;
(2) establish a formal reporting process to receive individual complaints concerning noncompliance with this subtitle; and
(3) ensure that the guidance and notices to victims are distributed in commonly encountered languages.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to limit any claim filed or other proceeding commenced, by the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, that might be available under Federal law, as in effect on the day prior to such date of enactment; or
(2) to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law, that provides greater protection than this subtitle for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

SEC. 41413. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN DIRECTOR.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be, within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a Violence Against Women Director (in this section referred to as the ‘Director’).

(b) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

(1) support implementation of the provisions of this subtitle and any funding authorized under this subtitle or any other program; and
(2) coordinate development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to the implementation of this subtitle, at each agency administering a covered housing program;

(3) advise and coordinate with designated officials within the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Justice concerning legislation, implementation, and other issues relating to or affecting the housing programs under this subtitle;

(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and support to each appropriate agency regarding implementation of this subtitle, including access to housing for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including compliance with this subtitle;

(5) ensure that adequate technical assistance is available to covered housing providers regarding implementation of this subtitle, as well as other issues related to advancing housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including compliance with this subtitle;

(6) act as a liaison with the judicial branches of Federal, State, and local governments on matters relating to the housing needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(7) implement a quality control system and a corrective action plan system for those covered housing providers that fail to comply with this subtitle, where necessary;

(8) establish a formal reporting process to receive individual complaints concerning noncompliance with this subtitle; and

(9) coordinate the development of interagency guidelines to ensure that information concerning available dwelling units is forwarded to the Director by all covered housing providers and by the Secretary in facilitating the emergency transfer process of a covered governmental entity.

(10) coordinate with HUD regional offices and officials at each appropriate agency the development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines on time frames for the completion of emergency transfers; and

(11) ensure that the guidance and notices to victims are distributed in commonly encountered languages.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to limit any claim filed or other proceeding commenced, by the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, that might be available under Federal law, as in effect on the day prior to such date of enactment; or
(2) to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law, that provides greater protection than this subtitle for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

SEC. 41414. PROHIBITION ON RETALIATION.

(a) NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENT.—No covered governmental entity shall discriminate against any person because that person has opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this subtitle, or because that individual testified, assisted, or participated in any matter related to this subtitle.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL.—No covered governmental entity shall coerc, intimidate, threaten, or retaliate against, any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of the person having exercised or enjoyed any such right or access, to housing program; the Secretary in facilitating the emergency transfer process of a covered governmental entity.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to limit any claim filed or other proceeding commenced, by the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, that might be available under Federal law, as in effect on the day prior to such date of enactment; or
(2) to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law, that provides greater protection than this subtitle for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

SEC. 41415. RIGHT TO REPORT CRIME AND EMERGENCIES FROM ONE’S HOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, and guests of, and applicants for, housing assisted under a covered housing program shall have the right to seek law enforcement or emergency assistance on their own behalf or on behalf of another person in need of assistance, and shall not be penalized based on their requests for assistance or based on criminal activity of which they are a victim or otherwise not at fault under statutes, ordinances, or policies adopted or enforced by covered governmental entities as defined in subsection (d). Penalties that are prohibited include—

(1) actual or threatened assessment of penalties, fees, or fines;
(2) actual or threatened eviction;
(3) actual or threatened refusal to rent or renew tenancy;
(4) actual or threatened refusal to issue an occupancy permit or landlord permit; and
(5) actual or threatened closure of the property or designation of the property as a nuisance or a similarly negative designation.

(b) REPORTING.—Consistent with the process provided for in section 104(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(b)), covered governmental entities shall—

(1) report any of their laws or policies, or, as applicable, the laws or policies adopted by subgrantees, that impose penalties on landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, guests, or housing applicants based on requests for law enforcement or emergency assistance or based on criminal activity that occurred at a property; and
(2) certify that they are in compliance with the protections under this subtitle or describe the steps they will take within 180 days to come into compliance, or to ensure compliance among subgrantees.

(c) OVERSIGHT.—Oversight and accountability mechanisms provided for under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) shall be available to address violations of this section.

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, ‘covered governmental entity’ shall mean any municipal, county, or state government that receives any Federal, State, or local program funds, or any other governmental entity, including a covered governmental entity under this title, that receives funds under any Federal, State, or local program.
(a) SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE, ALTERNATIVE CRIME REDUCTION METHODS. (1) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF BYRNE-JAG FUNDS.—Section 501(a)(1) of part I of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(e)(1)) is amended—

(2) by striking paragraph (1) after the semicolon; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “;”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) To develop and implement alternative methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies. For purposes of this subparagraph, a punitive program or policy is a program or policy that—(i) imposes a penalty on a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, based on the existence of such crime; or (ii) imposes a penalty on such victim that is dependent on criminal activity that occurred at a property.”.

(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF COPS FUNDS.—Paragraph (23) of section 41404(i) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12474(i)) is amended—

(A) by striking “the 2009 Act” and inserting “the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b))”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(25) To develop and implement alternative methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies (as such term is defined in section 501(a)(1)(I)).”

(3) HOMICIDE AND LACK OF RESOURCES.—Section 201(b) of part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461(b)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) To develop and implement alternative methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies. For purposes of this paragraph, a punitive program or policy is a program or policy that—(A) imposes a penalty on a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, based on the existence of such crime; or (B) imposes a penalty on such victim that is dependent on criminal activity that occurred at a property.”

(2) To develop and implement alternative methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies. For purposes of this paragraph, a punitive program or policy is a program or policy that—(A) imposes a penalty on a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, based on the existence of such crime; or (B) imposes a penalty on such victim that is dependent on criminal activity that occurred at a property.”

SEC. 606. UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 AMENDMENTS. Section 502(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f–1(d)) is amended—

(1) by adding paragraph (13) to read as follows:

“(13) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING PROGRAM.—

(A) COPIES.—A copy of—

(i) all standardized notices issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) and any other housing protections under subtitle D of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including the notice required under section 4111(d) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; and

(ii) the reference, if any, to paragraph (14) of such Act;

(B) DESCRIPTIONS.—A description of—

(i) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by an agency, either directly or through a partnership, to help child or adult victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(ii) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by a public housing agency that helps child and adult victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(iii) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by a public housing agency that helps victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or to enhance victim safety in assisted families; and

(iv) all training and support services offered to or through the public housing agency to provide a basic understanding of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to facilitate implementation of the housing protections provided under this section;”.

(2) in paragraph (12), by striking “the 2009 Act” and inserting “the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b))”.

SEC. 701. FINDINGS. Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2016, over 20% of women in the United States had experienced sexual violence, including rape, intimate partner violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. For millions of individuals in the United States, this violence has had a profound impact on individuals and communities, including the economic, health, and psychological well-being of individuals and families.

(2) The presence of a gun in domestic violence situations increases the risk of homicide for women and children.

(3) Research has shown that guns are responsible for a higher percentage of domestic violence-related deaths compared to other weapons.

(4) Legislation has been enacted to address the issue of firearm ownership in domestic violence situations, including the Domestic Violence and stalking.
(7) Studies find that 60 percent of single women lack economic security and 81 percent of households with single mothers live in economic insecurity. Significant barriers that survivors confront include a lack of housing, food, transportation, and child care. Ninety-two percent of women have experienced domestic violence, and more than 50 percent of women cited domestic violence as the direct cause for homelessness. Survivors are deprived of their autonomy, liberty, and security, and face tremendous threats to their health and safety.

(8) A voluntary force for Disease Control and Prevention report that survivors of severe intimate partner violence lose nearly 6,000,000 days of paid work, which is equivalent to more than 32,000 full-time jobs, nearly 5,000,000 days of household productivity each year. Therefore, women disproportionately need time off to care for their health or to find safety solutions, such as obtaining a restraining order or finding housing, to avoid or prevent further violence.

(9) Annual costs of intimate partner violence are estimated to be more than $8,300,000,000. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the costs of intimate partner violence against women in 1995 exceeded an estimated $5,800,000,000. These costs included nearly $4,000,000,000 in direct costs of medical and mental health care and nearly $1,800,000,000 in the indirect costs of lost productivity. These statistics are generally considered to underestimate because they are associated with the criminal justice system are not included.

(10) Fifty-five percent of senior executives recently surveyed said domestic violence has a harmful effect on their company's productivity, and more than 70 percent said domestic violence negatively affects attendance. Seventy-eight percent of executive resources professionals considered partner violence a workplace issue. However, more than 70 percent of United States workplaces have no formal program or policy that address domestic violence, leaving survivors vulnerable to domestic violence. In fact, only four percent of employers provided training on domestic violence.

(11) Studies indicate that one of the best predictors of whether a survivor will be able to stay away from his or her abuser is the degree of his or her economic independence. However, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking can severely impede a survivor's ability to maintain employment.

(12) Abusers frequently seek to exert financial control over their partners by actively interfering with or destroying their ability to work, including preventing their partners from working, limiting their partners’ access to cash or transportation, and sabotaging their partners’ child care arrangements.

(13) Economic abuse refers to behaviors that control an intimate partner’s ability to acquire, use, and maintain access to, money, credit, ownership of assets, or access to governmental or private financial benefits, including defaulting on joint obligations (such as school loans, credit card debt, or rent). Other forms of such abuse may include preventing someone from attending school, threatening to or actually terminating employment, controlling or withholding access to cash, checking, or credit accounts, and attempting to damage or sabotage the creditworthiness of an intimate partner, including forcing an intimate partner to write bad checks, forcing an intimate partner to default on payments related to household needs, such as housing, or forcing an intimate partner into bankruptcy.

(14) The Emergency Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the amendments made by such Act, ensures that most health plans must cover preventive services, including counseling for domestic violence, at no additional cost. In addition, it prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against patients for preexisting conditions, like domestic violence.

(15) Yet, more can be done to help survivors. Federal law in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act does not explicitly—

(A) authorize survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to take leave from work to seek legal assistance and redress or assistance with safety planning activities;

(B) address the eligibility of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking for unemployment compensation;

(C) provide job protection to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(D) prohibit insurers and employers who self-insure employee benefits from discriminating against survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking those who help them in determining eligibility, rates charged, and standards for payment of claims; or

(E) prohibit insurers from disclosing information about abuse and the location of the survivors through insurance databases and other means.

(16) This Act aims to empower survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to be free from violence, hardship, and control, with an equal right to freedom and safety in the United States.

(17) National resource center on workplace responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence.

Section 41501 of the Violence Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12001) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “and sexual harassment” after “domestic violence” and;

(B) by striking “employers and labor organizations” and inserting “employers, labor organizations, and victim service providers”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “and stalking” and inserting “, stalking, and sexual harassment”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting before the period at the end “or sexual harassment”; in subsection (c)(2)(A), by inserting “or sexual harassment” after “sexual violence”; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024”.

SEC. 702. ENTITLEMENT TO UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF SEXUAL AND OTHER HARASSMENT AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.

(a) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (18), by redesignating paragraph (19) as paragraph (20), and by inserting after paragraph (18) the following new paragraph:

“(20) any person who has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking means—

(I) a person who has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(II) a person whose family or household member has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(III) a person whose family or household member has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”

(2) Section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) SEXUAL OR OTHER HARASSMENT; ETC.—

(1) DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), a voluntary separation of an individual shall be considered to be attributable to such individual being a survivor or victim of sexual or other harassment or a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking if such individual submits such evidence as the State deems sufficient.

(2) SUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall deem sufficient, at a minimum—

(A) evidence of such harassment, violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the form of—

(i) a sworn statement and a form of identification,

(ii) a police or court record, or

(iii) documentation from a victim service provider, an attorney, a police officer, a medical professional, a social worker, an attorney or a law enforcement officer, a member of the clergy, or another professional, and

(B) an attestation that such voluntary separation is attributable to such harassment, violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(A) The term ‘domestic violence’, ‘sexual assault’, and ‘stalking’ victim of sexual or other harassment’, and ‘survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking’ have the meanings given such terms under State law, regulation, or policy.

(B) The term ‘victim service provider’ has the meaning given such term in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(c) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 330(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting a new subsection:

“(9) no person may be denied compensation under such State law solely on the basis of the individual’s claim and submitted evidence.

(2) in subsection (b), by striking the term ‘domestic violence’ and inserting ‘sexual assault, or stalking’; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking the term ‘sexual harassment’ and inserting ‘sexual and other harassment’; and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking ‘harassment’ and inserting ‘sexual or other harassment’; and

(5) in subsection (f), by striking ‘Sexual Harassment’ and inserting ‘Sexual or Other Harassment’.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Section 330(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(b)) is amended by striking ‘‘(1)’’ and inserting ‘‘(1)’’.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 1994.—

(1) DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), a voluntary separation of an individual shall be considered to be attributable to such individual being a survivor or victim of sexual or other harassment or a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking if such individual submits such evidence as the State deems sufficient.

(2) SUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall deem sufficient, at a minimum—

(A) evidence of such harassment, violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the form of—

(i) a sworn statement and a form of identification,

(ii) a police or court record, or

(iii) documentation from a victim service provider, an attorney, a police officer, a medical professional, a social worker, an attorney or a law enforcement officer, a member of the clergy, or another professional, and

(B) an attestation that such voluntary separation is attributable to such harassment, violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(A) The term ‘domestic violence’, ‘sexual assault’, and ‘stalking’ victim of sexual or other harassment’, and ‘survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking’ have the meanings given such terms under State law, regulation, or policy.

(B) The term ‘victim service provider’ has the meaning given such term in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(c) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 303(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting a new paragraph:

“(a) In General.—A certification by the chief executive officer of the State that the State has established and is enforcing standards and procedures for—

(i) ensure that applicants for assistance under the State program funded under this part...
and individuals inquiring about such assistance are adequately notified of—

"(1) the provisions of section 3304(a)(19) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

"(2) any other law, rule, or policy; and

(iii) the term 'survivor of domestic violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking'; and

(iv) ensure that the training required under this paragraph (1)(B) is provided through a training program operated by an eligible entity.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

(i) the terms 'domestic violence', 'sexual assault', and 'stalking' have the meanings given such terms in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; and

(ii) the term 'sexual and other harassment' has the meaning given such term under State law, regulation, or policy; and

(iii) the term 'survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking' means an entity—

(A) that—

(i) is a State or tribal domestic violence coalition or sexual assault coalition;

(ii) a State or local victim service provider with recognized expertise in the dynamics of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking whose primary mission is to provide services to survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including a rape crisis center or domestic violence or sexual assault coalition; or

(iii) an organization with demonstrated expertise in State or county welfare laws and implementation of such laws and experience with dissemination, but only if such organization will provide the required training in partnership with the entity described in clause (i) or (ii); and

(B) that—

(i) has demonstrated expertise in the dynamics of both domestic violence and sexual assault, as well as at least one area of expertise in sexual violence and sexual assault coalition; or

(ii) will provide the required training in partnership with an entity described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A) to apply with the dual domestic violence and sexual assault expertise requirement under clause (i).

(2) APPLICATION OF VICTIM PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS.—(A) APPLICABILITY.—A grant under this subsection shall require the Secretary to—

(i) develop and disseminate a model training curriculum that includes the use of the internet to disseminate information on such laws and implementation, but only if such organization will provide the required training in partnership with the entity described in clause (i) or (ii); and

(ii) each 3 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the grant program established under this subsection.

(B) REPORTS AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the dissemination to the public of each report submitted under subparagraph (A). Such procedures shall include the use of the internet to disseminate such reports.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(i) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(B) THREE-YEAR AVAILABILITY OF GRANT FUND.—A grant under this subsection shall return to the Secretary any unused portion of such grant not later than 3 years after the date the grant was awarded, together with any earnings on such unused portion.

(4) AMOUNTS RETURNED.—Any amounts returned pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(5) EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR STATE LAW AMENDMENT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendment made by subsection (c) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR STATE LAW AMENDMENT.—In the case of a State plan under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State action (including legislation, regulation, or other administrative action) in order to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendment made by subsection (c), the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such amendment on the basis of its failure to meet these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'domestic violence', 'sexual assault', 'stalking', 'survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking', and 'victim service provider' have the meanings given such terms in section 3308(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 704. STUDY AND REPORTS ON BARRIERS TO SURVIVORS' ECONOMIC SECURITY ACCESS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall conduct a study on the barriers that survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking throughout the United States experience in maintaining economic security as a result of issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall submit a report to Congress on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) CONTENTS.—The study and reports under this section shall include—

(1) an identification of geographic areas in which State laws, regulations, and practices have a
strong impact on the ability of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to exercise any rights under this Act, including family members and excluding the abuser; and

(b) other components of economic security;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (35) the following:

"(36) any hearing officer that empowers individuals as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2))."

(b) BASIS.—The term includes a person employed as described in subparagraph (A) on a full- or part-time basis during a specified time period, in a work assignment as a condition of receipt of Federal or State income-based public assistance.

(2) EMPLOYER.—The term "employer" includes—

"(i) any person engaged in commerce or in any activity affecting commerce; and

"(ii) any entity subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal, State, Tribal, or municipal law; and

"(III) any other person similarly situated to a household member of that person.

(c) STUDY ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a study on the status of workplace responses to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking while employed, in each State and nationally, to improve the access of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to supportive resources and economic security.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The Comptroller General is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

TITLES VIII—HOMICIDE REDUCTION INITIATIVES

SEC. 801. PROHIBITING PERSONS CONVICTED OF MISDEMEANOR CRIMES AGAINST DATING OR DOMESTIC PARTNERS FROM OBTAINING OR MAINTAINING A PROTECTIVE ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person who has been convicted of an offense that involves a battery, assault, or similar offense described in section 11361 of title 18, United States Code, shall be granted a protective order under section 1621 of title 18, United States Code, or the comparable State law that authorizes the issuance of such orders.

(b) EXEMPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if—

"(1) the person was represented by counsel in the case, or knowingly and intelligently waived the right to have the case tried by a jury, if guilty plea or otherwise.

SEC. 802. STUDY ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS.

The Attorney General shall conduct a study of the effectiveness of protective orders to protect dating or domestic partners from crimes of violence, sexual assault, or stalking as defined in subsection (a).

SEC. 803. OBLIGATIONS ON PROTECTIVE ORDER FACILITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall take appropriate actions, including regulations, to facilitate the issuance of protective orders under State law.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The Comptroller General is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.
“(C) A person shall not be considered to have been convicted of such an offense for purposes of this chapter if the conviction has been expunged or set aside, or is an offense for which the person has been pardoned or has had civil rights restored (if the law of the applicable jurisdiction provides for the loss of civil rights under such an offense) unless the pardon, expungement, or restoration of civil rights expressly provides that the person may not ship, transport, possess, or receive firearms.”

SEC. 902. PROHIBITING STALKERS AND INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO COURT ORDER FROM POSSESSENG A FIREARM.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—
(1) in subsection (d)—
(A) in paragraph (8), by striking “that restrains such person” and all that follows, and inserting “described in subsection (g)(6);”;
(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “;”;
(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:
“(10) who has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of stalking;”;
and
(2) in subsection (g)—
(A) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:
“(8) who is subject to a court order—
“(A) that was issued—
“(i) after a hearing of which such person received actual notice, and at which such person had an opportunity to participate; or
“(ii) in the case of an ex parte order, relative to which notice and opportunity to be heard are provided—
“(I) within the time required by State, tribal, or territorial law; and
“(II) that restrains such person from—
“(i) engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person proscribed by the criminal law of a State, territory, or Indian tribe; or
“(ii) intimidating or dissuading a witness from testifying in court; and
“(C) that—
“(i) includes a finding that such person represents a credible threat to the physical safety of such individual described in subparagraph (B); or
“(ii) by its terms explicitly prohibits the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against such individual described in subparagraph (B) that would reasonably be expected to cause bodily injury;”;
(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “;”;
and
(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:
“(10) who has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of stalking.”

TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

SEC. 901. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) American Indians and Alaska Natives are 2.5 times as likely to experience violent crimes—and at least 2 times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault crimes—compared to all other races.

(2) More than 4 in 5 American Indian and Alaska Native women, or 84.5 percent, have experienced violence in their lifetime.

(3) The vast majority of Native victims—96% of women and 89% of male victims—report being victims of intimate partner violence.

(4) Native victims of sexual violence are three times as likely to have experienced sexual violence by an interracial perpetrator as non-Hispanic White victims, and at least 2 times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault crimes—compared to all other races.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph, the terms ‘coercion’ and ‘commercial sex act’ have the meanings given in the terms section 1251(e) of title 18, United States Code.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out the provisions of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated $3,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024, to remain available until expended, for the purposes of enhancing the ability of tribal government officials to increase resources and information into, and obtain information from, Federal criminal information databases, as authorized by this section.”

SEC. 902. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to a 2010 Government Accountability Office report, United States Attorneys are mandated to report to the Department of Justice reports that American Indian and Alaska Native victims between 10 and 24 years of age are the fifth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age.

(2) More than 4 in 5 American Indian and Alaska Native women suffer the vast majority of reported rape victims. And among other Indian Tribes, Alaska Native women suffer over-representation in the domestic violence victimization, patronizing, or soliciting by any means conduct—

“(i) recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, providing, obtaining, advertising, maintaining, patronizing, or soliciting by any means conduct—

(2) in subsection (a)(6), in the heading, by striking “SPECIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION” and inserting “SPECIAL TRIBAL CRIMINAL JURISDICTION”;

(3) by striking ‘special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction’ each place such term appears and inserting ‘special tribal criminal jurisdiction’;

(4) in subsection (a)—

(A) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) STALKING.—The term ‘stalking’ means engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person proscribed by the criminal law of the Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs that would cause a reasonable person to—

“(A) fear for the person’s safety or the safety of others; or
“(B) suffer substantial emotional distress.”;

(B) by redesigning paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (10) and (11);

(C) by inserting before paragraph (10) (as redesignated) the following:

“(8) SEX TRAFFICKING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘sex trafficking’ means conduct—

“(I) consisting of—

“(i) recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, providing, obtaining, advertising, maintaining, patronizing, or soliciting by any means conduct—

“(II) benefiting, financially or by receiving anything of value, from participation in a venture that has engaged in an act described in subclause (I); and

“(iv) carried out with the knowledge, or, except when the act constituting the violation of clause (i) is advertising, in reckless disregard of the fact, that—

“(I) means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion, or any combination of such means will be used to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act; or

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph, the terms ‘coercion’ and ‘commercial sex act’ have the meanings given the terms in section 1251(e) of title 18, United States Code.

“(9) SEXUAL VIOLENCE.—The term ‘sexual violence’ means any nonconsensual sexual act or
SEC. 2003. DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint one Director for the Office on Violence Against Women (in this title referred to as the ‘Director’) to be responsible, under the general authority of the Attorney General, the administration, coordination, and implementation of the programs and activities of the Office.

(b) OTHER EMPLOYMENT.—The Director shall not—

(1) engage in any employment other than that of serving as Director; or

(2) hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization or entity with which the Office makes any contract or other agreement under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–386), 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 2013 (Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 54), or the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

(c) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at a rate payable under level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 2004. DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—

The Director shall have the following duties:

(1) Maintaining liaison with the judicial branches of the Federal and State Governments on matters relating to violence against women;

(2) Providing information to the President, the Congress, the judiciary, State, local, and tribal governments, and the general public on matters relating to violence against women;

(3) Serving, at the request of the Attorney General, as the representative of the Department of Justice on domestic task forces, commissions, or agreements addressing policy or issues relating to violence against women;

(4) Serving, at the request of the President, acting through the Attorney General, as the representative of the United States Government on human rights and economic justice matters related to violence against women in international fora, including, but not limited to, the United Nations.


(A) the development of policy, protocols, and guidelines;

(B) the development and management of grant programs and other programs, and the provision of technical assistance under such programs; and

(C) the awarding and termination of grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts.

(6) Providing technical assistance, coordination, and support to—

(A) other components of the Department of Justice, in efforts to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to violence against women;
women, including the litigation of civil and criminal actions relating to enforcing such laws; “(B) other Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies, in efforts to develop policies, provide technical assistance, synchronize federal definitions and protocols, and improve coordination among agencies carrying out efforts to eliminate violence against women, including Indian or indigenous women; and “(C) grantees, in efforts to combat violence against women and to provide support and assistance to victims of such violence.”

(5) Establishing such other powers and functions as may be vested in the Director pursuant to this subsection or by delegation of the Attorney General.”

(6) Establishing such rules, regulations, guidelines, and procedures as are necessary to carry out any function of the Office.”.

(7) The term ‘vulnerable person’ means an individual who—

1. Is under 21 years of age or over 60 years of age;
2. Is pregnant;
3. Identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex;
4. Has a serious mental or physical illness or disability;
5. Is victim or witness of a crime;
6. Is a victim of domestic violence;
7. Is in Federal or State court;
8. Is post-natal.

SEC. 1101. IMPROVING THE TREATMENT OF PRIMARY CARETAKER PARENTS AND OTHER INDIVIDUALS IN FEDERAL PRISONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Ramona Brant Improvement of Conditions for Women in Federal Custody Act.”

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall implement this section and the amendments made by this section.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 1102. PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF WOMEN.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Stop Infant Mortality And Recidivism Reduction Act” or the “SIMARRA Act.”

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (in this section referred to as the “Director”) shall establish a pilot program in this section referred to as the “Program” that provides a roadmap to address the pre- and post-natal needs of Federal pregnant offenders, participants a report on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section.
(6) assist the Department of Justice to address the underlying cost structure of the Federal prison system and ensure that the Department can continue to run prison nurseries safely and securely without compromising the scope or quality of the Department’s critical health, safety and law enforcement missions.

(d) DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.—(I) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out this section in consultation with—

(A) licensed and board-certified gynecologist or obstetrician;

(B) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts;

(C) the Director of the Office of Probation and Pretrial Services;

(D) the Director of the National Institute of Justice; and

(E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(2) DUTIES.—The Director shall, in accordance with paragraph (2),—

(A) develop an offender risk and needs assessment system particular to the health and sensitivities of Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers in accordance with this subsection;

(B) develop recommendations regarding recidivism reduction programs and productive activities in accordance with the system developed under subparagraph (A) and the recommendations developed under subparagraph (B), using the research conducted under paragraph (3); and

(C) conduct ongoing research and data analysis on—

(i) the best practices relating to the use of offender risk and needs assessment tools particular to the health and sensitivities of Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers and the level to which they rely on dynamism, risk factors that could be addressed and changed over time, and on measures of risk of recidivism, individual needs, and responsiveness to recidivism reduction programs;

(ii) the most effective and efficient uses of such tools in conjunction with recidivism reduction programs, productive activities, incentives, and rewards; and

(iii) which recidivism reduction programs are the most effective—

(I) for Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers classified at different recidivism risk levels; and

(II) for addressing the specific needs of Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers;

(D) review periodically, based on the best available statistical and empirical evidence, the eligibility criteria and the criteria for determining the date of the infan’s term of imprisonment terminations;

(E) the date the infant fails to meet any medical criteria established by the Director or the Director’s designee along with a collective determination of the persons listed in subsection (d)(1); or

(F) 30 months.

(2) INMATE REQUIREMENTS.—For the duration of an inmate’s participation in the Program, the inmate shall—

(A) take substantive steps towards acting in the role of a parent or guardian to any child of that inmate;

(B) participate in any educational or counseling opportunities established by the Director, including topics such as child development, parenting skills, domestic violence, vocational training, or substance abuse;

(C) abide by any court decision regarding the legal or physical custody of the child;

(D) transfer to the Federal Bureau of Prisons any child support payments for the infant of the participating inmate from any person or governmental entity; and

(E) specify a person who has agreed to take at least temporary custody of the child if the inmate’s participation in the Program terminates before the inmate’s release.

(g) CONTINUITY OF CARE.—The Director shall take appropriate steps to prevent the separation or disruption of either an inmate’s or infant’s health and bonding-based well-being due to termination of the Program.

(h) REPORT.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and once each year thereafter for 5 years, the Director shall submit a report to the Congress with regards to progress in implementing the Program.

(2) F INAL REPORT .—Not later than 6 months after the termination of the Program, the Director shall issue a final report to the Congress that contains a detailed statement of the Director’s findings and conclusions, including recommendations for legislation, administrative actions, and regulations the Director considers appropriate.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

TITLE XII—LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY

SEC. 1201. NOTIFICATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF PROHIBITED PURCHASE OR ATTEMPTED PURCHASE OF FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) NOTIFICATION.—In order to improve the enforcement and prosecution of the National Instant Criminal Background Check System pursuant to the request of a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed distributor (as such terms are defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code), which background check determines that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(8), (g)(9), or (g)(10) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, and such determination is made after 3 business days have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system and a firearm has been transferred to that person, the System shall notify the law enforcement agencies described in subsection (b).

(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—The law enforcement agencies described in this subsection are the law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction over the location of the person for which the background check was conducted, as follows:

(1) The field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(2) The local law enforcement agency.

(3) The State law enforcement agency.

(4) The Tribal law enforcement agency.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 107 the following:

“Sec. 108. Notification to law enforcement agencies of prohibited purchase of a firearm.”

SEC. 1202. REPORTING OF BACKGROUND CHECK DENIALS TO STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL AUTHORITIES

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 925B the following:

“§ 925B. Reporting of background check denials to State, local, and tribal authorities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) provides a notice pursuant to section 922(t) of this title that the receipt of a firearm by a person with a pending background check pursuant to section 922(t) of this title or State law, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with subsection (b) of this section—

(1) report to the law enforcement authorities of the State where the person sought to acquire the firearm and, if different, the law enforcement authorities of the State of residence of the person—

(A) that the notice was provided;

(B) the specific provision of law that would have been violated;

(C) the date and time the notice was provided;

(D) the location where the firearm was sought to be acquired; and

(E) the identity of the person; and

(2) report the incident to local or tribal law enforcement authorities and, where practicable, State, tribal, local prosecutors, in the jurisdiction where the firearm was sought and in the jurisdiction where the person resides.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR REPORT.—A report is made in accordance with this subsection if the recipient made within 24 hours after the provision of the notice described in subsection (a), except that the making of the report may be delayed for so long as is necessary to avoid compromising an ongoing investigation;

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to require a report with respect to a person to be made to the same State authorities that originally issued the notice with respect to the person.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925A the following:

“925B. Reporting of background check denials to State, local, and tribal authorities

SEC. 1203. SPECIAL ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS AND CROSS-DEPUTIZED ATTORNEYS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 925B the following:

“§ 925C. Special assistant U.S. attorneys and cross-deputized attorneys

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to improve the enforcement of paragraphs (8), (9), and (10) of section 922(g), the Attorney General may—

(1) appoint, in accordance with section 433 of title 28, qualified State, tribal, and local law enforcement authorities working for the United States government to serve as special assistant United States attorneys for the
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purpose of prosecuting violations of such paragraphs;
“(2) deputize State, tribal, and local law enforcement officers for the purpose of enhancing the capacity of the agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives in responding to and investigating violations of such paragraphs; and
“(3) to receive and expedite requests for assistance from State, tribal, territorial and local law enforcement agencies responding to intimate partner violence cases where the agencies have probable cause to believe that the offenders may be in violation of such paragraphs, points of contact within—
“(A) each Field Division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; and
“(B) each District Office of the United States Attorneys.
“(b) IMPROVE INTIMATE PARTNER AND PUBLIC SAFETY.—The Attorney General shall—
“(1) identify no less than 75 jurisdictions among States, territories and tribes where there are high rates of firearms violence and threats of firearms violence against intimate partners and other persons protected under paragraphs (8), (9), and (10) of section 922(p) and where local authorities lack the resources to address such violence; and
“(2) make such appointments as described in subsection (a) in jurisdictions where enhanced enforcement of such paragraphs is necessary to reduce firearms homicide and injury rates.
“(c) QUALIFIED DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified’ means, with respect to which the attorney is a licensed attorney in good standing with any relevant licensing authority.”;
“CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of this title referred to as the ‘Sexual Assault Services Program’ is amended by striking ‘2020 through 2024’."

“TITLE XIII—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

SEC. 1301. SHORT TITLE. This title may be cited as the ‘Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act of 2019’.

SEC. 1302. PROHIBITION ON ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTS WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2243 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—
“(1) by inserting at the end the following:
“(f) attend and participate in training programs on law enforcement consent.

“(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;
“(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:
“(c) OF AN INDIVIDUAL BY ANY PERSON ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.—
“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever, acting under color of law, knowingly engages in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any law enforcement officer; and
“(2) prohibits a person charged with an offense described in paragraph (1) from asserting the consent of the other individual as a defense.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A State that receives a grant under this section submits the Attorney General, on an annual basis, information on—
“(1) the number of reports made to law enforcement agencies in that State regarding persons engaging in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any law enforcement officer; and
“(2) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported.

(c) CEREMONIAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of this title referred to as the ‘Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 2014 (34 U.S.C. 20334(a)) is amended by striking ‘2014 through 2018’ and inserting ‘2020 through 2024’."

“TITLE XIV—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 1401. NATIONWIDE AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REDUCTION.


“SEC. 1402. FEDERAL VICTIM ASSISTANTS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 42114 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) is amended to read as follows:
“SEC. 42114. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL VICTIM SUPPORT PROGRAMS.
“ TITLE XV—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 1501. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report containing—
“(1) the information required to be reported to the Attorney General under section 3(b); and
“(2) information on—
“(A) the number of reports made, during the previous year, to Federal law enforcement agencies regarding persons engaging in a sexual act under color of law; and
“(B) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported.

(b) REPORT BY GAO.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on any violations of section 2244(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 2, contained during the 1-year period covered by the report.

“SEC. 1502. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term ‘sexual act’ has the meaning given the term in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code.

“TITLE XVI—RURAL MATTERS

SEC. 1601. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL VICTIM SUPPORT PROGRAMS.

Section 42114 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) is amended to read as follows:
“SEC. 42114. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL VICTIM SUPPORT PROGRAMS.
“ TITLE XVII—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 1701. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM PROGRAM GRANTS.

Section 394(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 20334(d)) is amended by striking ‘2015 through 2019’ and inserting ‘2020 through 2024’."

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116–32. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 25, after line 13, insert the following:

(4) COMMON LANGUAGES.—The Secretary of Labor shall ensure that the information disseminated to survivors under paragraph (2) is made available in commonly encountered languages.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1585, the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

This amendment modestly modifies the bill to ensure that the materials distributed to victims and survivors are available in commonly encountered languages.

There are approximately 26 million Americans whose primary language is not English. One in five American families speak another language at home. In my home State of New York, that number is one in three. Languages spoken throughout the country include Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and French, just to name a few.

H.R. 1585 provides that the Secretary of Labor may disseminate information on the resources and rights available to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. It is important that all survivors and all victims, regardless of the language they primarily speak or read, have access to such critical information.

This amendment will not adversely impact Federal spending. In fact, several agencies, including the Department of Labor, have similar obligations to provide materials and notices in commonly encountered languages, and guidance and resources are available on how to do so consistent with existing provisions in other areas of law.

Let me also briefly express my support for this important and significant legislation.

Since the Violence Against Women Act was first enacted 30 years ago, it has helped to address the crisis of domestic and sexual violence through vital grant programs and improved law enforcement response to sexual crimes.

It has also elevated an important national conversation about this issue, drawing attention to its prevalence, reducing stigma, and encouraging survivors to get support.

I want to thank the distinguished Chair of the Small Business Committee, JERRY NADLER, for his tremendous leadership, as well as my friend, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, for her leadership in ushering forward H.R. 1585.

I am proud today that we are doing our part in the United States House of Representatives to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act and urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my friend from New York. I have no problem with his amendment. It is already a current, existing order, introduced by President Clinton, and it is also under DOJ guidance. This is currently happening, and I think his wanting to continue this, to put it in this bill, I would have no problem with.

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my colleague, the ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee, for his support.

This is a nation of immigrants. We are a gorgeous mosaic of people from all across the world. Out of many, we are one. That is what makes America such a phenomenal country.

We just want to make sure that, with respect to this issue of sexual and domestic violence, every American who is a victim has an opportunity to get access to the resources that will be put into law.

I thank my colleagues for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

The Acting CHAIR. It is in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.
Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and I thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I support this amendment, which would require the preparation of a GAO report on the return on investment for legal assistance grants for victims.

Studies show that the efficiency of the legal system improves when victims receive assistance by legal professionals. This amendment would provide a vehicle to help us assess the efficacy and ramifications of providing legal assistance for victims, particularly in the areas of housing, medical needs, and employment social welfare programs.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 156, insert after line 20 (and conform the table of contents accordingly).

SEC. 1103. RESEARCH AND REPORT ON WOMEN IN FEDERAL INCARCERATION.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and thereafter, every other year, the National Institutes of Justice, in consultation with the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Bureau of Prisons (including the Women and Special Population Branch) shall prepare a report on the status of women in federal incarceration. Depend-
more likely to become homeless. Data from the Prison Policy Initiative show that formerly incarcerated women face homelessness at much higher rates than men. For women of color, the rate of homelessness only increases. Further, many shelters are reluctant to accept formerly incarcerated women. When developing reentry plans and services, the Department of Justice officials are required to address gender-responsive collaborative services; housing; previous exposure to and risk for domestic and sexual violence; and the need for parenting classes, securing childcare assistance, and assistance securing jobs that afford flexibility.

Finally, the establishment of a national standard on domestic and sexual violence prevention will ensure that the government sets the bar for protecting vulnerable women from abuse. Affirmatively including incarcerated women in the reauthorization of VAWA will enable the government to treat these women with dignity and respect and ensure we are doing all we can to prevent future victims of violence.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. LAWRENCE). Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, again, I am not opposed to the amendment. I appreciate some of the comments by the gentlewoman from Texas. Several of these were actually in the FIRST STEP Act, which we passed last year, on criminal justice reform. I am glad to see that they are still being discussed.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I support this amendment, which would direct the preparation of a report on the status of women in Federal incarceration. The amendment would also urge attorney General to work on a model of gender-responsive transition for incarcerated women, including the development of a national standard on prevention with respect to domestic and sexual violence.

According to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, very little current data exists on the status of incarcerated women in Federal custody. This amendment will allow us to better respond to the needs of incarcerated women, and it will provide us with vital, important data, for oversight purposes.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.
shelters like Turning Point to better serve people in need.

Madam Chair, I am proud to stand with survivors.

Ms. DEAN. Madam Chair, I thank the author of this important bill, Representative Bass, and I thank the tireless advocates who have worked to bring us to this important day.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to please support this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, line 17, strike “and” at the end.

Page 34, line 3, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “; and.”

Page 34, after line 3, insert the following:

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall submit to Congress, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on the activities funded by grants awarded under this section and best practices relating to rape prevention and education.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Madam Chair, rape is a crisis in this country. In the United States, one in five women will be raped in their lifetime—one in five. Men can be rape victims, too. As a matter of fact, 1 in 71 men will be raped.

The LGBTQ community suffers from even higher rates of sexual violence and rape. Forty-six percent of bisexual women have been raped, and 47 percent of transgender individuals have been assaulted at some point in their lives. These statistics are more severe for people of color in the LGBTQ community. What is worse is that many LGBTQ victims are denied services simply because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

Whether we know it or not, everyone in this room knows a rape survivor. Maybe she or he is the barista who makes your morning coffee.

May she or he be a security officer who smiles at you on your way to work. Maybe he or she is your co-worker, your sibling, your partner, or your child. Many people don’t realize that they know a rape survivor.

Too often, rape isn’t reported because victims fear the consequences. Often survivors fear that no one will believe them or that they will be blamed or stigmatized. In the MeToo era, the pervasiveness of sexual assault has come to the forefront. However, the public is still grappling with our understanding of rape, the myth versus reality.

Many people still think that rape is only an act committed by a stranger in a dark alley. Instances like this do happen. In 2016, Brock Turner raped an unconscious young woman behind a dumpster. His punishment? Three months of probation. The sentencing alone reflects the failure to understand rape and a tendency to blame the victim.

Our comprehension of rape has changed dramatically in the past decade. Instances of rape being perpetrated by strangers do happen, but eight out of ten rape survivors knew their rapist. The majority of female survivors were raped by an intimate partner.

While there is plenty of data on VAWA grants administered by the Office of Violence Against Women, an analysis by the Congressional Research Service found that there is insufficient information on RPE formula grants run by the CDC.

To prevent rape and create innovative trauma-informed policies and programs, we need to improve our understanding of which initiatives are effective. My amendment will bridge this information gap and help better inform our rape prevention efforts. My amendment requires the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide a report to Congress on the activity of grant awardees funded through the Rape Prevention and Education Grant Program as well as on emerging best practices relating to rape prevention and education.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am in full support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSONLEE), and Chairman NADLER for introducing H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, and I urge its swift passage.

Lastly, Madam Chair, I would ask that this amendment be made in order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I call up amendment No. 6 to H.R. 1585.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 170, line 18, strike “Section 2(3)” and insert “Section 2”.

Page 170, line 19, strike “by” and insert “—”.

Page 170, strike lines 20 through 21, and insert the following:

(1) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) information on best practices for state and local governments to reduce the backlog of DNA evidence”; and

(2) in subsection (j), by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, the Violence Against Women Act authorizes the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program through 2024. This amendment simply requires State and local governments that are recipients of the grant program to include information in their reports to the Attorney General on best practices for reducing the backlog of DNA evidence.

The grant program was originally authorized under the Justice for All Act of 2004 to provide grants to State and local governments for the collection and analysis of forensic samples and to ensure the timely processing of DNA evidence by law enforcement.

Congress reauthorized the program several times, most recently providing $151 million for fiscal year 2019.

Despite these efforts, the backlog of untested DNA evidence is still high. According to reporting from The Texas Tribune, a paper back in the State of Texas, it costs between $500 and $2,000 to test a kit, and there are approximately 3,500 untested kits in Texas.
alone. We must continue working to reduce this backlog so that we can bring justice to the victims of assault.

State and local grant recipients are required to submit a report to the Attorney General which is then summarized for Congress. My amendment adds the best practices for reducing the backlog to the report required by grant recipients in order to better understand the needs of entities directly involved in collecting and processing DNA evidence.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I support this amendment to improve the report required for States and localities that receive funding under the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program.

As we all know, because of the increased awareness of the potential for DNA evidence to help solve crimes, the demand for DNA testing continues to grow nationwide. Crime laboratories now process more DNA than ever before. In recognition of this, H.R. 1385 reauthorizes the Debbie Smith Act, which I helped to introduce.

This amendment directs States and localities to report information to the Attorney General on best practices for reducing the backlog of DNA evidence. The emphasis on best practices is a win-win, as it will help ensure that the backlog is cleared in as expeditious and efficient a manner as possible.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116-32. Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment on the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 39, after line 6, insert the following: 

"(12) To train campus personnel in how to search on the neurobiology of trauma. To the extent practicable, campus personnel shall allow the reported victim to participate in a recorded interview and to receive a copy of the recorded interview."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1385, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2019. This legislation is the result of the tireless work of advocates, Chairman NADLER, of the bill’s original sponsor, my colleague from California, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, and most especially, the women who survived domestic violence and sexual assault and bravely shared their stories. Without their courage, this legislation would not be on the floor today.

I also appreciate the title in this bill which helps victims of domestic violence. Women who are in dangerous situations at home need to be able to quickly transfer to alternative housing, and that is precisely what Title 6 of this bill aims to do. I understand that there are some stakeholders who have raised some questions about how the implementation of this title would work, and I will continue to work with them as this bill moves through the Senate.

Though the Violence Against Women Act has led to widespread change in how our Nation understands and responds to domestic violence, sexual assault, and sexual harassment, much work remains to be done.

Twenty-five years after the original Violence Against Women Act passed in 1994, women who come forward are still too often disregarded, discredited, and humiliated, all because those in power know that if the stories of the trauma and abuse suffered by women are true, then everything—including their power—would need to change. My amendment is another step toward ensuring that women who speak out and refuse to be silenced are supported and heard.

Section 303 of H.R. 1385 includes the grant program that provides funds to higher education institutions to combat violent crimes on campuses, including especially, domestic and sexual violence. My amendment would create a new purpose area for section 303 grants, which allows funding to be used by higher education institutions to train employees on how to conduct victim-centered, trauma-informed interviews with the students who report being a victim of sexual assault, domestic violence, stalking, or harassment. Individuals trained to communicate in a manner which does not blame or judge the survivor for the crimes he or she reports.

My amendment stipulates that if a student requests to have a record of their conversations with college employees and administrators, then schools which accept funding for this purpose area must offer a recorded interview. Given the lengthy record of colleges suppressing sexual or domestic violence on campus, recorded interviews can be incredibly important to survivors.

Only one in five female college students report their sexual assault, and many cite a fear of retaliation and not being believed as the primary reasons they stayed silent. Students who come forward and report an assault or other crime should never be made to feel that they are at fault, that they will be punished, or that they should feel shame. College administrators should never use their ignorance as to how trauma affects young women—which can often make it difficult for a victim to recall exactly what happened and when—as a reason to discount their report.

My amendment will help ensure that never happens by facilitating the training necessary for colleges to better support students as they navigate what is likely to be one of the most traumatic moments in their lives.

So, Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support training to promote more effective conversations between students and college employees and vote in the affirmative for my amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I do claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

The amendment is the result of the tireless work of advocates, Chairman NADLER, of the bill’s original sponsor, my colleague from California, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, and my colleagues in both parties. My amendment will help ensure that the Violence Against Women Act is extended to support campuses communities.

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Chair, I understand the gentlewoman’s concern here, and I appreciate that concern.

As a former police officer, I am concerned that the amendment here is concerning the trend of handling responsibilities on campus and giving those—students and college employees and...
Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I rise to continue to try and educate my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle about the trauma that is faced by victims of sexual assault, and I am hopeful that I will agree with me. Join in this amendment, and support this amendment so that we can create the opportunity to get these conversations going so that, indeed, these women can be supported and understood, perhaps in ways this has never happened before.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) who is the chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I support this amendment which expands the types of grants that can be funded to combat violent crimes on college campuses.

Evidence-based research on the neurobiology of trauma has shown the effectiveness of using victim-centered, trauma-informed interview techniques when investigating allegations of sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking.

This amendment seeks to ensure that campus personnel who investigate these types of cases are trained in up-to-date, research-based methods for interviewing victims and handling cases in a sensitive manner.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman’s concern; but, also, I do understand this issue, as someone who has been in the legal community, been a counselor, also a chaplain in the Air Force who has had to deal with sexual assault issues, and also served on the local board of Rape Response.

I do get these issues. I don’t disagree with the gentlewoman that there are concerns here, that we do need to be sensitive and we do need to do this.

My concern lies simply in the fact that we need to put this funding and these resources not to a bifurcated process, but we also need to continue to make sure that this goes to law enforcement, because someone who mis-treats and someone who is a victim of sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking—it is a crime, and it needs to be treated as such.

We need to make sure our law enforcement personnel can have better resources and better access so that the victims can be taken care of and the perpetrators can be locked up. That is my concern here, not that I don’t understand what the victims may be going through.

Although I have never personally been a victim, I have counseled on many occasions people who have been victims. So, I would just caution, so we understand the differences in our opinions, why someone may hold an opinion. And mine was simply from a law enforcement perspective, not that I was ignoring or ambivalent toward the feelings of those who have been victimized.

Madam Chair, I would just oppose this for those reasons and nothing more, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 135, strike lines 8 through 15, and insert the following:

‘‘(e) INDIAN COUNTRY DEFINED.—For purposes of the pilot project described in subsection (f)(5), the definition of ‘Indian country’ shall include—

‘‘(1) Alaska Native-owned Townsites, Allotments, and former reservation lands acquired in fee by Alaska Native Village Corporations pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 33) and other lands transferred in fee to Native villages, and

‘‘(2) all lands within any Alaska Native village with a population that is at least 75 percent Alaska Native. ’’

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, my amendment would improve this bill’s application to remote Alaska Native villages.

Women in Alaska Native villages suffer the very highest sexual abuse rates in the Nation.

Alaska Native women are overrepresented in the domestic violence survivor population by 250 percent. Alaska Natives comprise about 19 percent of the State’s population, yet are 47 percent of the reported rape survivors.

Yet, Native villages currently lack any efficient tools to criminally prosecute the offenders. The remoteness and isolation of the Native villages, most of which are not connected to the road system and only accessible by air, makes it difficult to prevent violence and care for the survivors.

Almost all of these villages lack any form of law enforcement, and it can take days for authorities to fly to the villages and respond to an incident, particularly when weather conditions are bad.

My amendment will open the door to a meaningful pilot project to help overcome these limitations by crafting an Alaska solution for a unique Alaska problem.

Currently, the bill would create an Alaska Native jurisdiction pilot program for five villages, but only covers Native lands that are largely outside the villages. These lands are not where people live and, therefore, not where crimes are also happening.

My amendment would add jurisdiction for all lands inside Alaska Native villages to cover where the majority of violence actually occurs.

Villages need to be empowered to develop local solutions to these problems.

My amendment is supported by the National Congress of American Indians, Alaska Federation of Natives, the Tanana Chiefs Conference, and Bristol Bay Native Corporation.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment for Alaska, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I support this amendment because it improves and enhances the special Tribal criminal jurisdiction pilot project created by VAWA in 2013 specifically to benefit Alaska Natives.

For over 5 years, the special Tribal criminal jurisdiction has given qualifying Tribes across the United States the authority to prosecute non-Tribal members for certain offenses.

This year’s reauthorization of VAWA would extend that jurisdiction to more crimes, including dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Tribes across the country have been effectively exercising their authority under VAWA and keeping their communities safe. This amendment would ensure that Alaska Native villages that qualify are also able to exercise this type of jurisdiction. It is only fair that they be allowed to do so.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 52, line 13, strike “means a transfer” and insert “means an emergency transfer under subsection (e) from a unit of a covered housing provider.”

Page 52, line 16, insert “that can transfer to any unit of the same covered housing provider” before the period at the end.

Page 52, line 18, strike “means a transfer” and insert “means an emergency transfer under subsection (e) from a unit of a covered housing provider.”

Page 59, strike lines 17 through 21 and insert the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A tenant who is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking may apply for an emergency transfer to another available and safe dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program. The covered housing provider shall grant such application.”

Page 61, beginning on line 4, strike “internal emergency transfer” and insert “internal transfer.”

Page 61, beginning on line 8, strike “internal emergency transfer” and insert “internal transfer.”

Page 61, line 15, strike “external emergency transfer” and insert “external transfers.”

Page 62, beginning on line 1, strike “internal emergency transfer” and insert “internal transfer.”

Page 62, line 3, strike “external emergency transfer” and insert “external transfer.”

Page 62, line 5, strike “internal emergency transfer” and insert “internal transfer.”

Page 62, line 6, strike “external emergency transfer” and insert “external transfer.”

Page 62, line 8, strike “emergency”. 

Page 62, line 11, strike “emergency”. 

Page 63, line 9, strike “emergency”. 

Page 63, line 10, strike “emergency”. 

Page 63, line 18, strike “emergency”. 

Page 64, line 19, strike “subsection” and insert “section.”

Page 73, line 7, strike “subsection” and insert “section.”

Page 80, line 9, strike “external emergency transfer” and insert “external transfer.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Rule 43, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment offered to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

My amendment will ensure that a tenant who is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking is able to apply for an emergency transfer to another available and safe dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program. The covered housing provider shall grant such application.

This amendment has also been scored by the Congressional Budget Office to have no effect on direct spending or revenues.

In my State of Texas and my city of Dallas, we are, unfortunately, deeply familiar with the tragedies involved in domestic violence. Families have been broken apart and people have lost their lives to the scourge of domestic violence.

We have the duty to do more to protect these people. Therefore, it is necessary for us to make clear the distinction in law, the difference between internal and external transfers. Though it may sound trivial, this amendment is crucial to providing victims of domestic violence a sense of security, safety, and dignity.

As representatives of Americans from all corners of our country, we know that this problem is not unique to any one part of our Nation. It is widespread and engraining, and our response to it must also measure up to the significance of the challenge.

Americans today are in need of protections and assistance to recover from domestic violence. They need these protections to return to full and prosperous lives.

By voting in favor of this amendment, Congress is upholding our sacred obligation to protect the millions of victims and survivors who need and deserve our wholehearted, full support.

As co-chair of the Congressional Homeless Caucus, I have worked on housing issues for a long time. I am appreciative of my colleagues on the Judiciary and Financial Services Committees for their partnership in strengthening our protections in this Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman’s amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chair, I simply urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mrs. WAGNER, Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 35, line 3, strike “and stalking” and insert “stalking, and sex trafficking.”

Page 35, strike lines 4 through 17, and insert the following (and redesignate other provisions accordingly):

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

Page 35, lines 21 through 23, strike “and stalking” and insert “stalking, and sex trafficking.”

Page 36, line 9, strike “sex trafficking,” after “stalking.”

Page 36, strike lines 11 through 13 (and redesignate other provisions accordingly).

Page 36, line 15, insert “and” after the semicolon.

Page 36, strike lines 16 through 18 (and redesignate other provisions accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

VAWA grant programs serve women and girls, especially those in underserved communities who are experiencing violence.

Sex trafficking is one such form of violence. Victims endure horrific trauma, violence, and abuse. Unfortunately, there is a real gap in services for child sex trafficking victims.

In Missouri, we struggle to find safe and secure options for girls who are looking to restart their lives. Amazing nonprofits like The Covering House in my district serve youth, along with other organizations across the country, but there is still a substantial unfilled need for services.

In addition to counseling and housing, victim service providers are trying to prevent violence by educating children and ensuring that they never become victims of sex trafficking in the first place.

That is why programs like the Creating Hope through Outreach, Options, Service, and Education for Children and Youth program, CHOOSE, are so essential.

This VAWA program ensures that the Department of Justice can develop, expand, and strengthen victim-centered interventions that target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking.

It enables schools to provide training to personnel on the needs of students.
who are victims of trafficking, and it develops prevention programming in middle and high schools.

These are critical services, and this amendment will ensure that the CHOOSE program can continue to provide funding for programs that counter sex trafficking, not only other forms of violence.

We cannot unintentionally strip sex trafficking references out of VAWA text. Sex trafficking is a paramount example of violence against girls and women, and we must be careful not to disenfranchise these victims as we legislate.

I thank my colleague from Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, and others for cosponsoring my amendment and working to ensure that we have bipartisan support.

I will also work with my colleagues in the Senate to ensure these references are restored in the final VAWA legislation.

Madam Chair, I urge my House colleagues to support my amendment and ensure that child sex trafficking victims maintain access to critical services, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank my dear friend from New York, C AROLYN MALONEY, for her continuing leadership. It has been a pleasure to work with her over the years in the House Committee on the Judiciary on the question of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

I am delighted to join this amendment, along with Congressman MALONEY from New York. We have a long history of working on the issues of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

Madam Chair, the International Labor Organization estimates that there are 40.3 million victims of human trafficking. Twenty-five percent of them are children; 75 percent of them are women and girls.

It is a tragedy, but one out of seven endangered runaways reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children were likely child sex trafficking victims. Of those, 88 percent were in the care of so-called family members who, once this bill is passed, will be able to both be honored but also be prosecuted.

What is necessary to know is that sex trafficking can be a revolving door. It is income that sex traffickers and human traffickers use.

I am very delighted to join with Congresswoman WAGNER’s amendment to this bill dealing with violence against women because it is an expanded bill that addresses the concerns of so many.

I am glad that this amendment will ensure that the Preventing Violence Against Women Act guarantees the success of people who are trafficking through Outreach, Options, Service, and Education for Children (CHOOSE Children and Youth program), the CHOOSE Children and Youth program, and continue to be programs that address sex trafficking.

It is important to note, in particular, that it is answering the question of the gap in services in our States for young women who are at risk and who are struggling to restart their lives. We must ensure that, once these individuals have been victimized, sex trafficked, we do all we can to help them heal and recover.

I ask all Members to join in supporting this amendment, which emphasizes that sex trafficking is a part of our trying to stop and stomp out for good violence against women. I ask all Members to support the Wagner-Jackson Lee-Maloney amendment.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Wagner/Jackson Lee/Maloney Amendment to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

The Wagner/Jackson Lee/Maloney makes an improvement to the bill by drawing attention to the lack of services for child sex trafficking victims, which draws attention to the fact that there are 48.6 million people trapped in forced sexual exploitation globally.

In 2017, an estimated 1 out of 7 endangered runaways reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children were likely child sex trafficking victims. Of those, 88 percent were in the care of so-called family members who, once this bill is passed, will be able to both be honored but also be prosecuted.

The International Labor Organization estimates that there are 4.8 million people trapped in forced sexual exploitation globally.

The U.S. Department of Labor has identified 148 goods from 75 countries made by forced labor.

From 2007 to 2017, the National Human Trafficking Hotline has received reports of 34,700 sex trafficking cases inside the United States.

In 2017, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children estimated that 1 in 7 endangered runaways reported to them were likely sex trafficking victims.

The International Labor Organization estimates that there are 4.8 million people trapped in forced sexual exploitation globally.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WAGNER. Madam Chair, I thank my friends across the aisle, certainly the Representative from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, and my good friend from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, who I know wanted to speak today on the amendment but is held up in a hearing that she is presently.

I thank them for their bipartisan support, and I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I support this bipartisan amendment, which would ensure that entities focused on addressing sex trafficking maintain eligibility for CHOOSE grants.

We know that sex trafficking is a serious problem in the United States. At this time, CHOOSE grants are available for the purpose of enhancing the safety of youth and children who are victims of or exposed to domestic violence, including violent offenders, stalking, or sex trafficking, and for preventing future violence.

This amendment ensures that we continue to provide critical funding to address sex trafficking in our communities. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I am holding up this bill, H.R. 1585. We are very grateful for the many victims who, once this bill is passed, will be able to both be honored but also be protected.

At the same time, with the gentlewoman’s help, we want to make sure
that sex trafficked victims are not left out of important historic legislation like H.R. 1585. With her amendment—and I am pleased to join it with Congresswoman MALONEY—we are ensuring that sex trafficking and the victims of sex trafficking will be heard, their voices matter. And importantly, there will be resources and programs that will address their pain but also address their ability to restore their lives. I ask my colleagues to support the Wagner–Jackson Lee-Maloney amendment to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment.

Power and control. The tools of human traffickers are the same as those of domestic abusers.

Hunger trafficking and domestic violence are not distinct crimes. They often overlap. In both cases, it is often intimate partners who traffic or abuse their victims. In both cases, abusers and traffickers use emotional manipulation, economic abuse, physical violence—all tactics to exert power and control over their victims.

Support services for survivors need to recognize the intersections between sex trafficking and domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

That is why this amendment from Congresswoman WAGNER is so important.

This amendment would ensure that the Justice Department’s Creating Hope through Outreach, Options, Service and Education for Children and Youth Program can continue to include programs that address sex trafficking. We must address both of these crimes individually and as a whole.

But we must also acknowledge that these crimes can often overlap and where they overlap we need to address the patterns that perpetuate this violence, in order to best serve survivors and connect them with the resources they need to get the help they deserve.

So I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment and thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for all of her efforts to combat human trafficking and domestic abuse.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, strike lines 6 through 12, and insert the following:

(G) in paragraph (16)—

(i) in subparagraph (8)(I), by striking "$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General and inserting "$100,000 in Department funds, unless the Director or Principal Deputy Director of the Office on Violence Against Women, the Deputy Attorney General,”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

(B) INELIGIBILITY.—If the Attorney General finds that a recipient of grant funds under this Act has fraudulently misused such grant funds, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, such recipient shall not be entitled to receive grant funds under this Act for up to 5 years. A misuse of grant funds or an error that does not rise to the level of fraud is not grounds for ineligibility.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Chair, I rise today to ask my colleagues to vote for my amendment that will ensure greater transparency and accountability when it comes to taxpayer dollars.

The Department of Justice inspector general has found frequent misconduct, fraud, and abuse in VAWA grant-making. More than $7 billion in grants has been awarded over the years, and audits have revealed that too many recipients are out of compliance with the terms of these grants.

This amendment will ensure that the Office on Violence Against Women cannot continue to grant VAWA dollars to organizations that are fraudulently misusing funds. Organizations that misuse funds will lose their eligibility to receive VAWA grants for up to 5 years.

Errors that do not rise to the level of fraud will not impact an organization’s eligibility, but we must encourage grant recipients to act with caution and integrity. In this way, we can best serve the women and girls that VAWA programs are designed to help.

I thank you for supporting justice and services for America’s women and children and girls, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment and broaden access for organizations acting in compliance with honesty and good faith.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I support this amendment, which would make entities found by the Attorney General to have fraudulently misused VAWA grant funds ineligible to apply for future grants for up to 5 years.

This amendment tries to guard against the potential misuse of grant funds, but it does so in a way that safeguards due process, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Any misuse of funds that does not rise to the level of fraud, or that is merely an error, is insufficient to make a grantee ineligible for funds and only places a temporary, but sufficiently lengthy, ban on receipt of funding.

Because this is a commonsense measure, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 131, strike line 8 and all that follows through line 12, and insert the following:

(V) is under the care of a victim of the offense;

(II) is related to another victim of the offense;

(VIII) is related to another victim of the offense by blood or marriage; or

(V) is related to the offense by blood or marriage;

(VI) is related to another victim of the offense by blood or marriage;

(VII) is related to another victim of the offense by blood or marriage;

(VII) is related to another victim of the offense by blood or marriage;

(VIII) is related to another victim of the offense by blood or marriage.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Madam Chair, as we have heard over and over today, and justifiably so, the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act is critical for women across this country. This bill will ensure the safety of women, especially Native American women.

My amendment will expand the definition of domestic violence to include violence against immigrants.
child or elder, as defined by Tribal law. This important amendment will allow Tribes to ensure that perpetrators acting violently toward or near children or elders receive consequences for their actions.

The Tulalip Tribe is one of the first Tribes to implement the Special Domestic Violence Criminal Jurisdiction from the 2013 Violence Against Women Act reauthorization. They immediately experienced the implications of not having this protection for children and elders in their jurisdiction. Of the 30 cases they received in Tribal court, 20 involved children and/or elders. Although the violence impacted the children or the elder, the Tribal court was not able to prosecute. When the jurisdiction moved to the State, it did not prosecute the remaining 20 cases in State court. Justice was not served for the children and/or the elders experiencing violence.

In 2010, the Attorney General’s report on American Indian and Alaska Native children exposed to violence included the recommendation that Congress should restore the inherent authority of American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes to assert jurisdiction over persons who commit crimes against American Indian and Alaska Native children.

This amendment is a step toward guaranteeing that Congress keeps American Indian and Alaska Native children and elders safe. By passing this amendment, Congress will restore the inherent authority for the Tulalip Tribe and others to fully secure the safety of Tribal children and elders throughout Indian Country.

I urge my colleagues to protect Native children and elders by supporting this amendment.

Madam Chair. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not so opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.
There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I have no other speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.
eligible entities to carry out the demonstration program under this section by implementing evidence-based or promising policies and practices to incorporate trauma-informed techniques.

(A) prevent re-traumatization of the victim;

(B) ensure that covered individuals use evidence-based or promising practices to respond to and investigate cases of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(C) improve communication between victims and law enforcement officers in an effort to increase the likelihood of the successful investigation and prosecution of the reported crime in a manner that protects the victim to the greatest extent possible;

(D) increase collaboration among stakeholders who are part of the coordinated community response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(E) evaluate the effectiveness of the training process and content by measuring—

(i) investigatory and prosecutorial practices and outcomes; and

(ii) the well-being of victims and their satisfaction with the criminal justice process.

2. TERM.—The Attorney General shall make grants under this section for each of the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

3. AWARD BASIS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section to multiple eligible entities for use in a variety of settings and communities, including—

(A) urban, suburban, Tribal, remote, and rural areas;

(B) college campuses; or

(C) traditionally underserved communities.

C. USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant to—

(1) train covered individuals within the demonstration site of the eligible entity to use evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and knowledge of crime victims’ rights throughout an investigation into domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including by—

(A) conducting victim interviews in a manner that—

(i) elicits valuable information about the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(ii) avoids re-traumatization of the victim;

(B) conducting field investigations that mirror best and promising practices available at the time of the investigation;

(C) customizing investigative approaches to ensure a culturally and linguistically appropriate approach to the community being served;

(D) becoming proficient in understanding and responding to complex cases, including cases of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking—

(i) facilitated by alcohol or drugs;

(ii) involving strangulation;

(iii) committed by a non-stranger;

(iv) committed by an individual of the same sex as the victim;

(v) involving a victim with a disability;

(vi) involving a male victim; or

(vii) involving a lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (commonly referred to as LGBT”) victim;

(E) developing collaborative relationships between—

(i) law enforcement officers and other members of the response team; and

(ii) victims and their legal advocates; and

(F) developing an understanding of how to define, identify, and correctly classify a report of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(2) promote the efforts of the eligible entity to improve the response of covered individuals to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking through various communication channels, such as the website of the eligible entity, social media, and community meetings, in order to ensure that all covered individuals within the demonstration site of the eligible entity are aware of those efforts and included in trainings, to the extent practicable.

D. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM TRAININGS ON TRAUMA-INFORMED APPROACHES.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF EXISTING TRAININGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall identify trainings for law enforcement officers, in existence as of the date on which the Attorney General begins to solicit applications for grants under this section, that—

(i) employ a trauma-informed approach to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(ii) focus on the fundamentals of—

(I) trauma responses; and

(II) the impact of trauma on victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(B) SELECTION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall select one or more of the approaches identified under subparagraph (A) to test within the demonstration site of the eligible entity.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall consult with the Director of the Office for Victims of Crime in order to seek input from and cultivate consensus among outside practitioners and other stakeholders through facilitated discussions of best practices in the field of trauma-informed care for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

E. EVALUATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall—

(1) identify one or more of the approaches selected under subparagraph (B) and develop a system for generating and collecting the appropriate data to facilitate an independent, external, and comprehensive evaluation of the use of the grant funds;

(2) periodically conduct an evaluation described in paragraph (1); and

(3) periodically publish the results of the evaluations conducted under paragraph (2), and

(4) make a preliminary evaluation available to the public at the website of the eligible entity.

F. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

The Attorney General shall carry out this section using amounts otherwise available to the Attorney General.

G. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to interfere with the due process rights of any individual.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER. Madam Chair, as we consider the Women’s Equality Against Men’s Act or VAWA, reauthorization, I offer an amendment to allow for a demonstration program that will issue grants to promote trauma-informed training for law enforcement and other personnel.

The amendment is substantially similar to the Abby Honold Act, which has been led by bipartisan Minnesota Members of Congress. The amendment does not authorize new appropriations, but merely enables existing funds to be used for training that ultimately could save lives and help find the perpetrators of an assault.

The amendment aims to help victims of sexual assault, in addition to those who have experienced other forms of trauma, by improving the care and treatment they receive after the event.

Specifically, the amendment will create a voluntary grant program to train law enforcement agencies in evidence-based, trauma-informed interview techniques to prevent retraumatization of victims, improve communication between victims and law enforcement, and ensure accurate and complete information is submitted to law enforcement.

The amendment and bill is in honor of Abby Honold, who attended the University of Minnesota. Abby was the victim, but one of the bravest people I have ever met for being able to publicly share her story and fight for changes to the law that will help countless Americans.

During traumatic events, parts of the brain shut down and block shocking experiences, shielding the victim, but affecting recollection. When searching for evidence of criminal behavior, many interview techniques are not developed to comfort the victim and effectively access these memories. Information collected in the normal manner may inhibit memory recall and accuracy of events and details. This often leads to suspicion of the victim.

Thankfully, Abby was treated by a nurse who had been trained to provide trauma-informed techniques that allowed the nurse to ask questions in a respectful way that enabled an accurate recount of events. Nurse Walther, who interviewed Abby, made her feel comfortable, and by using the trauma-informed techniques, avoided retraumatization.

The difference that we can make for victims by providing training for these techniques will ensure that recovery and healing can occur for victims of these traumatic instances.

Abby also encountered Officer Kevin Randolph, who went above and beyond to help her win her case against her perpetrator because he understood how these techniques lead to more accurate information and ensured prosecution.

In Minnesota alone, 2,000 women report being raped or sexually assaulted every year. Abby’s Act will help law enforcement investigate sexual assault cases and improve care and treatment for victims.

The amendment establishes a pilot program to train law enforcement, first responders, university officials, or any
other personnel who interface with victi-
ms of sexual violence in trauma-in-
formed techniques focused on pre-
venting retraumatization of the vic-
tim, improving communication and rap-
bport between victims and law en-
forcement as well as collaboration be-
tween the different entities that assist a 
victim of sexual violence.

Sexual assault is a crime, and it is
vital for law enforcement to have accu-
rate and complete information to pros-
cute, and for the thousands of victims who experience trau-
ma, this is a key part of their recovery process, as is a compassionate response in 
the immediate aftermath of an 
event.

This pilot program would be an 
important step forward to provide better 
treatment to sexual assault victims in 
crisis and to make certain it is treated like the serious crime that it is.

I am disappointed that the bill before us today will be a partisan vote and Republicans on the Judiciary Com-
mittee were excluded from the process, but I offer this bipartisan amendment as a demonstration that we can still work together. 
I also hope the Senate considers this 
body's overwhelming support for the Abby Honold Act as it contemplates VAWA reauthorization.

Abby has been a strong advocate for the use of trauma-informed care by law enforcement, and I have been fortunate to work with her and our law enforce-
ment community on this important 
legislation.

A good first step to holding those ac-
countable is ensuring law enforcement has the tools and resources needed to investigate these crimes.

This bill is just one step towards solving a clear problem across our country. 

Victims of sexual assault deserve the best possible care and the most 
compassionate response following their trauma, and we can provide it now. We 
must all work together to ensure these crimes are treated as the heinous acts 
they are, with the hope that one day they cease altogether.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the 
gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, I claim the 
time in opposition to the amend-
ment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objec-
tion, the gentlewoman from Wash-
ington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, I am very 
profoundly honored to cosponsor this bipartisan amendment with my colleague from 
Minnesota to provide access to training on trauma-informed techniques for law enforcement and other agencies that 
respond to survivors of domestic vio-
ence and sexual assault.

Unfortunately, as you well know, de-
spite our best efforts, rape and sexual assault continue to be underreported, 
and the statistic tells us that, out of 
every 1,000 rapes, 995 perpetrators will 
walk free.

One thing we can do to address this is to 
make sure that investigators have training on trauma-informed tech-
niques to work with the survivors of 
sexual violence so that investigators don't further harm survivors. This is 
not just in the best interest of the sur-
vivors, but it is also in the best interest of law enforcement can hold perpetrators accountable.

I am particularly moved by the cour-
age and the determination of Abby 
Honold, the namesake of this amend-
ment, and for many women across 
my State and across the country who have suffered the same situation as she has.

Ms. Honold endured a brutal attack, 
and then she did something truly cour-
grageous. And let me just say, Madam 
Chair, that it is courageous to continue to submit yourself to investigation after a brutal assault. She took action to call attention to the importance of the trauma-informed services she received that helped her to pursue jus-
tice, and today, her work has resulted in this amendment to ensure that oth-
ers will be able to provide the same 
kind of assistance that she received.

So as we recognize Sexual Assault 
Awareness Month, I hope that my col-
leagues will support this amendment to the reauthorization of the Violence 
Against Women Act, traditionally a bi-
 partisan act in this Chamber.

When Congress passed VAWA 25 years ago, it was a landmark achieve-
ment that sent a very clear message to people living in abusive or violent situ-
ations that we saw them, that we 
would stand with them. With each re-
authorization, we continue to expand critical protections and make improve-
ments like this amendment to better 
serve survivors.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the 
gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. 
OMAR), my colleague on this side of the 
aisle.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment.

This amendment to the Violence 
Against Women Reauthorization Act 
includes language of a bill that I am 
proud to be an original cosponsor of 
called the Abby Honold Act. 

Abby is a constituent of mine, a 
former student at the University of 
Minnesota. A survivor of sexual as-
ault, she has been a fierce champion of 
this initiative and was the driving force behind this legislation that bears 
her name.

I want to make sure that my col-
leagues support this amendment on be-
half of the thousands of victims who experience trauma. This is a key part of 
their recovery process and a crucial 
response to the immediate aftermath.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, we 
look forward to everyone supporting this 
amendment. We hope that we can 
continue to operate in a bipartisan fashion in the Chamber, pass not only this 
amendment, but the full reauthoriza-
tion of the Violence Against Women Act.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance 
of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gent-
leman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY 

The Acting CHAIR. It now is in order to 
consider amendment No. 15 printed in 

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will 
designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
lows:

Page 171, insert after line 2, the following 
and (conform the table of contents accord-
ingly):

SEC. 1408. REVIEW ON LINK BETWEEN SUB-
STANCE USE AND VICTIMS OF DO-
MESTIC VIOLENCE DATING VIO-
LENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALK-
ING.

Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the 
Department of Health and Human Services 
shall complete a review and submit a report to Congress on whether being a victim of 
domestic violence, dating violence, sexual as-
sault, or stalking increases the likelihood of 
having a substance use disorder.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to 
House Resolution 281, the gentleman 
from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and a Mem-
er opposed each will control 5 min-
utes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I yield 
myself as much time as I may con-
sume.

Madam Chair, I rise today to offer this 
straightforward, commonsense amendment that does not affect direct 
spending or revenues.

My amendment requires the Sec-
retary of HHS to complete a review of the relationship between survival of 
domestic violence, dating violence, sex-
ual assault, or stalking and the likeli-
hood of developing a substance use dis-
order.

This information is vital because we 
know traumatic experiences such as 
domestic violence are associated with 
behavioral health conditions; we know 
better that behavioral health conditions are 
associated with substance use dis-
orders; and we know that substance use 
is linked to traumatic experiences.

What we don't know is if survivors of 
domestic violence have an increased 
likelihood of developing a substance use disorder. Although the evidence ex-
ists, we have yet to conduct a compre-
prehensive review of the data to make 
the connection.

It is important to understand the na-
ture and impact of trauma to effec-
tively serve those who have suffered. If 
the review indicates a connection, it 
would help providers prevent domestic 
violence survivors from developing a 
substance use disorder and enable sur-
vivors to access preventative and more 
comprehensive services.

This review will also give a better 
understanding of the broader impacts
and effects of trauma on survivors. Social stigma silences both domestic violence survivors and those suffering from substance use disorders. We cannot allow survivors to be silenced any longer.

To reduce stigma, we must talk about these issues, better educate ourselves on the struggles of those living with them, and let survivors know they are not alone. By acknowledging that there might be a connection between domestic violence survival and substance disorders, we can begin to have a conversation and let victims know that we are willing and able to support them through their recovery.

Congress has a responsibility to victims and survivors. This amendment and, more broadly, this bill is one step toward fulfilling that responsibility.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of legislation introduced by myself and Representative KAREN BASS to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

VAWA programs have provided educational tools and helped survivors and their families get the resources they need to protect themselves and to begin the healing process. This should not be a partisan issue.

I would like to thank Congresswoman Bass for her leadership. She is a valued partner in this fight, and I am grateful that we can make this bill bipartisan.

Across our country, Madam Chair, millions of women and children have been saved by the programs funded through VAWA. Shelters, counseling, training, and law enforcement are all key parts of a national strategy to end domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

In the district I represent, in Bucks and Montgomery Counties, in Pennsylvania, and in all of our districts, VAWA programs are saving lives.

A Woman’s Place in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, relies on VAWA funding to save lives. Unlike some larger women’s organizations, their emergency housing only has room for seven families. Nonetheless, their shelter saved 150 women and children who were in imminent danger, often fleeing for their lives.

Another Bucks County organization, Network of Victim Assistance, or NOVA, has helped more than 3,600 victims of sexual assault, human trafficking, stalking, and other serious crimes. NOVA’s work to expand prevention programs, which is essential to preventing violence, is supported by VAWA.

This bill also includes my Combat Online Predators Act, which will increase penalties for cyberstalking against children. My constituent, Madison Zezzo, was cyberstalked by a then 51-year-old predator, who was only sentenced to probation and counseling. Three years later, he made contact with Madison again and created a web of social media accounts to cyberstalk her. He was later sentenced to between 18 months and 7 years in prison.

From domestic violence and sexual assault to cyberstalking, we must do more to prevent violence and, when it does happen, to support victims and bring perpetrators to justice.

Madam Chair, the Violence Against Women Act will help us do all these things and more, across party lines, Democrat and Republican alike, to support this legislation, which will save lives in all of our communities.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN), an extraordinary advocate on this issue.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding time to me to speak on this important topic.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment today which directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to study the relationship between domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking experience and the likelihood of developing a substance use disorder.

This information is critical. If we are going to make smart policy, we must take an evidence-based approach. We must understand the nature and impact of trauma to best serve those who have suffered.

We know traumatic experiences, such as domestic violence, are associated with behavioral conditions, including substance abuse; and we know that these behavioral health conditions are also associated with collective trauma. The full impact of trauma is only now beginning to be understood as tools such as the Adverse Childhood Experiences Score, or ACES, begin to inform this.

As the gentleman from Illinois mentioned, broadening our understanding will weaken stigma. Far too often, social stigma silences both domestic violence survivors and those suffering from substance use disorders. We must empower them, not further traumatize them.

To reduce this stigma, we have to continue to talk about these issues, educate ourselves about these issues, and support those who are struggling with them. This amendment and, more broadly, this bill is an important step towards fulfilling that responsibility.

Reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act reaffirms and expands protections for women everywhere. It improves services available to survivors, empowers local law enforcement to protect their communities, prevents stalkers and abusers from obtaining firearms, and strengthens protections against discrimination in housing and the workplace—because everyone, everywhere deserves a life free from abuse.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, so we can better protect and treat those who have experienced unspeakable suffering, and to support the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I ask for support for the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 IS OFFERED BY MS. MENGE

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment to the measure is agreed to in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. MENGE. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), I have an amendment at the amendment stage.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 171, insert after line 2 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1408. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO STUDY FEDERAL EFFORTS TO COLLECT DATA ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

(1) The Working Group shall be comprised of at least one representative from each of the following, who shall be selected by the head of that agency:

(A) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(B) The Department of Education.

(C) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(D) The Department of Justice.

(E) The Attorney General (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

(2) The Working Group shall be comprised of at least one representative from the following agencies, who shall be selected by the head of that agency:

(1) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(2) The Department of Education.

(3) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(4) The Department of Justice.


(6) The Working Group shall consider the following:

(A) What activity constitutes different acts of sexual violence.

(B) Whether reports that use the same terms for acts of sexual violence are collecting the same data on these acts.

(C) Whether the context which led to an act of sexual violence should impact how that act is accounted for in reports.

(D) Whether the data collected is presented in a way that allows the general public to understand what acts of sexual violence are included in each measurement.

(E) Steps that agencies that compile reports relating to sexual violence can take to avoid double counting incidents of sexual violence.
to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

Additionally, she is grateful to House Judiciary Committee leadership for their support, and to Senators McCaskill and Johnson for shepherding a similar bill through the Senate last year.

Madam Chair, we know the #MeToo movement continues to shed light on the disturbing prevalence of sexual violence in our country. For survivors, it has been a powerful and moving reminder that they are not alone. For all of us, it has been a wake-up call that the status quo is unacceptable and will not be tolerated anymore.

In order to fully understand the scope of the challenge we face, we need reliable, transparent data. The Federal Government has a critical role to play to that end. We have tremendous confidence that better communication amongst these agencies, coupled with thoughtfully harmonized terminology and standardized data collection, will yield more accurate data. Armed with that knowledge, we can better prevent and end the scourge of sexual violence.

Madam Chair, I urge support of Ms. Kuster’s amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, I recognize the gentleman for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments which are pending.

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. JEFFRIES of New York

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. SCALON of Pennsylvania

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. WATERS of California

Amendment No. 10 by Mrs. WAGNER of Missouri

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. JEFFRIES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The result of the vote was announced.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered. 

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.
were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was by electronic device, and there were—ayes 429, noes 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

VOTE—429

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia changed his vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia changed his vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

Mr. CARTER of Georgia changed his vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is whether the House agrees to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendments to the bill. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, my amendment would ensure that incarcerated, pregnant prisoners who are primary caretaker parents and who have limited English proficiency will have access to parenting classes.

Mr. Chair, we know that at the end of 2016 there were over 111,000 women in prisons across our country. That is a nearly 750 percent increase from 1980. Women are the fastest growing population of incarcerated individuals in our country.

Our Nation has 4 percent of the world’s female population, but 30 percent of its female incarcerated population. We also know that women of color are significantly overrepresented in our criminal justice system. In fact, two-thirds of women in jail are women of color.

Additionally, a recent study published just 2 weeks ago in the American Journal of Public Health found that, during their 1-year study of rates of pregnancy and outcomes among women in prison in 22 States and the Federal system, almost 1,400 pregnant women were admitted to prison.

Given the intersection of these data, my amendment ensures that parenting classes be accessible to those incarcerated women with limited English proficiency.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 153, line 25, strike “and” at the end.

Page 153, after line 25, insert the following (and redesignate other provisions accordingly):

(F) develop tools to communicate parenting program availability and eligibility criteria to each employee of the Bureau of Prisons and each pregnant inmate to ensure that each pregnant inmate in the custody of a Bureau of Prisons facility understands the resources available to such inmate; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, this amendment would ensure that our Federal prison system develops tools to communicate parenting program availability and eligibility criteria to each employee of the Bureau of Prisons and each pregnant incarcerated woman so that each of these women in the custody of a Bureau of Prisons facility understands the resources available to them.

Mr. Chair, we know that women are the fastest growing population in the criminal justice system. Only 5 percent of the world’s female population lives in the United States, yet nearly 30 percent of the world’s incarcerated women. That is an injustice to not only those incarcerated but to their families, our economy, and our society as a whole.

According to Prison Policy Initiative, 80 percent of the women who will go to jail this year are moms, including nearly 150,000 women who are pregnant when they are admitted, and many of these women are the primary caretaker of their family.

This means that the impact of their incarceration reaches far beyond the prison system. As we incarcerate women, we are also incarcerating their families.

Currently, the BOP does offer some programs to women who are moms or soon-to-be mothers. Mothers and Infants Nursing Together, otherwise known as MINT, is offered to moms who are pregnant at the time of commitment. Many women have reported that the program has helped them learn important parenting skills and develop a bond with their infants.

However, the September 2018 Department of Justice’s OIG review of the Federal Bureau of Prisons management of its female inmate population found that BOP’s pregnancy programs were underutilized.

Between fiscal years 2012 and 2016, there were 951 pregnant incarcerated women in BOP’s custody, 558 of whom were sentenced inmates. Of these 558 sentenced pregnant inmates, they estimate that only 204 participated in MINT or the Residential Parenting Program. That is, only 37 percent were in these parenting and pregnancy programs.

The reasons were varied. Incarcerated mothers who may be eligible for the programs are often not identified as being eligible. While social workers are responsible for informing inmates of these opportunities, social worker positions often remain vacant.

Many staff did not fully understand the eligibility criteria for the Mothers and Infants Nursing Together program, and, even more surprising, some staff were entirely unaware of these programs’ existence.

These are valuable programs that need to be reaching more people. This amendment directs the Bureau of Prisons to develop tools to better communicate the availability of these programs and their eligibility criteria to inmates. With these improvements, incarcerated individuals will be empowered to better utilize the resources made available to them.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

☐ 1800

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, again, I have been on this side, and I would love to see more cooperation, especially since this is one of the areas I do believe, Mr. Chair, we can actually have agreement on. The chairman and I have talked about this a great deal, and others, members of our Judiciary Committee.

The FIRST STEP Act, criminal justice reform is something that I have been working on for many years. I think the issue of women incarceration is definitely something that needs to be looked at.

Again, my concern with this program is the diversion of dollars that go through these programs to programs that already exist, and I am not sure how we are prioritizing these anymore. Even the numbers given were based over a non-calendar years period, not a single-year period.

When we were doing the FIRST STEP Act and doing some of the incarceration numbers, these numbers were a lot lower in the Federal prison of those actually pregnant at the time.

So again, I don’t, by any means, demean or try to talk badly about an amendment in the sense that it is not intended well. I think the problem is the underlying issues are already there. The underlying stuff is there. I appreciate her bringing that out. We just disagree that this would be the place to do this.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments. Again, only 37 percent of pregnant inmates utilize these programs. I think that it is very common sense to make sure that more people are aware of these programs, both staff employees and those who are incarcerated.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 145, line 21, insert after “training” the following: “, including cultural competency training.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, my amendment would ensure that cultural competency training is included in trauma screening trainings provided to correctional officers and each Bureau of Prisons employee, including instructors and healthcare professionals.

Estimates suggest that as many as 90 percent of incarcerated women have experienced some sort of trauma such as interpersonal or sexual violence in their lives. Female inmates are more likely to have been the victims of direct violence, repeated sexual violence, intimate partner violence. We also know that trauma is experienced in different ways, depending on the individual’s gender identity, culture, and past experiences.

The BOP’s incarcerated female population is incredibly diverse, with many ethnicities, approximately 30 religions, and women from all 50 States and many foreign countries represented.
Studies show that trauma treatment programs should be administered and facilitated during the first 12 months of the incarcerated individual’s sentence so as to maximize the benefits of these programs. Research also shows that the effects of trauma manifest themselves differently for incarcerated women and men. This manifestation is further compounded by the individual’s cultural background.

Incarcerated individuals with limited English proficiency have unique challenges in interaction with correctional officers. This is also true for LGBT incarcerated individuals who have experienced injustice and violence in very specific ways.

In order to address the past trauma of inmates, the BOP has tried to adopt a “trauma-informed correctional care approach.” Under this method, the actions of staff are centered on the understanding that trauma is real and prevalent. Opportunities to avoid retraumatizing inmates are an opportunity for healing.

This approach also includes several principles which seek to ensure the psychological and emotional safety of those incarcerated. Individuals and staff, and use communication methods that avoid triggering memories of past trauma.

And yet testimony from formerly incarcerated women illustrates that correctional officials’ facilities still often fail to receive trauma-informed and gender-responsive training, letting alone culturally competent training.

Correctional officers, healthcare professionals, and other staff members must be adequately trained on methods of trauma-informed care that address the needs of incarcerated individuals.

The trauma screenings must equip each BOP employee to be mindful of the unique culturally rooted trauma of incarcerated individuals. A better understanding of these needs allows correctional officers and instructors to provide the most effective care possible.

Such training would ensure that correctional staff respond to incarcerated individuals in productive and impactful ways.

In other words, these officials will be able to provide trauma-informed care to those who have limited English proficiency, come from diverse backgrounds, or live with disabilities, regardless of gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

The dignity of an incarcerated individual must be honored and upheld, and ensuring the proper training of employees to interact with them would be a significant first step. I urge support for the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not necessarily opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is whether the amendment is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 offered by Ms. Plaskett in part B of House Report 116–32. Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, strike lines 3 through 7, and insert the following:

SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM. Section 51501 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking “0.25 percent” and inserting “0.5 percent”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

Page 79, line 19, strike “and”.

Page 79, line 21, strike the period at the end and insert “;”.

Page 79, insert after line 21 the following:

(C) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “0.25 percent” and inserting “0.5 percent”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, the Violence Against Women Act is the cornerstone of our Nation’s response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. VAWA’s community response model helps abuse victims find safety and receive services. VAWA allows communities to hold perpetrators accountable for their actions.

I would like to commend Congresswoman KAREN BASS, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, and leadership for their commitment to making this legislation a priority of this Congress.

Mr. Chair, the U.S. territories, including my district of the U.S. Virgin Islands, along with Puerto Rico, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa, are eligible for the Violence Against Women Act programs under the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services.

For example, the Sexual Assault Services Formula Grant authorized under VAWA provides funding to support rape crisis centers and assist individuals who have been sexually assaulted.

The Office on Violence Against Women awards no less than 1.5 percent of the total amount appropriated for the program to each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands are awarded a base amount of 1 quarter of 1 percent of the total appropriation.

In fiscal years 2017–2018, the smaller territories each received just $60,000 in funding under the Sexual Assault Services Formula Program. My amendment would double the minimum amount made available to these U.S. territories under the program. This funding is sorely needed at this time.

According to mental health professionals in the Virgin Islands, a recent increase in domestic violence cases can partially be attributed to the residual stress of the disastrous hurricanes of 2017. Even before this uptick, however, the territories were massively under-equipped to shelter and protect the victims of violence, and the situation has only worsened since.

Mr. Chair, my amendment would similarly double the minimum amount made available to the small territories for transitional housing services, including housing for victims for whom emergency shelter services are unavailable or insufficient and to move individuals into permanent housing.

In the Virgin Islands, assistance for emergency and transitional housing is crucially important, as the territory has seen housing costs skyrocket since the aforementioned disasters. Without this assistance, many women have no hope of escaping life-threatening situations.

There is currently one domestic violence and abuse program on St. Thomas, offering a hotline and emergency shelter. On the island of St. Croix, there is one program which offers a hotline and emergency shelter to victims.

Undeniably, there is a need for more funding to provide additional services. This amendment takes a positive step towards addressing the additional funding needed to adequately assist and protect women and children of the Virgin Islands and other U.S. territories who lived through the horror of violence this bill seeks to protect them from.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the Women’s Coalition and the Virgin Islands Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalition on St. Croix and the Family Resource Center on St. Thomas for their passionate and continued work to provide services and training on prevention to the victims of abuse and their families.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank my colleague across the aisle, Congresswoman AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN of American Samoa, for cosponsoring this amendment to improve services for women and children in the U.S. island territories.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, again, I appreciate the gentleman’s concern.

My concern is that the underlying bill already addresses this with sufficient funding. This amendment or anything like it was not offered in committee and not brought up in the discussions of this.

I don’t doubt the sincerity of the need in this, but we do believe that the underlying bill would cover it, so for that reason, I would oppose it. I appreciate the gentleman’s concern, and I am sure there are other ways that we could work it out, but we do believe the bill itself would cover that.

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

My amendment would increase support for communities of color who face domestic and sexual violence in our country and allow them to access critical support services in a culturally appropriate context.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, insert after line 9 the following:

SEC. 905. REPORT ON THE RESPONSE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO REPORTS OF MISSING OR MURDERED INDIANS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED DATABASE.—The term “covered database” means—

(A) the database of the National Crime Information Center;

(B) the Combined DNA Index System;

(C) the Next Generation Identification System; and

(D) any other database or system of a law enforcement agency under which a report of a missing or murdered Indian may be submitted, including—

(i) the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program; or

(ii) the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System.

(b) INDIAN.—The term “Indian” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 3304).

(c) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term “Indian country” has the meaning given the term in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term “law enforcement agency” means a Federal, State, local, or Tribal law enforcement agency.
Women Act shines a light on a crisis that has been ignored for too long by this body: the crisis of missing and murdered indigenous women. In Indian Country, American Indians and Alaska Native women experience murder rates ten times the national average.

One study found that there were 5,712 reported cases of missing indigenous women in 2016. In reality, the numbers are even worse because indigenous women are often underrepresented in national and local data.

Just one example of the thousands of heartbreaking cases of missing and murdered women and girls is Ashlynn Mike, an 11-year-old Navajo girl. In 2016, Ashlynn and her 9-year-old brother, Ian, were tricked into accepting a ride home from a stranger while playing after school on the Navajo Reservation.

When Ashlynn and Ian did not return home, her family contacted the authorities. Ian was eventually found a few hours later wandering on the side of a road. Friends and family members then mobilized a search party for Ashlynn and spread news of her abduction through texts and social media. However, because of the jurisdictional issues, an official AMBER Alert wasn’t issued until 12 hours after her disappearance.

Eventually, Ashlynn’s body was found by family members near a dirt road.

Indigenous communities are demanding action on this crisis and justice for Native women and girls like Ashlynn. That is why last month, I was proud to hold the first hearing on missing and murdered indigenous women in the Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States. That is why today, I am proud to introduce this amendment as a first step towards solutions.

We know the factors exacerbating this crisis are many. They include lack of resources, lack of coordination between law enforcement agencies, and jurisdictional challenges within our criminal justice system.

My amendment would drill down on the nature and scope of these issues, so that we can take direct legislative action to fix them. It will give us the tools to give Tribes the resources and support they need to combat horrific violence directed at their communities.

This amendment is identical to the bipartisan Studying the Missing and Murdered Indian Crisis Act that I introduced earlier this week and that Senator Tester has introduced in the Senate.

After hearing Ashlynn’s story and knowing that there are thousands of women and girls who have suffered and died as a result of this crisis, I am sure that my colleagues will agree: Silence is not an option. Inaction is not an option.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE XV—CYBERCRIME ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 1501. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CYBERCRIME

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Attorney General shall award grants under this section to States and units of local government for the prevention, enforcement, and prosecution of cybercrimes against individuals.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To request a grant under this section, the chief executive officer of a State or unit of local government shall submit an application to the Attorney General within 90 days after the date on which funds to carry out this section are appropriated for a fiscal year, in such form as the Attorney General may require.

(2) AMOUNT.—An assurance that, for each fiscal year, in such form as the Attorney General may require. Such application shall include the following:

(A) A certification that Federal funds made available under this section will not be used to supplant State or local funds, but will be used to increase the amounts of such funds that would, in the absence of Federal funds, be made available for law enforcement activities.

(B) An assurance that, not fewer than 30 days before the application (or any amendment to the application) was submitted to the Attorney General, the application (or amendment) was submitted for review to the governing body of the State or unit of local government (or to an organization designated by that governing body).

(C) An assurance that, before the application (or any amendment to the application) was submitted to the Attorney General—

(i) the application (or amendment) was made public; and

(ii) an opportunity to comment on the application (or amendment) was provided to citizens and to neighborhood or community-based organizations, to the extent applicable law or established procedure makes such an opportunity available.

(D) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant shall maintain and report such data, records, and information (programmatic and financial) as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(E) A certification, made in a form acceptable to the Attorney General and executed by the chief executive officer of the applicable Unit of local government, that the application is not required. Inaction is not an option.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Chair, my amendment to the Violence Against
(1) the programs to be funded by the grant meet all the requirements of this section;
(ii) all the information contained in the application is correct; and
(iii) there has been appropriate coordination with affected agencies; and
(iv) the applicant will comply with all provisions of this section and all other applicable Federal laws.

(F) A certification that the State or in the case of a unit of local government, the State in which the unit of local government is located, has criminal laws which prohibit cybercrimes against individuals.

(G) A certification that any equipment described in subsection (c)(7) purchased using grant funds under this section will be used primarily for investigations and forensic analysis of evidence in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals.

(c) Use of Funds.—Grants awarded under this section may only be used for programs that provide—

(1) training for State or local law enforcement personnel relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify and protect victims of cybercrimes against individuals;
(B) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals;
(C) training such personnel to identify and investigate cybercrimes against individuals;
(D) training such personnel to enforce and utilize the laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;
(E) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the investigation of cybercrimes against individuals and enforcement of laws that prohibit such crimes; and
(F) the payment of overtime incurred as a result of such training;

(2) training for State or local prosecutors, judges, and judicial personnel, relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify, investigate, or prosecute, or adjudicate cybercrimes against individuals;
(B) training such personnel to utilize laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;
(C) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals;
(D) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the prosecution or adjudication of acts of cybercrimes against individuals;

(3) training for State or local emergency dispatch personnel relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify and protect victims of cybercrimes against individuals;
(B) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals;
(C) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the identification of and response to cybercrimes against individuals; and

(D) the payment of overtime incurred as a result of such training;

(4) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies in enforcing laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in performing enforcement operations, such as overtime payments;

(5) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies in educating the public in order to prevent, deter, and identify violations of laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;

(6) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies to establish task forces that operate solely to conduct investigations, forensic analyses of evidence, and prosecutions in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals;

(7) assistance to State or local law enforcement and prosecutors in acquiring computers, computer equipment, and other equipment necessary to conduct investigations, forensic analysis of evidence in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in the training, maintenance, or acquisition of such equipment; and

(8) assistance in the facilitation and promotion of sharing, with State and local law enforcement officers and prosecutors, of the expertise and information of Federal law enforcement agencies about the investigation, analysis, and prosecution of matters involving laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals, including the use of multijurisdictional task forces; or

(9) assistance to State and local law enforcement and prosecutors in processing interstate extradition requests for violations of laws involving cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in the extradition of an offender from one State to another.

(d) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—On the date that is one year after the date on which a State or unit of local government receives a grant under this section, and annually thereafter, the chief executive of such State or unit of local government shall submit to the Attorney General a report which contains—

(1) a summary of the activities carried out during the previous year with any grant received by such State or unit of local government;

(2) an evaluation of the results of such activities; and

(3) such other information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than November 15 of each calendar year, the Attorney General shall submit to the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that contains a compilation of the information contained in the report submitted under subsection (d).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

(2) LIMITATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) in any fiscal year, not more than 5 percent may be used for evaluation, technical assistance, salaries, and administrative expenses.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ‘‘cybercrimes against individuals’’ means the criminal offenses applicable in the relevant State or unit of local government that involve the use of a computer to cause personal harm to an individual, such as the use of a computer to harass, stalk, stalk, extort, coerce, cause fear, intimidate, without consent distribute intimate images of, or violate the privacy of, an individual, except that—

(A) use of a computer need not be an element of such an offense; and
(B) such term does not include the use of a computer to calculate personal financial, commercial, financial, government, or any non-natural persons.

(2) The term ‘‘computer’’ includes a computer network and an interactive electronic device.

SEC. 1502. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER GRANT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Attorney General shall award a grant under this section to an eligible entity for the purpose of the establishment and maintenance of a National Resource Center on Cybercrimes Against Individuals to provide resource information, training, and technical assistance to improve the capacity of individuals, organizations, governmental entities, and communities to prevent, enforce, and prosecute cybercrimes against individuals.

(b) APPLICATION.—To request a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General not later than 90 days after the date on which funds to carry out this section are appropriated for fiscal year 2020 in such form as the Attorney General may require. Such application shall include the following:

(1) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant shall maintain and report such data, records, and information (programmatic and financial) as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(2) A certification, made in a form acceptable to the Attorney General, that—

(A) the programs funded by the grant meet all the requirements of this section;

(B) all the information contained in the application is correct; and

(C) the applicant will comply with all provisions of this section and all other applicable Federal laws.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—The eligible entity awarded a grant under this section shall use such amounts for the establishment and maintenance of a National Resource Center on Cybercrimes Against Individuals, which shall—

(1) offer a comprehensive array of technical assistance and training resources to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, community-based organizations, and other professionals and interested parties, related to cybercrimes against individuals, including programs and research related to victims;

(2) maintain a resource library which shall collect, preserve, analyze, and disseminate information and statistics related to cybercrimes against individuals; and

(3) conduct research related to—

(A) the causes of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) the effect of cybercrimes against individuals on victims of such crimes; and

(C) model solutions to prevent or deter cybercrimes against individuals or to enforce the laws relating to cybercrimes against individuals.

(d) DURATION OF GRANT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The grant awarded under this section shall be awarded for a period of 5 years.

(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section may be renewed for additional 5-year periods if the Attorney General determines that the funds made available to the recipient were used in a manner described in subsection (c), and if the recipient resubmits an application in subsection (b) in such form and at such time as the Attorney General may reasonably require.
(e) Subgrants.—The eligible entity awarded a grant under this section may make subgrants to other nonprofit private organizations with relevant subject matter expertise in order to support and maintain the National Resource Center on Cybercrimes Against Individuals in accordance with subsection (c).

(f) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—On the date that is one year after the date on which an eligible entity receives a grant under this section, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant period, the entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report which contains—

(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant program during the previous year;
(2) an evaluation of the results of such activities; and
(3) such other information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than November 1 of each even-numbered fiscal year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that contains a compilation of the information contained in the report submitted under subsection (d).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

SEC. 1503. NATIONAL STRATEGY, CLASSIFICATION, AND REPORTING ON CYBERCRIME.

(a) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) COMPUTER.—The term ‘‘computer’’ includes computer system, computer network, and any interactive electronic device.

(2) CYBERCRIME AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.—The term ‘‘cybercrime against individuals’’ means an offense that involves the use of a computer to cause personal harm to an individual, such as the use of a computer to harass, threaten, stalk, extort, coerce, cause fear, intimidate, or to commit fraud.

(b) NATIONAL STRATEGY.—The Attorney General shall develop a national strategy to—

(1) reduce the incidence of cybercrimes against individuals;
(2) coordinate investigations of cybercrimes against individuals by Federal law enforcement agencies; and
(3) increase the number of Federal prosecutions of cybercrimes against individuals.

(c) CLASSIFICATION OF CYBERCRIMES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS FOR PURPOSES OF CRIME REPORTS.—In accordance with the authority of the Attorney General under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall—

(1) design a category within the Uniform Crime Reports for offenses that constitute cybercrimes against individuals;
(2) to the extent feasible, within the category established under paragraph (1), establish subcategories for each type of cybercrime against individuals that is an offense under Federal or State law;
(3) classify each type of cybercrime against individuals under paragraph (1) as a Part I crime in the Uniform Crime Reports; and
(4) classify each type of cybercrime against individuals under paragraph (1) as an A offense for the purpose of the National Incident-Based Reporting System.

(d) ANNUAL SUMMARY.—The Attorney General shall publish an annual summary of the information reported in the Uniform Crime Reports and the National Incident-Based Reporting System relating to cybercrimes against individuals.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, every day, millions of Americans use the internet to enrich their lives, engage with their communities, and do business. While most online interactions are positive, the sad reality is that for far too many Americans having an online presence means being subjected to harassment, stalking, sextortion, and sexual abuse.

In recent years, the internet has become an easy way for abusers to stalk victims of domestic violence and prey on vulnerable children. These crimes aren’t just one-off occurrences, they are not just virtual. They can be the start, the means, of a horrific and explicit journey.

One of my constituents received an onslaught of rape and death threats so horrific and explicit that she and her husband fled their home and eventually moved because they feared for their lives.

Unfortunately, when she reported these threats to law enforcement, the officers she worked with did not have the training or the resources necessary to fully investigate this crime and bring the perpetrators to justice.

And this is just one story. In fact, 20 percent, one in five, of all adult internet users have been affected by cyberstalking, persistent harassing emails or other unwanted online contact.

One increasingly common form of online abuse involves perpetrators threatening to expose private or sensitive material, including nude images, unless victims produce sexual materials or pay the abuser money.

The Department of Justice recently declared that this type of abuse, known as sextortion, ‘‘... is by far the most significantly growing threat to children,’’ and that:

Sextortion cases tend to have more victims who are minors per offense than all other child sexual exploitation offenses.

According to a 2015 FBI analysis of 43 sextortion cases, at least two victims committed suicide and at least ten more were attempted.

From self-mutilation to suicide, the consequences of sextortion for traumatized victims can be devastating.

If we are going to prevent these types of online crimes, we need to make sure our law enforcement understands how to best combat them.

This amendment establishes a grant program to train local and State law enforcement to prevent, enforce, and prosecute crimes carried out online. It creates a national resource center to study these crimes and requires the FBI to update the Uniform Crime Reports and National Incident-Based Reporting System to include cybercrimes.

In an economy that is increasingly online, these crimes can profoundly impact career choice, and economic participation.

My amendment would make sure our criminal justice system is equipped to respond to the crimes that happen online.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to provide law enforcement with the tools they need to combat these crimes by supporting my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentlewoman is talking about and wants to do here.

The concern here is this amendment establishes an entirely new grant program with a national resource center. It is unclear how it would be necessary, but it is also unclear on what resources would be used to establish that new center. And if it means taking money out of the current VAWA bill for victims, for women and others, then I would definitely be opposed to this.

Provisions in existing law and the underlying bill already address these similar issues, including digital and cyber abuse.

So just from that perspective, from a concern of where the funds are actually coming from and how to do this, but also the fact that it seems redundant, that is why I would oppose it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

The amendment was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.
The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 109, line 8, insert after "other components of economic security" the following: "including financial empowerment, affordable housing, transportation, healthcare access, and quality education and training opportunities."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 261, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of amendment No. 24 to the Violence Against Women Act.

The true cost of domestic violence is difficult to compute because of just how many aspects of someone’s life it can affect and the economic sabotage it can induce.

A woman could face job insecurity because she must spend excessive resources on legal assistance or childcare. She could lack the financial security to leave an abusive partner, because the partner may be tightening his grip on a shared bank account. She may be vulnerable to homelessness. She may even face unavoidable and skyrocketing healthcare costs due to the physical abuse she has experienced.

There are numerous ways that domestic and sexual violence can create economic obstacles for women in America, and it is imperative that we study these issues, to strengthen the health and safety of our communities.

My bipartisan amendment, which I introduced with Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS of Indiana, requires the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor to analyze and report all barriers that survivors face in achieving economic security outside of an abusive relationship.

This amendment would ensure we are taking a comprehensive approach to strengthening the economic stability of survivors of domestic and sexual violence, including their ability to achieve financial empowerment, affordable housing, transportation, healthcare access, and quality education and training opportunities.

Ultimately, this information will help put more women and survivors of domestic and sexual violence on a path of upward mobility.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Collins of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 114, line 10, insert after "or stalking" the following: "...including guidelines and best practices to promote the creation of effective employee assistance programs." and "...to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment No. 25 to the Violence Against Women Act.

For decades, Congress has taken action to ensure that victims of domestic violence are supported and protected from their abusers by providing resources and tools to promote health and safety.

We know that one in three women experience domestic violence or sexual assault in their lifetime. We also know that the devastating effects of such violence are experienced at home, in relationships, and even when they go to work.

In fact, the Department of Labor reports that, in total, survivors of domestic violence lose nearly 8 million days of paid work a year due to a violent situation at home, whether that be finding legal assistance, securing childcare, or receiving health services. Statistics show that abusers are more likely to follow or harass survivors at their workplace, which can add an overwhelming sense of fear. Survivors may also experience an extreme loss in productivity due to distraction, worry, or poor performance. Due to the abundance of difficult issues facing these individuals, their ability to remain employed often is at risk.

These missed days result in $1.8 billion in lost productivity for American businesses per year. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, over 44 percent of workplaces do not have formal policies to address domestic violence in the workplace.

Moving forward, we must find ways to help employers offer lifesaving resources to victims of such violence, an endeavor that will improve the health and safety of American employees both at home and at the workplace.

Many companies nationwide have adopted effective “employee assistance programs” that include comprehensive domestic violence services for survivors. Employee assistance programs have been proven to help survivors when they come into work by offering free counseling, referrals, and assessments. In many cases, these programs offer lifesaving services to survivors dealing with dangerous and difficult situations at home.

This bipartisan amendment, which I am offering with my colleague Congressman DON BACON, directs the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor to launch a public information campaign that includes guidelines and best practices for employers to create these effective employee assistance programs. By conducting extensive outreach and sharing these findings with employers across the country, we can strengthen support services at the workplace for the betterment of women’s health and safety.

Mr. Chair, with the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, we have a momentous opportunity to improve employee assistance programs throughout the country. I urge my colleagues to seize this moment by supporting this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, insert after line 24 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 108. GRANTS FOR LETHALITY ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to local government, Indian tribes, domestic violence victim service providers, and State or Tribal Domestic Violence Coalitions for technical assistance and training in the operation or establishment of a lethality assessment program.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "lethality assessment program" means a program that—

(1) rapidly connects a victim of domestic violence to local community-based victim service providers; and

(2) helps first responders and others in the justice system, including courts, law enforcement agencies, and prosecutors of tribal governments, units of local government, to identify and respond to potentially lethal circumstances;
(3) identifies victims of domestic violence who are at high risk of being seriously injured or killed by an intimate partner.
(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, an entity described in subsection (b) must demonstrate experience in developing, implementing, evaluating, and disseminating a lethality assessment program.
(d) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.
(e) DEFINITIONS.—Terms used in this section have the meanings given such terms in section 10002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first recognize the hard work of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER; my colleague from California, Congresswoman KAREN BASS; as well as all the members of the Judiciary Committee—on the underlying bill.

My amendment would create a grant program for States, localities, and non-profits to establish and operate a lethality assessment program.

The lethality assessment program was developed in my home State of Maryland by the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence.

Research shows that for one-third of victims of domestic violence, homicide or attempted homicide was the first act of violence in that relationship.

Research also shows that in the year prior to the homicide, more than 44 percent of abusers were arrested, and almost one-third of the victims contacted the police about the abuser.

The assessment program was developed to reduce the number of missed opportunities to identify victims of domestic violence who are at risk of being killed, and it enables them to take steps that might save their lives.

The lethality assessment program is an evidence-based homicide prevention tool. Because intimate partner homicides are predictable in many cases, they are preventable in many cases.

This program is used in 37 States by law enforcement, nurses, social workers, hospital personnel, caseworkers, and court personnel.

By simply asking the lethality screening questions, the trained person conducting the screening educates the victim about the signs of increased risk of homicide. The trained person then further educates the victim as to how to remain safe, what options are available, and what resources are in the community. The victim feels empowered to consider choices that increase their own safety.

The lethality assessment program is one of only two models of evidence-based intimate partner homicide prevention to be recognized and honored as a promising practice by the Department of Justice.

During my time as Lieutenant Governor, I supported expanding and fully funding the lethality assessment program in Maryland because I understood then, just as I understand today, that domestic violence and violence against women is not just a woman's issue. Domestic violence impacts all of us, families, neighbors, and entire communities.

As we stand here debating my amendment and whether to reauthorize legal protections and resources for women, one in four women continue to experience abuse or stalking by their current or former intimate partner.

One woman of the thousands who are killed by a current or former intimate partner every year was my cousin, Cathy. She was a 40-year-old woman and a teacher. She loved her work, and she loved her children.

On the weekend before she was going to begin her classes, in 2008, she was stalked; she was ambushed; she was tormented; and she was shot and killed by her former intimate partner in front of two police officers.

While there is nothing that will bring Cathy back, we have the opportunity, right now, to pass commonsense legislation that safeguards women and families from the horrors that Cathy and my family experienced, and so many other families.

Domestic violence does not discriminate, and it is up to us to ensure that our wives, husbands, partners, mothers, and children live their lives free from violence.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. HAA LAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. HAA LAND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 8, strike "and".
Page 18, line 14, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.
Page 18, after line 14, insert the following: "(23) providing victim advocates in State or local law enforcement agencies, prosecutor’s offices, and courts and providing supportive services and advocacy to American Indian and Alaska Native victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAA LAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. HAA LAND. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment addresses the needs of Native Americans living in urban areas by making victim advocates for urban Indians under the STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program for States.

In 2018, the State STOP grant program awarded 56 awards totaling over $141 million to State programs to provide funding for victim services to address sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking through State initiatives to enhance existing programs and fill gaps in services.

Currently, the State STOP grant program is used to strengthen partnerships between Tribal and non-Tribal stakeholders to improve responses to Native American victims, but there is no requirement for State grant activities to prioritize the hiring of in-court victim advocates for urban Indians.

Frequently, the subgrantees of this program are community-based organizations, which are chronically under-funded, short-staffed, and not able to specifically address the needs of urban Indian victims.

This leaves urban Native victims without any resources, which are severely needed within State courts and which could easily be remedied by hiring in-court victim advocates for urban Indians.

Currently, the State STOP grant program is used to strengthen partnerships between Tribal and non-Tribal stakeholders to improve responses to Native American victims, but there is no requirement for State grant activities to prioritize the hiring of in-court victim advocates for urban Indians.

Frequently, the subgrantees of this program are community-based organizations, which are chronically under-funded, short-staffed, and not able to specifically address the needs of urban Indian victims.

This leaves urban Native victims without any resources, which are severely needed within State courts and which could easily be remedied by hiring in-court victim advocates for urban Indians.

Frequently, the subgrantees of this program are community-based organizations, which are chronically under-funded, short-staffed, and not able to specifically address the needs of urban Indian victims.

This leaves urban Native victims without any resources, which are severely needed within State courts and which could easily be remedied by hiring in-court victim advocates for urban Indians.
The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, transgender and gender nonconforming people face extraordinary levels of physical and sexual violence. According to the U.S. Transgender Survey, which surveyed nearly 28,000 transgender Americans across all 50 States, nearly half of transgender individuals have been sexually assaulted in their lifetimes, and nearly 1 in 10 respondents in the survey reported that they were physically attacked in the past year because of being transgender.

Transgender people face disproportionate harassment and violence. More than one in four transgender people have faced bias-driven assault, and this rate is higher for trans women and trans people of color. The fear caused by these acts sends people underground and away from community services and support.

This violence has deadly consequences. The American Foundation for Suicide Prevention has found that transgender and gender nonconforming people have an elevated prevalence of suicide attempts, especially when they have suffered physical or sexual assault.

As always, listening to and believing survivors is critical, and I stand committed to rejecting the prejudice and hate facing transgender and gender nonconforming people in our Nation. Far too often, the experiences of transgender and gender nonconforming people are ignored and overlooked.

My amendment, which is supported by the Human Rights Campaign and the National Center for Transgender Equality, adds language to the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act that recognizes the ongoing epidemic of violence against these members of the LGBTQ community.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment that seeks to include the experiences of transgender and gender nonconforming people in this important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman. I have no problem, As far as any violence against anyone, no matter what the cause is, is wrong. And no one should be treated differently because of choices and other things in their life, whether it be just the basic humanity that we deal with.

I think the only concern that I have here, as someone who has dealt with
suicide, who has dealt with it on a counseling level for many years both in the military and outside. I would not want to assign a certain bias to the reasoning here, because there are other reasons, as well, for suicide, and to keep that holistically. That is why, from my standpoint, I would not want to assign that. I think any of these is tragic and do contribute to that issue, just as it would anything else. So I think limiting time in my opinion, would not be good in the holistic approach to making sure that no one believes that their only choice in life is suicide, which is what the amendment seems to do.

I think there are multiple things there, and we need to be very aware of that—and the friends and family around us. If I could take anything else from this moment, it is that I would include everybody listening in today, no matter what their background is, suicide is something that is tragic. And if it came to a point where people do not feel any hope, it is imperative that people reach out to all people, no matter who they are, if they know them or not, and just ask simple questions. 'Are you okay? Can we talk?'. Do the things like that that help people understand that they are not alone in this situation. I appreciate the gentleman’s concern. I do voice opposition to this amendment just in the sense that I believe it is too limiting in scope to say that this is the reason why or to input a bias into a congressional finding. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the Member’s comments and agree that suicide, nationally, is an issue, regardless of the situation, and I appreciate his comments that anybody in that situation should be encouraged to reach out.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is as follows:

Page 38, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate other provisions accordingly):

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting after “improve delivery of” the following: “primary prevention training and”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, as we seek to reauthorize this landmark piece of bipartisan legislation, it is important that we recognize we have a long way to go to end rape, sexual violence, and sexual harassment on college campuses.

Nearly one-quarter of American college women experience sexual violence. Let me repeat. Nearly one-quarter of college women experience sexual violence while attending school.

We have failed the young people of our Nation who are tirelessly pursuing higher education and chasing the American Dream.

The Violence Against Women Act supports hundreds of thousands of sexual assault survivors across the United States; however, we must do more to prevent these acts of sexual violence from occurring in the first place. My amendment would give colleges and universities the opportunity to use grant funding to offer or improve the delivery of primary prevention training.

Primary prevention training is exactly what it sounds like. It seeks to educate and change the culture on college campuses. It promotes healthy relationships and addresses community and societal challenges. It teaches students consent and stops sexual assaults from occurring.

Organizations like End Rape on Campus know that primary prevention training works, and they are in full support of this amendment.

As I mentioned earlier, one-quarter of college women experience sexual violence while on campus. Today, we can begin to change that unacceptable statistic by adopting this amendment.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not necessarily opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, again, I do not necessarily oppose the amendment.

I think the underlying actual law addresses what you are after here, so, in my mind, it is duplicative and can serve another purpose. We do have some existing law that is already here. So that would be my concern about your amendment. I think it is already covered.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California. Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, as I mentioned, 25 percent of female students on campus have experienced sexual assault, yet less than 10 percent of college students who experience sexual violence report their assaults.

For many survivors, reporting a sexual assault result is an Дмитрій Вітальович процес that forces them to repeatedly relive the worst days or nights of their lives.

More than just traumatic, reporting can be dangerous or detrimental to one’s social status, academic pursuits, or career prospects.

Knowing that 90 percent of students feel uncomfortable with the current reporting process, my amendment would give colleges and universities the opportunity to use grant funding to offer alternative justice response programs.

These programs allow for a nonpunitive response to objectionable conduct, seek accountability from the accused, provide alternative pathways for justice and healing for survivors, and give access to education and behavioral change.

Research has shown that alternative justice programs, which return autonomy and control to survivors, can lessen PTSD symptoms.

Working toward justice and healing are not always linear processes, and this amendment would allow for the complex experiences of survivors to be respected and supported.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, this one is one that, from many perspectives—and we talked about this a little bit earlier in this debate. Especially when it comes to the alternative issue here, we understand the concerns for the victims and need to be a part of that, but this is something prosecutors across the country have
They go on to say that:

A philosophy of putting the ability to consent to this kind of program on a victim’s shoulders is misplaced and may result in unintended consequences to the victim, such as safety concerns. The prosecutors are among the people that utilize the beneficial tools of VAWA the most, and they are on the front lines of combating the violence against women.

I don’t think that we should ignore that. I think when we are looking at this, as I said earlier in this debate today, anyone who does this is a criminal. If they do this to people, stalking, domestic violence, all this, they are criminal actions, and I do not want to take that away from this. The victim should be cared for. The victim should be nurtured. The victim should be able to come forward in that process.

But I do not want to take campuses and other places away where it becomes something which law enforcement does not have the primary say so, or you are allowing the campus, Mr. Chairman, to come in and have their own alternative kind of investigative process. And this is something that is of concern.

I appreciate the gentleman’s concern in how people move through this process, but this is just not the right way to go, especially in this bill. There may be other ways to address this.

That is why I would oppose the amendment, because I just feel like we do not need to ever take away the fact that the victims in this are victims of a crime. We never can take that away and would not want to resurface that in any other way. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments.

As I mentioned early, when you look at 25 percent of the female student body experiencing sexual assault on campus, and only 10 percent feeling comfortable to come forward and report, that 90 percent of them that do not feel that they have an avenue that they are comfortable with to share their story and seek justice, this is an opportunity to do just that.

There is no evidence that suggests those universities that have already provided restorative justice have seen a decline in sexual assaults.

As such, I think this is a program that provides exactly what was laid out in the amendment and should have bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Again, not to prolong this, but I think the interesting issue here, Mr. Chairman, is from the understanding there are ways inside VAWA. There are other programs here. And I would just have to say that for those that do not come forward, there are also many other reasons besides the fact of the law enforcement process that we go through here.

So I think this is just because the law enforcement process does require reporting and does require this, we don’t want to let the abuser in this situation, or the perpetrator in this situation be allowed to continue because the abuser.

I would like to see the system be made where the victims can come forward and not take it away to where it would be something that is alternative. And I think in many ways we are probably saying or at least wanting the same things. I want to make it easier for them to report the folks who do this to them, no matter what background they are from or gender they are, to make these crimes need to be prosecuted. I just don’t want to see things diverted and an outlet given. It should be better for the victims to be able to come forward. I think the waiting state of occurrence when you don’t have the ability or want to come report because they feel the system is too hard. But also, not taking this out of account, there are other reasons why they may not report, or they don’t feel like they can come forward. And I don’t think we can deny that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chairman, I will point out that the victims do not come forward to the police department and the court system because they recognize that they often will not get justice. That could be because of a lack of evidence, or that could be for other reasons. This provides another recourse for them.

As the father of a daughter and three sons, I would want to see this available for those kids in that type of a situation, that if the victim felt this was the right course of action for them to address that issue, then I believe this amendment helps them do just that.

And while I respect my colleague’s comment, again, I would hold the amendment up as is, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, that is fine. I think the National District Attorneys Association also would agree that this is something that should be studied, but not mandated. And I think the amendment here goes farther than most of us are feeling comfortable with in that regard.
grant funding for training of all participants involved with the resolution process in training which identifies or responds to crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Representative members include the Title IX coordinator’s office, as well as the office of student conduct. This training will ensure that survivors are treated with more respect, professionalism, and compassion by every school official, campus security guard, administrator, and professor. I urge Members to adopt this amendment which promotes effective and positive responses to survivors on college campuses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, line 21, insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “Section 304”.

Page 38, after line 19, insert the following:

(b) REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES REGARDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING ON CAMPUSES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit a report to Congress on best practices regarding the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking on college campuses. This includes an evaluation of programs, events, and educational materials related to preventing acts of violence and harassment.

Preventing violence against young people on college campuses starts with education. Sharing information for best practices and guidance for educators on college campuses opens the door for collaborative work among experts in intimate partner and sexual violence prevention.

My amendment does not change the enforcement and implementation responsibilities of the Department of Education. Congress needs a report on best practices for prevention of these acts of violence, not on the agency’s recent efforts to change regulations and requirements under Title IX.

None of us can address sexual and domestic violence on our own. That is why this amendment provides a commonsense approach toward solving the problem by forcing the agency to continue to review best practices and prevention methods for combating acts of violence.

Colleges and universities, sexual violence prevention experts, and the Federal Government should share resources and information, learn from their peers, and take steps toward eradicating sexual and domestic violence altogether.

When it comes to the safety of our students, we cannot afford to work in silos. Every student deserves to feel safe in their community and we must be proactive and collaborative in our work to end sexual and domestic violence on our college campuses.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support the underlying bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. CRAIG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MRS. SCHRIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 44, line 17, strike “and stalking” and insert the following: “stalking, and children exposed to violence”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment to the Violence Against Women Act along with my colleagues, Representatives LAUREN UNDERWOOD and also Representative DONNA SHALALA.

This amendment would help increase the number of healthcare professionals who are able to assist children exposed to violence and also ensures that trauma and behavioral health specialists are included in efforts to address domestic and dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and childhood exposure to violence.

The long-term effects of childhood exposure to adverse experiences, which include domestic and sexual violence that go unaddressed, are chilling. Children exposed to violence, when they become adults, are more likely to have addictive behaviors, to drop out of school, and to be violent themselves.

The effects of these adverse experiences can be mitigated through counseling and other intervention services, which is why my amendment would require funding authorized under this section to be used to increase the number of social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, trauma specialists, and others who are trained in counseling children exposed to violence.

As a pediatrician, I know firsthand that if we treat adverse childhood experiences early, we can mitigate the costly long-term effects that occur later in life.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, which I coauthored with my colleague from Washington.

A female pediatrician and female nurse working together to write legislation, this has literally never happened before in this body.

Our amendment ensures that trauma and behavioral health specialists are included as healthcare professionals in the section of the bill intended to strengthen our healthcare system’s response to domestic violence.

Behavioral healthcare, of course, includes mental health as well as treatment for substance abuse disorders. Both are particularly important to victim survivors of domestic assault, dating violence, and stalking.

Mental healthcare can be lifesaving for domestic violence survivors. Survivors.
are three times more likely to meet criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder. They are also more likely to have suicidal thoughts and to attempt suicide. Mothers who experience domestic violence are nearly twice as likely to develop postpartum depression than those who don’t. Access for treatment for substance abuse is also critical for domestic violence survivors. Survivors experience substance abuse disorders at rates two to six times higher than average. Violence against women isn’t just a women’s issue. It is a children’s issue, it is a men’s issue, it is a family issue, and it is an economic issue. That is why it is so important that our healthcare system take a comprehensive approach to its response.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support our amendment.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, insert after line 4 the following:

SEC. 1002. REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON THE EFFECTS OF THE SHUTDOWN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the effects of the Federal Government shutdown that lasted from December 22, 2018 to January 25, 2019, evaluating and detailing the extent of the effect of the shutdown on the ability of the Department of Justice to dispense funding and services under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005, and the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the recent Federal Government shutdown was the longest in our Nation’s history. It was reckless, and it was dangerous. It hurt our Nation’s security, it hurt Federal workers, and it hurt our most vulnerable populations, including survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault.

My amendment would direct the Department of Justice to report to Congress the effects of the shutdown on DOJ’s efforts to disburse VAWA and VOCA funding. This funding provides services to prevent and respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. This amendment is in direct response to months of conversations with domestic violence and agencies that serve my community in Illinois’s 14th District and to the urgent need in all of our districts.

I am thankful to my colleagues from Illinois and Pennsylvania for their support as cosponsors.

Over the past month, we have worked to understand how the shutdown affected our ability to respond to domestic violence. Let’s be clear. Everyone wants domestic violence victims to get the support they need. But that didn’t happen during the shutdown, and we don’t know why not. We have been told there was about a 2-week period at the beginning of the shutdown where DOJ employees who help process VAWA and VOCA grants weren’t able to work. We now know about a delay in processing their funding, and we have been told that those DOJ employees were expected and allowed to return to work at some point during the shutdown.

But that isn’t enough. We need to know what happened so that we can make sure it doesn’t happen again.

I want to share the stories that I am hearing from shelters in my district about how the shutdown affected them, because their experiences are unacceptable. Family Shelter Service, a domestic violence agency, serves my constituents in DuPage County, Illinois. During the shutdown, they had to turn away 138 members of my community who were seeking safety at the shelter. Because of the shutdown, Family Shelter Service had to hold off on filling four open positions for employees that were funded by VAWA and VOCA. Three of these positions were for child care workers. The shelter reports that this directly led to a decrease in the number of children whom they were able to help.

I also represent McHenry County in Illinois. It is a big county, but it only has one domestic violence agency called Turning Point. In 2018 alone, Turning Point served more than 1,700 people, and 170 of those were children. Fifteen percent of Turning Point’s funding comes from VOCA. They shared with me that because of the shutdown, they had to stop referring survivors for individual counseling because of the lack of resources.

Now, Illinois has some supplemental sources of domestic violence funding, but many States rely almost completely on Federal funding. Failure to maintain and protect these Federal funding streams literally puts lives at risk.

Resources for domestic violence survivors and the organizations that help them have already stretched too far and too thin. It is our fiscal and moral responsibility to ensure that their funding is not interrupted again.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CASTEN OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 24, insert after “centers” the following: “and appropriate campus faculty, such as academic advisors or professionals who deal with students on a daily basis.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 36 to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

This amendment would ensure that campus faculty are trained to recognize victims of sexual and domestic violence. Specifically, this legislation amends the bill to include “appropriate campus faculty, such as academic advisors or professionals who deal with students on a daily basis” for grant training programs to recognize and respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. This would include training health providers on how to provide universal education to members of the campus community on the impacts of violence on health and unhealthy relationships and how providers can support ongoing outreach efforts.

Now, going off to school can be a wonderful opportunity for our children. But sexual and domestic violence on college campuses is horrific and must be addressed. We know that under graduate students, 23.1 percent of females and 5.4 percent of males experience rape or sexual assault during their time on campus.

But all too often, those students do not report to law enforcement. Only 20 percent of female student victims report their experience. Some don’t report because they fear reprisal, others don’t think it was important enough, and some don’t even believe that police could or would do anything to help.

We cannot eradicate sexual violence on campus if we can’t even reach the students who are being impacted. We are failing them.

That is why this amendment to include campus faculty in training programs to help them identify signs of
sexual and domestic violence is so necessary. If students feel that they cannot report these crimes, then we must have knowledgeable and trained faculty in place to provide help if it is needed.

Recently I went to a panel at Benedictine University in Illinois, and I got to hear directly from campus faculty about this specific issue and from students on the unique needs on college campuses. There are really specific challenges, as Congresswoman UNDERWOOD. We have limited but flawed procedures in place for people who need shelter when they are victims of domestic violence. That is really hard on a college campus.

What do you do for someone when they are in a dorm room and everybody knows where the dorms are on campus?

What do you do to change their schedule if there is only one section of the class they need to take?

What can schools do when a survivor doesn't have time to class?

I was honored at the time to speak with Bernadette Mulloski, Benedictine's Violence Against Women Act Grant Coordinator. She pointed out that when schools provide more information and resources for reporting and speaking openly about these issues, then it often leads to higher numbers of reports—not because violence is happening more often, but because people finally feel safe to come forward.

Now is so important for the first person that a student confides in to have an appropriate reaction, because that disclosure often has a huge impact on the survivor's healing. It is also impactful on how the student decides to move forward, either in reporting or seeking additional assistance such as counseling and support.

So if the first person does not respond with empathy and gives an indication that they don’t care or maybe doesn't want to do and doesn't know where the resources are on campus, the student may never tell another person or may struggle with that, and the perpetrator may go on to commit more violence.

On college campuses students often develop mentor relationships with faculty or staff beyond the health department that they are working with, and it is more likely that a survivor will disclose their experience to someone they are close to a stranger. That is why we have to get this right.

This amendment would provide the resources to train all of those faculty who interact with students, and by providing resources to schools so that they can individualize their response to sexual and domestic violence, we will enable them to better meet the unique challenges of those students. This is particularly true for underserved communities. Coordinated, comprehensive responses allow college communities to develop sustainable strategies to address these crimes.

For colleges and universities to curb sexual violence on campus, we must create the safe, respectful, collegiate learning and teaching environment that every student and employee deserves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment which will not only provide resources for college and university faculty, but also support that students need and deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative BASS for authoring this bill, and I thank all the tireless advocates who have worked to bring us to this day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, please support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. PORTER. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, line 24, strike “and”;
Page 15, line 12, strike the period at the end and insert “;”;
Page 15, insert after line 12 the following: “(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of this Act, nothing may be construed to preclude the term ‘domestic violence’ from including economic abuse each place the term ‘domestic violence’ occurs unless doing so would trigger an extension of effective date under section 703(c)(1)(B) of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be here today to introduce my amendment to the Violence Against Women Act, which integrates the term “economic abuse” throughout the legislation. I wrote this amendment to ensure that this largely invisible abuse is recognized federally, and victims are afforded all of the protections currently available under section 703(c)(1)(B) of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Economic abuse takes many forms, ranging from employment sabotage to malicious attempts to restrict survivor’s access to funds.

Abusers obstruct childcare and transportation options to disrupt job and academic performance, stealing victim’s keys, and leaving children intentionally unattended. They cut off access to financial information to keep their partner in a state of financial dependence and unable to leave. They commit identity theft to run up credit card debt and ruin their partner’s credit scores, taking out loans in their partner’s name that the victim knows nothing about and cannot pay off.

In intimate partner relationships, on average, physical violence victims lose 7 days of paid employment, rape victims lose 8, and stalking victims lose 10 per year.

For the rest of their lives, these survivors are less financially secure because they endured an abusive relationship.

Abusers often take advantage of their heightened degree of financial sophistication relative to their partner’s. They don’t tell their partners about the assets the couple owns, and they force their partners to sign quitclaim deeds and give up ownership in major assets like homes without knowing it. Coerced debt follows victims of domestic violence for the rest of their lives, long after they have left the relationship. It is particularly destructive in the weeks after these women leave, when they try to rent an apartment or otherwise provide for themselves financially.

Burdening a woman with economic obligations that she did not take on as she is trying to escape an abusive relationship can be as crippling to her long-term well-being as violence.

Credit repair is an almost impossible process. Expunging coerced debt from a victim’s credit report, even with existing evidence of fraud, is a nearly insurmountable task, which is why I will be introducing legislation to provide a way forward for women whose credit scores are ruined as a result of domestic violence.

I endured an abusive relationship, and three of my children and I were able to move forward with our lives, staying in our community and in our home. I had a good job; I had a strong credit history; and I was extremely engaged with our family’s financial decisions, which allowed me to leave when I needed to.

However, without a substantial safety net, many women can’t and don’t
leave. When they do leave, almost 40 percent of survivors become homeless. This is wholly unacceptable.

Until we address the full spectrum of abuse that survivors face, we won’t significantly reduce rates of domestic violence. And as long as domestic violence remains a glaringly prevalent problem in our society, we will not see gender equality.

Incorporating economic abuse into the definition of domestic violence in this landmark Federal legislation is a huge step.

I am honored to have the opportunity to carry the voices of Orange County families and survivors to the Halls of Congress. I find help to let my family rebuild our lives. A police officer who had been trained in DV because VAWA helped create the amazing, healthy children I have. I will count the passage of VAWA among my proudest achievements.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Porter).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. ROSE OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, because we are talking life and death here. This is not only a matter of believing survivors—though, to be clear, we absolutely must. This is about making sure that we empower survivors with the resources need in the 21st century.

If we apply modern-day technology to combat dating violence and sexual assault, we can keep survivors and their families safe while holding the perpetrators accountable.

It is our job to make sure that our federally funded hotlines can serve in the most effective way. We need to get this done because, at the end of the day, this amendment will save lives.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rose).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MALOWINSKI) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSE of New York, 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. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

IN SUPPORT OF VAWA

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA.

I rise today to bring our stories out of the shadows. Let us reject the myth that strong women, bold women, independent women do not find themselves in the throes of violence at the hands of someone who claims to love them.

My mother, my shero, found herself in such an abusive relationship, one that threatened her physical safety and her sanity, and chipped away at her dignity and her joy.

As a child, to witness the abuse and degradation of the person who is your world, your everything, it is an image, a feeling, that never leaves.

To the millions of women who find themselves in the shoes of my mother and to the countless daughters who find themselves looking on: I see you. I am fighting for you and all the Sandys out there.

Mom, Sandy, depending on the day, was beaten for being too pretty, too ugly, too smart, too dumb. This man beat my mother’s limbs and tried to beat down her spirit. His abuse was the deepest of betrayals.

For the stories that we share here today, if they make people uncomfortable, good. Let that discomfort lead to. transformation, transformation in our discourse, transformation in our lawmaking, and a renewed commitment to our shared humanity.

No more.

Mommy, this one is for you.

AMERICA’S ECONOMIC FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I promise not to go 60 minutes.

Continuing the series we have been trying to do on a much more, shall we call it, wholistic policy of how to get a sort of unified theory of what will make America’s economy, opportunity, our ability to pay for our promises, particularly over the next 30-some years, when our baby boomers are in their retirement years.

This is, actually, sort of just another module on trying to help sell, educate, convince, cajole, on that idea.

We always start with this particular poster now that our belief is you sort of have five pillars on what we must do...
almost immediately to have the economic growth and the mechanics to be able to keep our promises.

Remember, basic math: We have 74 million baby boomers. We are now about halfway through that 18-year cycle turning 65. In 8½ years is the final portion of the baby boom turning 65. In 8½ years, half the spending, less interest, coming out of this body, so 50 percent of the spending will be to those 65 and older. In 8½ years, there will be two workers for every retiree.

Understand what this means: If we don’t have substantial economic growth, substantial incentives to stay in the workforce, and also a really disruptive cost curve in parts of healthcare, I defy you to make the math work.

So we have actually sort of laid out five principles of policy, and within those policies, there are lots of moving parts. We are going to talk a little bit more of sort of the technology disruption, but we are going to talk the other half of it from what we did 2 weeks ago.

But growth: What do you do in a tax system? What do you do with trade? What do you do with smart regulations?

I have done presentations here about crowdsourcing data as a much more elegant way to regulate; using block chain to collect data in financial markets so you could actually have a much more rational, much more reactive, much faster regulatory environment.

We also have on here, I use the term, “population stability.” Remember what has happened to the United States birth rates and where we are going and where we are predicted to go.

In the last 10 years, there are 4 million children that we expected who are not here. That is functionally 4 full years of immigration in 10. Are we willing to actually say it is time to go to a talent-based immigration system with some flexibility in there to maximize population stability? And on the other end, are we willing to also adopt public policy that encourages family formation?

It is math, and it is math about the economic robustness of this society.

Earned benefits: We are going to have to find ways that, as we keep our promises—Social Security, if we keep our promises on Medicare, are there inducements, incentives we can produce to say: Are you willing to stay in the workforce longer, part-time? If you are healthy, happy, capable, we want you. It makes a difference.

Are we able to give you certain incentives to postpone taking benefits to actually help yourself, but also help the programs as they function?

And then the last one under our five pillars is employment. How do we maximize our society, participation in the workforce?

You know, we still have some data issues on millennial males. What can we do to help them get into the workforce?

As you know, last December, we finally had a real breakthrough in some of the data—we call it the U–6—employment data on millennial females moving into the workforce. That is part of it.

We also want to encourage older Americans to stay in the workforce if that is their choice.

But we also are starting to see something that is really exciting in the labor statistics—I am sorry I am seeing out, and I know I am sounding like an accountant on steroids, but these things are really important—is our handicapped brothers and sisters. People who have actually had substance abuse and other types of issues are actually moving back into the workforce.

Behind this microphone I have talked about even the things going on in Arizona right now, where we actually have private, paid-for job training in our prisons because there is such a labor shortage, there is such a skilled labor shortage in our community. That is actually working for us.

I mean, if you care about people, where we are at right now, our ability to draw our brothers and sisters into the labor force for that honor of work is an amazing thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF UNITED STATES ARMY SERGEANT JOSEPH P. COLLETTE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

I rise today to commemorate one of America’s heroes, United States Army Sergeant Joseph P. Collette of Lancaster, Ohio.

Sergeant Collette gave his life in the service of our Nation on March 22, 2019, while serving in Afghanistan with the 242nd Ordnance Battalion, 71st Explosive Ordnance Disposal Group. Serving with the United States Army was a goal for Sergeant Collette. On September 11, Sergeant Collette was only 11 years old, but on that tragic day he felt the call of service. It is that bravery, selflessness, and commitment that Sergeant Collette will be remembered for.

A man of many talents, he loved sharing his passion for cooking with others and challenging his friends to paintball matches and Pokemon battles.

He loved spending time outdoors, but he loved nothing more than spending time with his friends and family, and his legacy will live on in their memories.

As a brigadier general in the Ohio Army National Guard, I have been privileged to serve alongside men and women like Sergeant Collette. I can say without a doubt that Lancaster, Ohio, and our Nation is a better and safer place as a result of his service.

I am honored to celebrate his life and legacy, and my heart goes out to his entire family.

This country needs to recognize heroes like Joseph Collette, so I hope that we all will take a moment of silence to recognize the life of Joey Collette.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, local heroes are always hard to do, particularly, you know, when you want to reach out to the families in your community and deal with those really difficult moments. So I appreciate the gentleman, and I am always happy to yield. He has always been very kind to me here.

All right. Back on to trying to help do our theme here. And I know it is a little sarcastic, but it is sort of meant to have a little impact. We interest the joke that we are operating in a math-free zone, and it is a great frustration.

One of the neat things that has happened over these first couple of months as we have been doing this sort of unified theory pitch—and we keep trying to say it is not Republican or Democrat. It is math. A number of my friends from the left have actually started to stop by the office, particularly on the technology, which I am very excited about. And I have shown this; I am going to keep showing it—2008 to 2028, 91 percent of the increased spending—so when you see that curve going up between that 2008 and 2028, 91 percent, Social Security, healthcare entitlements.

Social Security, the healthcare entitlements, and interest—91 percent of the growth in spending for those 20 years.

So when we get here behind these microphones and we are often talking about this or that, understand the vast majority of what is driving our spending are our demographics. Our demographics are what drives Social Security, Medicare, because there is a revolution happening around us.

So let’s actually sort of move on to one or two more boards just to make sure that we have built the argument. On this particular board—and I have shown this; I am going to keep showing it—2008 to 2028, 91 percent of the increased spending—so when you see that curve going up between that 2008 and 2028, 91 percent, Social Security, healthcare entitlements.

So this particular slide is really important for us to get our heads around, and this is the other side.

In the previous couple of weeks, we have done a series of presentations here on the floor about the technology that is coming on everything from wearables to autonomous healthcare to being able to instantly have your flu diagnosed, and can we build a system, if we would take down some of the barriers, what barrier that instantly your antivirals can be delivered to you.

Think about blowing into something that looks like a flu kazoo. It diagnoses you. It pings off your personal medical records and instantly can override those antivirals. How much healthier, how much more time do you have for your life, for your family?
These are the types of disruptions we as a body—and it is not Republican or Democrat. It is where technology is leading us, to make our lives more convenient. That precious commodity of time is given back to you, and we become healthier as a society while bending our costs.

Well, this particular slide makes it very clear that we actually believe about 75 percent of all of our spending—and we get this, I believe, from the Centers for Disease Control. Seventy-five percent of our healthcare spending is for chronic conditions.

Okay. So we actually know where our spending concentration is. So how do we start to have a disruption in that?

And if you actually look at the growth of healthcare, this is basically our spending in 2001 to 2017. But you see that line just growing and growing and growing.

Well, a lot of that, we will immediately get people who say: Well, that is pharmaceutical prices. Well, that is that. That is this.

It is substantially our demographics and then the procedures that come along with that aging in society.

We are in the future, if there is a request for it, we will bring some of those boards and actually do more breakdown. But it is just understanding we cannot survive if this line continues to follow in this fashion.

Additionally, I am just understanding these categories—and I am going to push this back just a little bit because this particular board may be unreadable from a distance, but it is really important.

What we are trying to explain here is, the green bars, the small bars, think of these as chronic conditions that have never been diagnosed; the blue are where they have been diagnosed; and the total cost in our society.

When you look at this, what would happen if I could come to you and say, for a number of these, there are ways to manage hypertension. There are ways for someone like myself that is a pretty severe asthmatic to manage my asthma. There may be cures on the very short horizon coming for many of the diseases we consider chronic conditions.

Part of what I want to talk about tonight is the second half: How do we finance these chronic conditions? What happens if we start to cure them, or at least a portion of them?

There has got to be a formula we can come up with as a society where we continue to encourage these incredible miracle disruptions that are on the horizon. We need more of them because they start to solve this chart’s problem.

Remember the previous one, the pie chart. Seventy-five percent of our spending, functionally, is within those chronic conditions. What happens if we start to cure them, or at least a portion of them?

It is time this body stops having the crazy debate we have had here for the last 10 years, which is the ACA. It is even our Republican alternative, which I believe had some great things in it.

But we have been having this debate about who gets to pay. We have not been having the discussion, the intellectually honest discussion of what do we do to pay less and provide more?

That is my goal here. If these miracle biologicals, if these miracle genetic treatments, are coming, how do we get them adopted into our society as fast as possible?

In many ways, as we saw in the first phase of the hep C cure—what was the drug, Sovaldi? In that first year, year and a half, it cost $84,000, I believe, but it cured hepatitis C, meaning you did not need a liver transplant. But what happened? We had a number of our State Medicaid systems that were on the verge of going bankrupt.

The difference in that sort of pharmaceutical is you had time before someone became symptomatic where liver transplant was indicated. And then we knew there was a second pharmaceutical with some of the same efficacy coming.

Now what happens when there is not going to be a second drug, because it is a small population or it had such stunning research costs?

We need to think through how we finance disruptions of these pharmaceuticals and how do we get fair pricing so the research continues. We incentivize that, but also a fair pricing to society, which is willing to put on debt for a quick adoption and then use the future savings.

We understand, what is neat about this, if you actually look at these diagnoses with serious chronic conditions, a number of them can be partially benefited by technology.

Once again, I am a pretty severe asthmatic. We have played with a couple of contraptions that help me manage my blood oxygen.

What happens if that contraption can talk to my phone and say: “Hey, David, this morning, you really need to take two puffs of your inhaled steroid.”

“Hey, David, we are doing some calculations. Today, you don’t.”

As you have already seen, you may even have family members who are now reading off their phones about their diabetes, because they have a port that is reading their blood glucose.

Technology can help us manage a number of these chronic conditions to move them so they are not catastrophic, but they are not catastrophic for the individual and not expensive for society.

If you have hypertension, how many of you may have an arrhythmia that you now have a watch that will help you manage? Those are on the technology side.

On some of these, it is the curative that I really wanted to get into our understanding, the other half of the miracle disruption that is coming in healthcare.

We need, as policymakers, to understand these are the benefits we are now yielding because of a lot of really good policy decisions this body made over the last few years.

Let’s move on to a couple more boards to try to help this argument become a little more robust.

This was the best one I had, but let’s go back to the hemophilia discussion.

Can we use this example that is on our immediate horizon? I believe they are already well in or through their phase III. They have had,
apparently, just from even the latest article I pulled up a couple days ago, amazing efficacy. It is curative for the vast majority of the population, something we never really thought of.

Are we ready as a society to say: Can we build this box of how we finance these technologies?

Let’s walk through a couple others. How many of you have heard of some of the gene therapies where we can turn on your immune system, but we turn on this normally somehow—well, the medical researchers, by understanding the type of cancer you have, looking at that cancer and saying, hey, here are the receptors that your immune system would do the most efficient—how do I describe it?—the most efficient method of killing those cancers. What if that costs $250,000, $500,000, but it cures?

How about in some of these cases? Now we are looking at this particular one. This is from earlier in the year or late in 2018, a pharmaceutical biological that changes a genetic form of blindness. You are born with this blindness on your DNA, and it recodes your DNA and brings back a substantial portion of your sight. What is the value of that?

There are some unique things. I believe it may be within this gene editing. Actually, it is really expensive. I think it may have been $400,000 or $500,000 for a certain number of the patients. It was almost only paid if we hit a certain level of returning your sight.

What happens when we are able to do more of this, that it is more than just a disease you have developed, and we are actually recoding parts of your own personal genome to deal with a genetic blindness that you were born with? How much does this help society? How much, as a society, are we willing to pay?

When we pay it, is there a way we can have a financing mechanism that the adoption of such miracles happen quickly, and we can reap the benefits in future time? That is the concept for the healthcare bond.

Let’s take one that actually is near and dear to me. I am from the desert Southwest. I am from the Phoenix-Scottsdale area. I live in a little community called Fountain Hills, a wonderful part of the country. I am incredibly blessed for the community I get to represent and live in.

But from the desert areas of California through Maricopa County, Phoenix, Pinal, all the way down to the Tucson area, we have fungi in the soil. We call it Valley Fever.

We believe one out of three people who go to a hospital believing they have pneumonia actually have the fungi, have Valley Fever in their lungs.

For a small fraction of the population, they don’t just feel like they had pneumonia for a week or 2 or 3. They get something. I believe the term is “undifferentiated,” where it breaks out and ends up in your bones.

I have a neighbor, a former Vietnam helicopter pilot, one of the greatest human beings you can ever meet. His hands have been cut up from when they had to go in and remove the fungi that is growing in his bones.

Leader McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, because I represent and myself in the Scottsdale-Phoenix area, a few years ago, we started a Valley Fever Caucus for those of us who live in the desert Southwest. We have had some amazing success.

We have been able to bring some resources. We have gotten the folks back East here to understand this very unique regional disease we have. We were able to move some money, and all of a sudden, we now are hearing that we may be 3 years from a vaccine for animals.

This particular disease killed my dog, Charlie, a few years ago.

But after the vaccine for our canines and our pets, it is only a short time afterward, the most significant distribution of years, that we will collect enough data that we will have fungi vaccine for something called Valley Fever for those of us who live in the desert Southwest.

These are examples. We believe a disease like that ultimately costs billions in our communities for hospital visits, for sick days, for all the things that go with that.

What is the value of a vaccine that is being developed for an orphan disease like that most folks back East have never even heard of?

We have succeeded at moving the resources around here in Congress over the last few years to start these miracles of the genomic and the other types of research that are bringing these miracles here.

Back to our primary conversation. As we age as a society, our biggest cost driver, particularly over the next 30 years, is healthcare. We have done presentations here the last few weeks on the technology miracles that are coming, where you can manage your own health. You don’t have to be part of the collective. You can manage your own health and have incredible data. But we are going to have to break down some of the old silos, some of the old legislative barriers, some of the barriers to entry.

The other half of that is how we continue to encourage these disruptive biologicals, these disruptive genomics, these disruptive drugs that are curative.

The one that was in our office a couple weeks ago, talking about ALS, is probably going to be a couple shots a year, but it will free you. You will hold steady. So it is not curative, but it stops the regression and the progression of the disease. What is the value to that in our society?

These are big deals. As I reach out to my Republican brothers and sisters and my Democrats, help those of us who understand these cures are not Republican or Democrat. We as a society must come up with the mechanisms that bring them out, finance them, and then understand the debate here must be about what we are doing to change the price curve of healthcare at the same time our demographics are getting much older very, very, very fast. We have to do that.

It is a much more elegant discussion than the absolutely ridiculous discussion that continues to go on here because it works in our partisan format where everything here has been weaponized now politically. Let’s have a fine debate on who gets to pay, how much government subsidy should you receive.

Let’s do something really creative. Let’s start lowering the price by bringing technology, by bringing other channels of excising new pharmaceuticals, and even down to things that are affecting the folks in my neighborhood, a disease like Valley Fever, where I now get to go home and say we worked on it a few years ago. We were not optimistic, but we kept working and we kept working and we kept working. There are people down at the University of Arizona Center for Excellence on Valley Fever.

There are researchers at NAU. There are researchers in California who are now almost there.

There should be joy in this body when you start to think about the cusp we are on. Will Congress be looked at by someone 10, 20 years from now, saying they did policy that actually made these things happen faster? Or will we continue to exist in a world where the way we reimburse, the way we finance, the barriers to entry of the technology, we slowed down the disruption that could have helped us lower healthcare costs?

These are the things we are fixated on, because remember our five points: We must have the robust economic growth. We must have the labor force participation. We must do the incentives to, if someone wishes to stay in the labor force and delay parts of their retirement, how do we reward that? We must do these others, but we also must push these technologies, because our biggest fragility is the healthcare costs.

I think there are some great things about to happen. Look, that is a portion of the presentation. Hopefully, in a couple weeks, we are going to come back and we are going to do something much more technical—I am sorry; I know that is really exciting—on some of those incentives to stay in the workforce. But we need to understand, if you have a complicated problem and someone walks up to you and gives you a really simple solution, it is absolutely wrong, because complicated problems require complicated solutions.

That is where we are headed. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
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NATIONAL DONATE LIFE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize April as National Donate Life Month and the awareness one Louisiana family has brought to organ donation through the tragic loss of their son.

On May 5, 2015, the Perry family, from Monroe, welcomed twin babies, John Clarke and Ella, up the world. All was fine and well for the twins until John Clarke was given the fatal diagnosis of a brain bleed shortly after their 6-month checkup. On November 29, 2015, John Clarke passed away at only 6 months old.

Before his death, his parents, Jonathan and Holley, were approached about donating John Clarke's organs, to which they agreed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize April as National Donate Life Month and the awareness one Louisiana family has brought to organ donation through the tragic loss of their son.

On May 5, 2015, the Perry family, from Monroe, welcomed twin babies, John Clarke and Ella, up the world. All was fine and well for the twins until John Clarke was given the fatal diagnosis of a brain bleed shortly after their 6-month checkup. On November 29, 2015, John Clarke passed away at only 6 months old.

Before his death, his parents, Jonathan and Holley, were approached about donating John Clarke's organs, to which they agreed.

Organ donation as a final act of compassion.

In 2018, 36,528 organ transplants were performed, a record high for the sixth consecutive year. On average, one organ can save up to eight lives. Through organ donation, John Clarke saved two children's lives.

The sequence of events could have only been handcrafted by God, organ donations have saved lives across the world on a daily basis.

Like so many donors, John Clarke is remembered by his family for his big blue eyes and sweet smile, a smile his parents say grew bigger every time the LSU Tigers scored a touchdown. In 2018, 36,528 organ transplants were performed, a record high for the sixth consecutive year. On average, one organ can save up to eight lives. Through organ donation, John Clarke saved two children's lives.

Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize the unspeakable tragedy that the Perrys faced and their incredibly brave decision to donate John Clarke's organs.

Through this heartbreaking decision, John Clarke became a hero.

Today, John Clarke is remembered by his family for his big blue eyes and sweet smile, a smile his parents say grew bigger every time the LSU Tigers scored. In 2018, 36,528 organ transplants were performed, a record high for the sixth consecutive year. On average, one organ can save up to eight lives. Through organ donation, John Clarke saved two children's lives.

New York has passed a law that allows abortions at any time—at any time. That is outrageous, especially considering that many babies can live outside the womb around 20 weeks.

Virginia tried to pass a similar law. Virginia Governor Ralph Northam, a Democrat, who argued babies could be killed after birth if the mother had preferred to abort it rather than to birth it, said:

"The infant would be delivered. The infan would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that's what the mother and family desired. And then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother." That is disgusting. That is an endorsement of a murder of a helpless child, and we cannot stand for that.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act, which requires that babies who survive abortions be given the same standard of care as any person in medical need.

This is a common-sense approach because a baby is a person. Doctors are sworn to help those in need, and I cannot fathom how any medical provider could watch a helpless baby struggling outside the womb after she survives an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mason Andrews, an 18-year-old from Monroe, Louisiana, who was recently recognized by the Guinness Book of World Records as the youngest pilot to circumnavigate the globe.

Mason is a junior at Louisiana Tech University who set off on his trip around the world on July 22 and returned October 6 of 2018. He flew for 76 days in the spirit of Louisiana, a 1976 Piper Lance PA-32 single-engine aircraft. Mason made over 20 stops around the world, including Dubai, Paris, and Taiwan. His longest leg of the journey was the 14-hour, 2,150-mile stretch from Japan to Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mason Andrews, an 18-year-old from Monroe, Louisiana, who was recently recognized by the Guinness Book of World Records as the youngest pilot to circumnavigate the globe.

Mason is a junior at Louisiana Tech University who set off on his trip around the world on July 22 and returned October 6 of 2018. He flew for 76 days in the spirit of Louisiana, a 1976 Piper Lance PA-32 single-engine aircraft. Mason made over 20 stops around the world, including Dubai, Paris, and Taiwan. His longest leg of the journey was the 14-hour, 2,150-mile stretch from Japan to Alaska.

Mason flew not only to break a world record, but to raise awareness and funds for MedCamps of Louisiana. MedCamps of Louisiana is a free summer camp for children with heart, kidney, or liver disabilities or illnesses, such as autism, spina bifida, and Down syndrome.

Mason has served as a camp counselor for 3 years with MedCamps of Louisiana and raised over $30,000 for the camp. To raise these funds and to break the world record, Mason overcame all obstacles he faced, including a sandstorm over Saudi Arabia and two Category 5 typhoons that kept him grounded for the better part of five days.

I am proud of what Mason was able to accomplish and how he has represented the great State of Louisiana. From one pilot to another, I congratulate Mason on his incredible achievement and look forward to what he will accomplish next.

BORN-ALIVE SURVIVOR PROTECTION

Mr. Speaker, I rise today about something that has really been weighing on my mind, and that is the disturbing push for late-term abortions we have been seeing around the country.

I am a doctor by trade. I have delivered many babies myself. I have seen babies in the womb on ultrasound winces in pain, and I have seen them comforted by their mother's voice. Baby is that every bit as alive then as he or she is when a mother gets to hold her or him for the first time.

I believe that at conception, I believe adoption is always better than abortion. And I certainly believe that delivering a baby in the third trimester is far better for both the mother and the baby than a late-term abortion, which brings me back to why I wanted to speak tonight.

The disturbing trend of codifying protections for late-term abortions must stop, and it will take Federal action to ban it across the entire country.

We see what is happening at the State level:

New York has passed a law that allows abortions at any time—at any time. That is outrageous, especially considering that many babies can live outside the womb around 20 weeks.

Virginia tried to pass a similar law. Virginia Governor Ralph Northam, a Democrat, who argued babies could be killed after birth if the mother had preferred to abort it rather than to birth it, said:

"The infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that's what the mother and family desired. And then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother." That is disgusting. That is an endorsement of a murder of a helpless child, and we cannot stand for that.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act, which requires that babies who survive abortions be given the same standard of care as any person in medical need.

This is a common-sense approach because a baby is a person. Doctors are sworn to help those in need, and I cannot fathom how any medical provider could watch a helpless baby struggling outside the womb after she survives an abortion.

Even still, Democrats are standing in the way of ending this heinous practice. Republicans have tried nearly 30 times to bring to the floor a vote on the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act, and Democrats have blocked it every single time.

Thankfully, my colleagues, STEVE SCALISE from my great State of Louisiana and ANN WAGNER, have introduced a discharge petition to go around the Democratic leadership and force a vote on this important bill.

I have signed the petition, and my prayer is that the Chamber can come together in a bipartisan way to state firmly that the United States of America does not believe in killing babies, especially after they are born.

Critics say that it is a woman's choice and that politicians are interfering. If a baby is crying and he is crying out for help in an operating room, that is a person, an individual who is entitled to the same life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness that every American is entitled to. Only the individual can decide that path forward for themselves; it is not the choice of anyone else; it is not the choice of anyone else; it is not the choice of anyone else.

That is disgusting. That is an endorsement of a murder of a helpless child, and we cannot stand for that.

They say this bill is unnecessary because it is already law, pointing to the 2002 Born-Alive Infants Protection Act which codified into law that any person born alive in any stage of development is a legal person. Since that time, however, there have been cases where abortion providers do not consider a baby born if it survives an abortion.

The Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act ends all debate and further protects babies who survive abortions. The Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act is a literal matter of life and death. It is about the core values of what we as
Americans and every single politician in State and Federal Government should clearly and definitely know: where we stand on this important bill. My position is clear: I stand with the babies. I stand with life.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 276. An act to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion agreed to: accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:


598. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Xozamide; Pesticide Tolerances (EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0666; FRL-9996-77) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

599. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promotion of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Delegation of Authority of the Federal Plan for Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Agreements (EPA-TRAN-02-2017-0055; FRL-9991-56-Region 3) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

600. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations; Consistency Update for Delaware (EPA-TRAN-02-2017-0065; FRL-9996-32-Region 4) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

601. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Approval and Conditional Approval of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Regional Haze Plan Quality Assurance; Stationary Source Permits (EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0481; FRL-9991-53-Region 9) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

602. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Approval of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Regional Haze Plan Quality Assurance; Stationary Source Permits (EPA-R02-OAR-2019-0058; FRL-9996-11-Region 4) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

603. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Approval of Regional Haze Plan Quality Assurance; Stationary Source Permits (EPA-R10-OAR-2019-0459; FRL-9996-32-Region 9) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

604. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Colorado; Approval of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Regional Haze Plan Quality Assurance; Stationary Source Permits (EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0437; FRL-9991-52-Region 8) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

605. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Approval of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Regional Haze Plan Quality Assurance; Stationary Source Permits (EPA-R07-OAR-2018-0616; FRL-9996-31-Region 1) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

606. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Xozamide; Pesticide Tolerances (EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0666; FRL-9996-77) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 595(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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 Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. McKINLEY):

H.R. 245. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Home Energy Savings Retrofit Rebate Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. TRETTEL):

H.R. 2441. A bill to accelerate smart building development and, for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. BROWN of New York, Mr. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MOORE, Mr. COHN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MENG,

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Reintegration Administration and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself, Mr. McCaul, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 regarding energy diplomacy and security within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2457. A bill to require annual reports on allied contributions to the common defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JUDY Chu of California, Mr. MCCAUL of California, Mr. CHILLIAN of Nevada, Mr. GREER of Alabama, Mr. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MENG,
H.R. 2048. A bill to prohibit the pricing of consumer products and services that are substantially similar if such products or services are priced differently based on the gender of the individuals for whose use the products are intended or marketed or for whom the services are performed or offered; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2049. A bill to reduce the amount of foreign assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras based on the number of unaccompanied alien children who are nationals or citizens of such countries and who in the preceding fiscal year are placed in Federal custody, including their removal from such custody status; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YARMOUTH (for himself, Ms. CASTRO-CETZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEGETTE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MERRI, Mr. GOMEZ, and Ms. MCCULLUM):

H.R. 2050. A bill to place a moratorium on permitting for mountaintop removal coal mining until health studies are conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. MOLINARI):

H.R. 2051. A bill to provide for Federal coordination of activities supporting sustainable chemistry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COMER:

H.R. 2052. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to a portion of the Wendell H. Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. GLENN, Mr. CASTRO, Ms. GONZALEZ, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HUMMEL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BASS, Mrs. BRATTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BUTLER of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLIFFER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEMINGS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOE-NAH, Mr. DAVIS of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORSEFORD, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRION, Mr. KENNY of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWINS of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEeks, Mr. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. O'KEEFE, Mr. PAINE, Mr. PELOSI, Mr. PLASKETT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SOWELL, of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VESSEY, Ms. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZE, and Ms. WILKIE):

H.R. 2053. A bill to provide assistance in persistent poverty counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STOS (for herself, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

H.R. 2054. A bill to honor the service and sacrifice of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. BASS, Mr. BASS, Ms. BASS, Ms. BEYER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. BROWN of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DENVER, Mr. DESCHAMPS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FINKELSTEN, Mr. FISK, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GARCIA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GIBSON of Georgia, Ms. GILLESPIE, Mr. GORE of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2055. A bill to provide an increased allocation of funding under certain programs for assistance in persistent poverty counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZE):

H.R. 2056. A bill to recognize and honor the service and sacrifice of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2057. A bill to direct the Attorney General to enter into an agreement with the National Academies to conduct a study to develop guidelines, best practices, and examples for congressional redistricting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK (for himself and Mr. LOCABARDE):

H.R. 2058. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to remove certain restrictions on intergovernmental and public relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself and Mr. FINCK):

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the second generation biofuel producer credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Ms. CHEW, Ms. STEFANIE, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 2060. A bill to direct the President to provide oversight over talks between the United States and the Taliban, limit the use of funds to reduce the total number of members of the Armed Forces who are deployed to Afghanistan until certain conditions on the ground are fulfilled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEERA (for himself, Mr. CABERAL, Ms. CLARK of New York, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. WILD, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2061. A bill to facilitate the efforts of States to establish auto-enrollment systems to enroll certain individuals in health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. MILLIN, Ms. DELBEHE, Mr. WALLACE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASTOR of Georgia, Ms. HISON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOUTON, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. STOZZI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PASCULLI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BILIRIKIS, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 2062. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. VILA, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2063. A bill to prohibit the President or a Federal agency from constructing, operating, or offering wholesale or retail services to broadband networks without authorization from Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require manufacturers of certain drugs, devices, biologicals, and medical supplies to report on product samples provided to certain health care providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2065. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase usage of the Federal student loan income-based repayment plan and improve repayment options for borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 2067. A bill to improve the coordination of programs to provide trade capacity building assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
police and law enforcement forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Mr. LOFgren): H.R. 2059. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for drug manufacturer price transparency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself, Ms. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TRONE): H.R. 2064. A bill to provide grants to State, local, territorial, and tribal law enforcement agencies to purchase chemical screening devices to enable law enforcement personnel to use chemical screening devices in order to enhance law enforcement efficiency and protect law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia: H.R. 2071. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the sale, purchase, shipment, receipt, or possession of a firearm or ammunition by a user of medical marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. STAUBE): H.R. 2072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the charitable mileage rate for business travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself and Mr. MARCHANT): H.R. 2073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 7.5 percent adjusted gross income floor for the medical expense deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. COLE): H.R. 2074. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the label of a drug that is intended for human use and contains an ingredient that is derived directly or indirectly from a gluten-containing grain to identify each such ingredient, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABATINI (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. UPTON): H.R. 2075. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize school-based health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRIER (for herself and Mr. STEVENS): H.R. 2076. A bill to establish a demonstration program to explore effective practices to improve early detection and management of infantile or potential abuse in infants under the age of 7 months, in order to prevent future cases of child abuse and related fatalities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. BASS): H.R. 2077. A bill to galvanize United States Government programs in support of brain health for global victims of autism, hydrocephalus and Alzheimer’s and other forms of dementia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOMACK: H.R. 2078. A bill to prohibit the sale of food that is, or contains, unsafe potato seeds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. DREUCH, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. LEWIS): H.Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MENDO): H.Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. DUFFY): H.Res. 266. A resolution recognizing over 85 years of successful State-based alcohol regulation since the creation of an effective system of independent beer, wine, and spirits distribution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GAETZ (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida): H.Res. 268. A resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green Real Deal; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Armed Services, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN: H. Res. 269. A resolution condemning the Nation of Brunei’s criminalization of lesbians, gay, bisexual, and trans gender individuals and imposition of cruel and disproportionately severe forms of punishment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH: H.R. 2043. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WALSH: H.R. 2044. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WENSTRA: H.R. 2045. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WRIGHT: H.R. 2046. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER: H.R. 2047. 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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS: H.R. 2048. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH: H.R. 2049. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. YARMUTH: H.R. 2050. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LIPINSKI: H.R. 2051. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COMER: H.R. 2052. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7. To establish Post Offices and Roads.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California: H.R. 2053. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7. To establish Post Offices and Roads.

By Mr. CICILLINE: H.R. 2054. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 2055. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2066. 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 18 of the United States Constitution. By Mr. MCDERMITY:

H.R. 2067. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution. By Mr. GUESS:

H.R. 2068. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution. By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2070. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Ms. MCDERMITY:

H.R. 2071. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution. By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 2072. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 2073. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2074. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2075. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 2076. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2077. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2078. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. TING:

H.R. 2079. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 2080. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress). By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 2081. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2082. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2083. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2084. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution. By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 2085. 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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2086. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. By Mr. GUESS:

H.R. 2087. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States. By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2088. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States. By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 2089. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States. By Mr. LAMM:

H.R. 2090. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 2091. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution. By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 2092. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8. By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 2093. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2094. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8. By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2095. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 2096. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2097. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8. By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2098. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8. By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 2099. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. Foster.

H.R. 9: Ms. Garcia of Texas, Mr. Kind, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. McAdams, Mr. Loeb, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Foster, Mr. Force, Mr. Broun, Mr. Kerry, Mr. Larsen of Connecticut, Ms. Torres Small of New Mexico, Mr. Trone, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Suozzi, Ms. McCol- lum, Mr. Visco, Mr. Bass, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Himes, Ms. Lofgren, Ms.oulahan, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Sires, Ms. Adams, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Butterfield, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Sherrill, Mr. Desaulnier, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. Payne, Ms. Pressley, Mr. Fucan, Mrs. Carter, Mr. Horsford, Mr. Lawson of Flor- ida, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Kim, Mr. Sherman, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Costa, Mr. Sarban, Mr. Kanno, Mr. Tanaka, and Mr. Ears.

H.R. 35: Ms. Spanberger.


H.R. 99: Mr. Shumkin.

H.R. 141: Mr. Himes.

H.R. 149: Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. Coven, Mr. Cleaver, Ms. Tlair, Mr. San Nicolás, and Mr. Heck.

H.R. 205: Mr. Soto.

H.R. 303: Ms. Stefanik.

H.R. 375: Mr. Gallego and Mr. Kratling.

H.R. 389: Miss Rice of New York.


H.R. 462: Mr. Shalala.

H.R. 500: Ms. Stevens, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Fischmann.

H.R. 510: Mr. Cook.

H.R. 530: Mr. Cox of California.

H.R. 533: Ms. Mucarsel-Powell, Ms. Haaland, and Mr. Raskin.

H.R. 582: Ms. Spanberger.

H.R. 585: Mr. Cohen.

H.R. 587: Mr. Chellshaw.

H.R. 594: Mr. Raskin.

H.R. 597: Mr. Durchti.

H.R. 600: Mr. Van Drew.

H.R. 615: Mr. Price of North Carolina and Mr. Zeldin.

H.R. 643: Mr. Raskin.

H.R. 647: Mr. Barr, Mr. Rouda, and Ms. Porter.

H.R. 649: Mr. Meeks, Mr. Trone, and Mr. Welch.

H.R. 692: Mr. Marchant.

H.R. 712: Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Heck, and Mr. Moult.

H.R. 728: Mr. Kind and Mr. Harder of Cali- fornia.

H.R. 788: Mr. Stehul.

H.R. 826: Mr. McCaul.

H.R. 874: Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Kim.

H.R. 849: Mr. Culline.

H.R. 891: Mr. Suozzi and Mr. Krishnamoorthi.

H.R. 873: Ms. Pressley.

H.R. 943: Mr. Bred, Mr. Sprow, Mr. Sprow, and Mr. East正义.

H.R. 946: Ms. Scanlon and Ms. Slotkin.

H.R. 978: Mr. Cummings.

H.R. 988: Ms. Titts, Mr. Heck, and Ms. Meng.

H.R. 1019: Mr. Raskin.

H.R. 1034: Mrs. Roby.

H.R. 1035: Mrs. Ray.

H.R. 1058: Mrs. Hayes and Mr. Marchant.

H.R. 1066: Mr. Duffy.

H.R. 1086: Mr. Burgess, Mr. Carter of Georgia, and Mr. Wittman.

H.R. 1139: Mr. Zeldin and Mr. Sarbanes.

H.R. 1140: Mr. Pappas, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Velázquez, and Mr. O’Haller.

H.R. 1142: Mr. Raskin.

H.R. 1191: Ms. Pingree.
The Senate met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:
Let us pray.
O God, our hope for years to come, guide our lawmakers on each step of their pilgrimage. Make them supreme in compassion, mercy, and love, in fellowship with one another and their constituents.
Lord, bring them more and more into oneness with You and obedience to Your commands. Fill them with the spirit of Your peace. In their weakness, give strength. In intenseness, give serenity. In discouragement, grant hope. And in weariness, bring rest. Work through them to fulfill Your will for our Nation and world.
We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The majority leader of the Senate is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 7
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
A bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the Calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.
The bill will be placed on the calendar on the next legislative day.

NATO
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first I want to take a moment to thank NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg for his remarks at this morning's joint session of Congress. I am proud that the Secretary General could be here with us in Washington as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization celebrates its 70th anniversary this week.
It is no exaggeration to say that over these seven decades, with steady American leadership, NATO shaped world history for the better. The proud history of alliance and solidarity has paid huge dividends to NATO's member states and to the world.
NATO, with American leadership, kept the peace and created the conditions for an unprecedented period of prosperity for the United States, as well as its allies. It has deterred major Soviet and Russian aggression and prevented a third world war.
When communism's Iron Curtain fell over much of the world, we stood together for democracy. When the post-Cold War transformation could have rolled Eastern and Central Europe, we stood together for stability. When brutal killers trampled human rights in the Balkans, we stood together for innocent lives. And when terrorist fanatics killed thousands of Americans on September 11, we stood together for freedom. NATO allies remain with our troops in Afghanistan to this very day.
It is essential that we keep the alliance healthy and strong. The threats we face are numerous, and not least among them, in a kind of throwback to the alliance's founding, is an assertive Russia that has barely even pretended to honor international commitments, brazenly violated arms control agreements, invaded and occupied Ukraine and Georgia, and conducted cyber operations and so-called active measures against NATO allies. As President Trump has made it clear, keeping NATO strong means that all allies must commit to NATO's collective security.
For our own part, after years of President Obama's defense cuts, the United States has turned the corner on defense spending, investing more in readiness and modernization. We need to sustain that progress, but, of course, NATO allies must live up to their promises to invest in their own defense. This isn't about meeting an arbitrary budget number but about building real capabilities that are needed to meet real requirements identified by the alliance's military commanders. As the Secretary General has pointed out, our allies are starting to follow our lead. They are on track to contribute an additional $100 billion in defense spending.
There are also other ways NATO must adapt to meet the threats of the 21st century. It is essential that the alliance follow through on the reforms championed by former Secretary Mattis. NATO must modernize its capabilities to address interoperability challenges, enhance military mobility across the continent, and improve the speed at which it makes decisions.
For today, I just want to thank the Secretary General for his address this morning. Every American should be
long.
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back at the end of Congress last year.
The Millennium Challenge Corpora-
tion has waited 631 days since President
Trump first nominated an Assistant Secretary
for Policy, Management and Budget.

That's how the process works. It
has been like this for more than a year since the President
nominated a chair for the Advisory Council
on Historic Preservation. None of these
are front-page news, just normal posi-
tions the President has been trying to fill
every year. In hundreds of other cases,
Democrats have made sure those chairs stayed emptied for far too
long.
happy to support it, provided it doesn't take effect until 2021. Well, that certainly concedes the reasonableness of what we are going to achieve later today.

Because bringing the Senate nomination process permanently back to Earth right now would help the Republican administration, they weren't interested in doing the right thing—what they did in 2013, what they are whispering in our ears now: Oh, no, we cannot do it now because we don't like who's in the White House.

Republicans remain committed to reform. Look at the nomination currently before us—a textbook case study on the shameful state of the current process. Jeffrey Kessler of Virginia was first nominated as Assistant Secretary of Commerce in November of 2017. It took 7 months before Democrats on the Finance Committee allowed his nomination to be considered. When it was, he was reported out on an unanimous vote. Nobody opposed him in the Finance Committee.

The familiar story continues—another 6 months of inaction. The nomination was sent back to the White House at the end of the last Congress. So the process started all over again. This time he got a voice vote out of the Finance Committee. Everybody just said aye. Yet here on the floor, inexplicably, it still required a cloture motion to break through the obstruction and give this nominee, whom no one voted against, a vote.

Later today, it appears that at long last we will be able to take action to finally advance Mr. Kessler's nomination, to do the responsible thing, to begin to unwind this partisan paralysis for the good of the Senate and for the future of the constitutional order each of us has pledged to protect.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey Kessler of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

ORDER OF BUSINESS
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. RES. 50

Mr. THUNE. Yesterday afternoon, Senate Democrats voted against a rules change that would have reduced needless delay in the Senate and ensure that future Presidents of both parties could staff their administrations in a timely fashion.

Democrats chose partisanship over principle and political advantage over the well-being of the Senate. How do I know this was a partisan decision? Because a disciplined one? Because 34 currently serving Members of the Democratic caucus supported a very similar rules change measure when President Obama was in office. Yet not one Member—not one active Member of the public on the floor in favor of the rules change yesterday.

Worse, privately, many Democrats had indicated a willingness to support the rules change but only if the effective date was pushed to 2021, when Democrats hope they will have a Democrat in the White House. Apparently, it is reasonable for Democratic administrations to be staffed up in a timely fashion, but Republican administrations should have to suffer endless partisan delays. That is a pretty offensive position.

It is disrespectful to the American people, who deserve a fully staffed administration, even when their choice of President isn't the Democrats' choice. It is disrespectful of our system of government.

Democrats apparently think the system should be rigged in favor of their party, no matter what election results say. Don't like the fact that a Republican President got to choose Supreme Court Justices? Pack the courts. Don't like the fact that your candidate didn't win the election? Change our electoral system.

In a democracy, you win some elections and you lose some elections. Sometimes you like the individual in the White House, and sometimes you don't. Sometimes you succeed in passing your legislation, and sometimes you just don't have the votes. That is the nature of life in a democracy.

No one likes being in the minority. It is not fun to lose votes or elections, but that is the price of freedom. That is the price of democracy.

The other option is to rig the system in its favor so that everything goes its way no matter what election results say. There is a name for that. It is called tyranny.

Back in 2013, a majority of Republicans, including the Republican leader and me, supported a rules change to streamline the process of approving lower level administration nominees, such as district court judges and assistants. We supported the rules change even though we knew it would benefit only President Obama since it would expire at the end of the 113th Congress, but we signed on because we supported the principle behind the change. We believed that Presidents should be able to staff their administrations in a timely fashion, yes, even if they weren't Presidents from our party. We believed that whether the President was a Republican or Democrat, the American people deserved a fully functioning executive branch. So we worked with Democrats to streamline consideration of lower level administration nominees.

I am deeply disappointed that Democrats chose to betray their principles for short-term partisan gain, and I hope the Democrats here in the Senate will think better of their vote and work with Republicans to speed up consideration of lower level nominees before Democrats' historic level of obstruction becomes a permanent standard in the US Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to use my time on the Senate floor to address two related subjects.

The Republican leader is reportedly on the verge of going nuclear again, and I hope the Democrats here in the Senate will think better of their vote and work with Republicans to speed up consideration of lower level nominees before Democrats' historic level of obstruction becomes a permanent standard in the US Senate.

I yield the floor.

When you look at the numbers, you see that the Republican leader's argument is a fantasy. Let's look at judges, and let's compare the Trump administration to the Obama administration. The Obama administration started with 53 judicial vacancies; the Trump administration started with 112. That increase didn't occur because a whole lot of judges somehow magically qualified for Social Security and quit sometime in 2016; it was because Republican blocked nominations for years at a time, and they kept those seats open. Senate Republicans even blocked their own judicial selections during the previous administration. Put your arms
around that. Senate Republicans even blocked their own. Only 22 judicial nominees were confirmed in the final 2 years of the Obama administration—the fewest in a Congress since Harry Truman was President.

In 2017, the Senate Judiciary Committee considered only five circuit court nominees. It considered that many in December of 2017 alone. There were nearly twice as many circuit judges confirmed in the first 2 years of the Trump administration as there were in President Obama’s entire first term. Nominees are moving nearly twice as quickly under this President.

Republicans even blew up a century-old bipartisan practice of seeking input from Senators on judicial nominees from their home States. It is based on what has come to be known as the blue slip to consent to a hearing and a markup of a nomination. It is a tradition, by the way. Republicans fought to protect this democratic way of doing things and they were in the minority. Under this President, they threw the blue-slip tradition out the window.

Republicans are also moving nominees at breakneck speed in an attempt to prevent serious debate on their qualifications. A few months ago, the Judiciary Committee held a markup and voted out 46 nominees, including 44 judicial nominees. That had never been done before. It is a head-scratcher how that can meet any reasonable definition of “advice and consent.”

The way my colleagues on the other side talk about the issue, you would think they are the administration of a Democrat who was in the minority and they were in the majority. Under this President, they threw the blue-slip tradition out the window.

Republicans are also moving nominees at breakneck speed in an attempt to prevent serious debate on their qualifications. A few months ago, the Judiciary Committee held a markup and voted out 46 nominees, including 44 judicial nominees. That had never been done before. It is a head-scratcher how that can meet any reasonable definition of “advice and consent.”

Setting judges aside, what about the executive branch? The President and his advisers will tell you right out in the open that they don’t want to nominate anybody. They have chosen to leave those positions vacant. That certainly doesn’t meet a textbook definition of “Democratic obstructionism.” I am the ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee. Our committee has zero nominees ready for a committee vote. It is not because any body is blocking them; it is because the Trump administration seems uninterested in putting nominees forward. Our committee, on a bipartisan basis, has done its job.

So, colleagues, you can’t look at the record of nominees over the last 2 years, particularly on judges, and conclude that Republicans have blockaded the Senate. It is just not true. I believe a number of my colleagues on the other side know it. When they want to go nuclear and change the rules, we get a parade of horror stories about how Democrats are obstructionists. It is a totally different argument they prefer to tout their record on nominations.

Let’s hear from Republicans, from the President down.

Here is the President tweeting in late 2017: “Judges are at record low. Our courts are rapidly changing.”

The President at a rally last year: “We have the best judges. We put on a tremendous amount of great Federal district court judges. We’ll be setting records. We are setting records. Appeals court judges. A Supreme Court judge—fantastic.”

The Vice President, March 2018: “The President has set a record for the most court of appeal judges confirmed in the first year of an administration in American history.”

Leader McConnell said it all, speaking about the judges. He said: “Including a record number of circuit court judges for a President’s first year.”

More recently, Leader McConnell said: “We confirmed every circuit judge. We’ve now confirmed 29 circuit judges. That’s a record for this quick in any administration in history.”

After November’s elections, when Democrats won control of the House, Leader McConnell said: “I think we’ll have probably more time for nominations in the next Congress than we’ve had in this one, because the areas of legislative agreement will be more limited between a Democratic House and a Republican Senate,... I don’t think we’ll have any trouble finding time to do nominations.” That is Leader McConnell. “I don’t think we’ll have any trouble finding time to do nominations.”

Leader McConnell said: “We intend to keep confirming as many as we possibly can for as long as we’re in a position to do so.”

My colleagues on the other side can’t have it both ways, constantly talking about judicial gridlock and then, in effect, making all these statements about how they are setting records for getting people through. You can’t have it both ways. I am going to close on this. I am not going to apologize for opposing nominees who are unqualified, corrupt, or simply outside of the mainstream.

I opposed the nomination of Ryan Bounds to the Ninth Circuit because he concealed the writings to a bipartisan committee—since I became the State’s senior Democrat, and now as the senior Senator, I have continued this committee. We have had a bipartisan selection committee that vets candidates. We had it when my former colleague, Senator Smith, who I know is a friend of the Presiding Officer, was here. We always worked in a bipartisan way to address these issues. This was a nominee who concealed hateful writings on a bipartisan selection committee that vetted his candidacy, and he was forced to withdraw.

I opposed Neomi Rao because she also had put extreme views in writing, and those views closely mirrored the work that the head of the Trump appointee attacking protections for women’s health, for sexual assault victims on campus, and for vulnerable communities across the country.

I opposed the nomination of Thomas Farr because he had already attacked the voting rights of people of color.

I opposed the nomination of Tom Price to lead the Department of Health and Human Services because I thought he was just about as corrupt as they came and seemed to be laser-focused on taking away people’s healthcare.

I opposed the nomination of Steven Mnuchin to be Treasury Secretary because I believed a history of profiting off of the suffering of millions of Americans ought to be disqualifying for that job.

Now, what has been the record? Multiple members of the Trump Cabinet have resigned under an ethical cloud. The rule change for which the Republican leader is pushing will cause the rushing through of even more unqualified and corrupt nominees at the sub-Cabinet level.

The bottom line is that all of the doom-say talk about the Democratic obstruction that is forcing the Republican leader’s hand is simply out of touch with the facts. The Trump administration will find more support among the Democrats when it picks better nominees. Her advisors will tell you right out in public—pick better nominees, and then you will get support. Instead, the nuclear option Leader McConnell is set to trigger this week is a strategy that will take us in the opposite direction. It is going to make it easier to put unqualified and extreme nominees through the Senate before anybody notices.

I oppose this change. I urge more of my colleagues on the other side to do the same.

NOMINATION OF DAVID BERNHARDT

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by turning briefly to a related subject that deals with, I believe, compromised, corrupt Trump nominees.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee is scheduled to vote tomorrow on the nomination of David Bernhardt to be the Interior Secretary, but there is developing news—news revealed just last night—that ought to be enough to put this flawed nomination on the same page.

According to the Washington Post, “[t]he Interior Department’s Office of Inspector General is reviewing allegations that acting secretary David Bernhardt may have violated his ethics pledge by weighing in on issues affecting a former client, the office confirmed Tuesday.”

I made it clear in Mr. Bernhardt’s hearing last week that I believed he had ethics problems. I asked the Interior Department’s inspector general to look into these matters, but she has not had time to respond to my request. The fact is that the inspector general is just at the very outset of this process.

Here is the prospect this body faces. The Senate could be on its way to installing an Interior Secretary who
could almost immediately face an investigation for corruption and lying under oath. These are serious allegations that face Mr. Bernhardt, so I feel strongly that the vote in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee needed to be delayed until they can be investigated fully.

With all of the Trump nominees who have resigned in scandal—by the way, one being the predecessor of whoever will be the head of the Interior Department—President Trump should allow the Interior Department to turn into a revolving door of corruption and scandal. The vote on the Bernhardt nomination, in my view, should not proceed tomorrow in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question be suspended.

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

The Senator from Texas.

S. RES. 50

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last 2 years, since the beginning of the Trump administration, our Senate Democratic colleagues have brought our work to a crawl over judicial and executive branch nominees. It is as if they have frustrated and surprised the current President Trump in the first place and still haven’t gotten over it. This is another way in which they have sought to undermine the administration—to deny the President the staff necessary to populate the various executive branch Agencies as well as the judiciary.

The way you do that in the Senate is by stringing out the amount of time it takes to confirm nominees who ordi-
narily would be confirmed—by consent or by voice vote—certainly, not by taking 3 days or so at a time to generate a confirmation. It is not because these nominees are unqualified or even controversial; it is simply because this is how the resistance operates at a time when President Trump is President of the United States. These nominees are being used as a weapon to slow the work of the Senate and, real-

ly, to deny us the floor time in which to do other things that we might be doing that would be beneficial to the American people, and they have been running this play repeatedly over the last 2 years.

In February of 2018, President Trump nominated John Ryder to serve on the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The work of the TVA is undeniably important, but this isn’t the sort of high-profile job that typically leads to a contentious nomination. In fact, these boards are normally confirmed by voice vote.

Mr. Ryder was, by any account, well qualified for the job. He received unanimous support from the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Environment and Public Works. Under normal circumstances, he would have been quickly confirmed by the entire Senate. Our Democratic friends, instead, decided to delay and delay and delay some more and forced the Senate to hold a cloture vote on the nominee, which caused him to sit in limbo for 400 days.

I wonder how many Americans who want to serve their country in some positions that require Senate confirmation, can their ties on hold for 400 days or more just for the Senate to get around to doing something that should be somewhat of a routine job.

With Mr. Ryder, in the end, the irony would almost be funny if it were not so pathetic. Ultimately, he was confirmed by voice vote. For 400 days, we waited to achieve the result we all knew we were to have all along if Mr. Ryder were to hang in there long enough. For 400 days, we waited for the vacancy to be filled without there being an end in sight, and for 400 days, Mr. Ryder and his family waited and waited and waited with uncertainty. Sadly, he is not alone. He is part of a long list of nominees who have received similar mistreatment.

There is one Texan, a friend of mine, who had to wait even longer. Susan Combs is a fourth-generation rancher from Big Bend who has led an impressive career in both public and private sectors and has gained the respect of virtually every person who has crossed her path.

She served as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, then as the first female agriculture commissioner of Texas, and later served as the Texas comptroller of public accounts.

When she was nominated to be the Department of the Interior’s Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, I was thrilled, and I was happy for the Senate to get around to doing something that should have been confirmed by voice vote.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last 2 years, since the beginning of the Trump administration, our Senate Democratic colleagues have brought our work to a crawl over judicial and executive branch nominees. It is as if they have frustrated and surprised the current President Trump in the first place and still haven’t gotten over it. This is another way in which they have sought to undermine the administration—to deny the President the staff necessary to populate the various executive branch Agencies as well as the judiciary.

The way you do that in the Senate is by stringing out the amount of time it takes to confirm nominees who ordinarily would be confirmed—by consent or by voice vote—certainly, not by taking 3 days or so at a time to generate a confirmation. It is not because these nominees are unqualified or even controversial; it is simply because this is how the resistance operates at a time when President Trump is President of the United States. These nominees are being used as a weapon to slow the work of the Senate and, really, to deny us the floor time in which to do other things that we might be doing that would be beneficial to the American people, and they have been running this play repeatedly over the last 2 years.

In February of 2018, President Trump nominated John Ryder to serve on the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The work of the TVA is undeniably important, but this isn’t the sort of high-profile job that typically leads to a contentious nomination. In fact, these boards are normally confirmed by voice vote.

Mr. Ryder was, by any account, well qualified for the job. He received unanimous support from the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Environment and Public Works. Under normal circumstances, he would have been quickly confirmed by the entire Senate. Our Democratic friends, instead, decided to delay and delay and delay some more and forced the Senate to hold a cloture vote on the nominee, which caused him to sit in limbo for 400 days.

I wonder how many Americans who want to serve their country in some positions that require Senate confirmation, can their ties on hold for 400 days or more just for the Senate to get around to doing something that should be somewhat of a routine job.

With Mr. Ryder, in the end, the irony would almost be funny if it were not so pathetic. Ultimately, he was confirmed by voice vote. For 400 days, we waited to achieve the result we all knew we were to have all along if Mr. Ryder were to hang in there long enough. For 400 days, we waited for the vacancy to be filled without there being an end in sight, and for 400 days, Mr. Ryder and his family waited and waited and waited with uncertainty. Sadly, he is not alone. He is part of a long list of nominees who have received similar mistreatment.

There is one Texan, a friend of mine, who had to wait even longer. Susan Combs is a fourth-generation rancher from Big Bend who has led an impressive career in both public and private sectors and has gained the respect of virtually every person who has crossed her path.

She served as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, then as the first female agriculture commissioner of Texas, and later served as the Texas comptroller of public accounts.

When she was nominated to be the Department of the Interior’s Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, I was thrilled, and I was happy for the Senate to get around to doing something that should have been confirmed by voice vote.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last 2 years, since the beginning of the Trump administration, our Senate Democratic colleagues have brought our work to a crawl over judicial and executive branch nominees. It is as if they have frustrated and surprised the current President Trump in the first place and still haven’t gotten over it. This is another way in which they have sought to undermine the administration—to deny the President the staff necessary to populate the various executive branch Agencies as well as the judiciary.

The way you do that in the Senate is by stringing out the amount of time it takes to confirm nominees who ordinarily would be confirmed—by consent or by voice vote—certainly, not by taking 3 days or so at a time to generate a confirmation. It is not because these nominees are unqualified or even controversial; it is simply because this is how the resistance operates at a time when President Trump is President of the United States. These nominees are being used as a weapon to slow the work of the Senate and, really, to deny us the floor time in which to do other things that we might be doing that would be beneficial to the American people, and they have been running this play repeatedly over the last 2 years.
from filling these nominations throughout the entire government. This is our government. In fact, we took the opposite approach. Along with several of my Republican colleagues, I joined Democrats in voting for a resolution that would speed up the consideration process for lower level nominees.

I have to give Senator ALEXANDER, the Senator from Tennessee, a lot of credit for negotiating that in the first place. But it has now expired, and we are back to the status quo before that temporary change went into effect. Like the changes we are talking about today, it didn’t change the threshold for nominees; it just made the process a little more efficient. It received votes from 78 Senators on a bipartisan basis.

So that is why it is a real head-scratcher that we find ourselves where we are today. Unfortunately, I think we know what the answer is. This is part of the anti-Trump resistance. Unfortunately, it is not playing out just in social media or on TV; it is playing out right here in the Senate—what used to be known as the world’s greatest deliberative body.

When our colleagues Senator BLUNT, chairman of the Rules Committee, and Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma introduced this resolution, I was surprised that our colleagues across the aisle wouldn’t do what we did back in 2013. Back then, all but one Member of the Democratic caucus voted for the resolution—again, something very similar to what we are proposing today—but yesterday, they refused to even proceed to debate a similar change. They could have offered amendments. They could have made changes to the resolution where they thought it fell short. But no—they’re commitment to obstruction remains. It is clear they don’t really oppose the resolution; they oppose supporting a resolution under the President of another party. Indeed, they oppose supporting this resolution under President Trump.

When 78 Republicans voted for a similar change in 2013—as I said, we didn’t vote for President Obama, but we understood the importance of protecting the Senate as an institution and allowing our valuable work to continue on behalf of the American people. I wish our colleagues across the aisle had that same commitment today.

Just as I supported this modest change in 2013, I will support it again today. This will allow us to make meaningful progress in confirming the long list of pending nominees without impeding our ability to do our other work, like legislation.

In particular, there are four district court nominees from Texas I am eager to get off the Senate calendar and on the Federal bench. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, later today, the majority leader will use the so-called nuclear option to once again break the Senate rules. This is going to be the latest episode in a series of decisions that have been made around here—mostly by the majority leader but not only by the majority leader—to degrade the Senate’s responsibility for confirming Supreme Court nominees. What has happened here is a travesty. We have destroyed—this generation of American politicians has decided that somehow we have prerogatives that the people who came before us didn’t have.

I think part of the problem we have is that people are so sick and tired of the dysfunction around this place, they are not even paying attention to what is happening here; even though, in theory, it is happening in their name.

Two days ago—on the first of April, fittingly—the majority leader wrote an op-ed laying out his case. He wrote:

Since January 2017, for the first time in memory, a minority has exploited procedure to systematically obstruct a President from staffing up his administration.

Let’s read that again.

Since January 2017, for the first time in memory, a minority has exploited procedure to systematically obstruct a President from staffing up his administration.

Senator MCCONNELL went on to write:

Crucial jobs are still being held empty out of political spite. He seems to have completely forgotten the Obama administration when he was the leader of the minority, when he was systematically denying President Obama the right not only to put people in his Cabinet and in his administration but to put judges on the bench.

Before President Obama arrived in Washington, the filibuster had been used 68 times on this floor—68 times since that rule was created sometime right before 1920. In the first 5 years of the Obama administration, the Republicans filibustered his nominees or used the filibuster in some other way 79 times. It had been used 68 times from when the rule was created to when President Obama became President, and then over the first 5 years of his administration, they used it 79 times. And they can’t remember a time when a minority systematically denied a President the ability to put judges on the court or to staff their administration.

When President Obama was President, they filibustered the Secretary of Defense nominee for the first time in the history of America, and he was a former Senator and a Republican. His name was Chuck Hagel. They filibustered him. Secretary of Defense seems like a pretty crucial appointment.

In President Obama’s last 2 years, the Republican Senate confirmed only 22 judges. That is a smaller number than at any time since the Truman administration. Twenty-two judges was all he got.

President Obama left 100 vacancies to President Trump to fill—a record number. There were more vacancies at the end of his term than there were at the beginning.

It has been a concerted strategy of Senator MCCONNELL’s for a decade—for more than that—and he has succeeded. I led the major blockade that has ever happened in the Senate, and that was the blockade he led of Merrick Garland.

When Justice Scalia died 342 days before the end of President Obama’s term, Senator MCCONNELL responded to that by saying: “This vacancy should not be filled until we have a new President.” He called President Obama a lame duck President. There were 342 days left in his term. He had an entire year left in his term.

Until that point, the Senate had never refused to consider an elected President’s nominee because the vacancy arose in an election year, which they claimed over and over again wasn’t the case. Since the Nation’s founding, the Senate has confirmed 17 Supreme Court nominees in election years; it has rejected 2.

The majority leader would later say:

One of my proudest moments was when I looked Barack Obama in the eye and said, “Mr. President, you will not fill this Supreme Court vacancy.”

He did it because he knew he could get away with it, and he thought he would roll the dice. It was shameful. He was not true to his word; it was contrary to his history; it was completely inconsistent with our history.

Whether you support Donald Trump or you don’t support Donald Trump, I think you can thank the majority leader for obstructing Donald Trump because by keeping that vacancy on the Court, he made that the issue in the election, and he galvanized the Republicans around a candidate who otherwise wouldn’t have been very appealing to many of them. People say that he stole the election. The Senate stole the election. That is bigger than that—he won the Presidency for Donald Trump. And we know what has happened since that time.

But it amazes me that in the name of things not moving quickly enough, he can come out here and claim that the most significant thing he has ever done is what he did to Merrick Garland and then the record he has set putting judges on the circuit courts and the district courts since Donald Trump was elected President. Nobody has ever had this many judges put on the court as fast as the majority leader has put them on the court. Now, for district court judges, he wants to do it in 2 hours of time. He is just going to crank the machine until it is not available to him anymore, and it has been clear that has been his objective from the beginning.

But it is not just that the judges are conservative judges; it is that they are not as good as the President wanted. You know, until the group of people in this room—including me, by the way—in 2013, out of desperation, I came to this floor and voted to change the
rules so that President Obama could actually get some nominees confirmed, some judges confirmed, and some administrative appointments confirmed. I have said on this floor before that that is the worst vote I have taken as a Senator. And I do not do that vote. I share some of the responsibility for where we find ourselves today.

The majority leader said at that time: “You’re going to come to regret this decision.” And I will say this about him: He was right. I do. Not me and not for the Senate but for the American people who are having their judiciary infected by the mindless partisanship of this place, which is hopelessly, fully temporary partisanship. But those are lifetime appointments that we are confirming that we can’t take 30 hours to confirm anymore, and now we are going to do them in 2 hours just to make sure we populate the court with conservative judges whose views are consistent with the majority leader’s and the White House’s and the United States Senate.

But, as I said, it is not just about their point of view, their judiciary philosophy, it is also their quality, because if you have to earn 60 votes for a lifetime appointment or—when I was in law school—a judge’s record was a single track. And if you were a judge who was nominated by a President for the Supreme Court, you would then command 90 votes or 95 votes, and that gave the American people confidence that the judiciary was insulated from politics, that it was insulated from partisanship. Now, because of what the majority leader has done to the Supreme Court, we are going to put people on that Court with lifetime appointments by the barest partisan majorities. It is impossible for me to see how that is going to build confidence in the judiciary.

So when he says he has just put it back to the way it was before anybody around here started to filibuster circuit court judges that is not true because before that, you would get 90 votes for somebody who was qualified for the Supreme Court, and today, you get whatever you get from the partisan majority that happens to be in power.

By the way, I have absolutely no idea what is going to happen when we have a President of one party and a majority of another party and there is a vacancy on the Supreme Court, or two or three. If we don’t change our behavior around here, those vacancies are just going to remain until we have a President and a Senate of the same party, however long that takes. But if you only need to get 51 votes, I guess you don’t have to be that qualified.

The Senate confirmed a nominee recently by the Sixth Circuit who wrote blog posts peddling conspiracy theories about Barack Obama and compared abortion to slavery. He was confirmed 51 to 47. He would never have survived the vet before.

The Senate confirmed a nominee to the Fifth Circuit who dismissed concerns about glass ceilings for women, sexual harassment, and the gender pay gap as a Trojan horse for government intervention. He was confirmed 50 to 47. This man would never have gotten to this floor before we changed the rules, and he now has a lifetime appointment.

The Senate confirmed a nominee for the Eighth Circuit, even though the American Bar Association rated him unanimously as “not qualified”—an unanimous rating of “not qualified,” and he is now a circuit court judge with a lifetime appointment. It has never happened in our history. The ABA questioned whether he “would be able to detach himself from his deeply held social agenda and political loyalty.” He was confirmed 50 to 48. They said he was unqualified unanimously because they thought his ideology would blind him, and now he has a lifetime appointment.

The Senate confirmed a second judge the ABA deemed unqualified for a district court in Oklahoma. According to the American Bar Association, he frequently missed work, and when he did show up, it was often in the middle of the day. He was confirmed by 52 votes.

Last December, the Senate confirmed a third judge the ABA found unqualified. Senator Mitchell said it was a mistake, but Vice President Pence made a trip from the White House to break the tie.

The partisan temper that is destroying this place needs to come to an end, and we need to make sure, between now and whenever that happens, that we don’t take down the rest of government with us.

The Founders didn’t design the court to be an extension of our partisan foolishness. The independent judiciary is responsible for enforcing the rule of law, which is at the heart of our democratic Republic. It is what separates us from so many other countries around the world that have failing economies because no one subscribes to the rule of law, and the court is not supposed to be those institutions, where rules are bent, broken, or ignored, with no thought about what is going to be left for tomorrow but just the looting of the economy for the benefit of people today.

The Constitution makes it clear that the Senate has a responsibility—we have a constitutional responsibility—to advise and consent on judicial nominations. There is no one else assigned that responsibility. The House of Representatives has nothing to do with it. This is a long, 20-year-old—20-year-long series of preemptive retributions, where one party says: If we don’t do it to them, they are going to do it to us, we are now at the point where we are destroying the judiciary, and I think we should pull back from the brink. I don’t think the majority leader should invoke the nuclear option today, should break another rule around here. No one else in America runs their operation by breaking the rules.

Just in this session alone, we have seen not only this, not only this violation of our norms and our customs, of the rule of law, of our responsibility to advise and consent, we have seen the same people support the President’s extralegal destruction of the rule of law when he claimed an emergency to fund his wall or to fund $5 billion for his wall, by the way, he said I had already been largely built.

Just like the majority leader today is saying, we have a record number of judges who have been confirmed since President Trump has been in office, but we are not moving quickly enough so I have to change the rules by using the nuclear option.

I need to declare an emergency to build the wall, even though it is almost complete because of my excellent administration.

It is all gibberish, and it is all meant just to get a result for partisan reasons.

I think when the history is written about this period of our political system, this is all going to look like a tragic farce—all of it. People are going to know, when they write an op-ed piece on April Fools’ Day something one thing, and they have spent the past 2 years doing something else, that is not going to be lost to the pages of history. People are going to know how the system worked when we arrived here, when the people who were in this Chamber arrived, including myself, and maybe in some tiny, little footnote there will be something that says: Well, at least Bennet was out here admitting the mistake he made to contribute to this disaster.

For the life of me, I don’t know why we aren’t correcting course. We are free people. Everybody in this Chamber, I think, should have an incentive to try to be remembered well and to be remembered as a good steward of this place and of the work we did here. I doubt very much, when our careers are over, that people are going to say is, the good news is, they broke the rules.

I know what the result is going to be today. I know my friend from Oklahoma has actually worked hard to see if he could get a bipartisan result here, and today that has been impossible, but what I really hope is that we can change what we are doing in the Senate so we can protect and preserve the independence of our judiciary and that maybe we will even move beyond the bipartisanship that is bringing the Senate to its knees today.

What I want that I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, Republicans believe, regardless of who the President is, they should be able to hire their staff. I can say we not only believe that, we practice that.

In 2013, there was an ongoing debate over nominations with President Obama. Democrats and Republicans came together to resolve the time issue for nominations under President Obama. Democrats asked Republicans to join them to say: Let’s fix the problem we have with the length of time on
nominations because it is taking too long, and so they made a proposal. It was 2 hours, equally divided—so it would actually be 1 hour—for district court judges, 8 hours for other nominees, which again equally divided would actually be 4 hours total for other lower nominees, 30 hours for circuit court, Supreme Court, Cabinet officers.

Republicans joined with Democrats in 2013 to engage in a quorum call—during which votes at the beginning of President Obama’s second term—and may I remind this body, Republicans were not excited about President Obama’s second term—Republicans joined with Democrats on this one principle. Every President should be able to hire their own staff and their staff not be blocked. When the American people vote for a President, this body should respect the vote of the American people and allow that President to hire their staff. Now, when President Trump was elected, Democrats have 128 times blocked President Trump from getting his nominees—128 times.

I have, for now 2 years, met with my Democratic colleagues, and I have asked, let’s put back into place exactly what Republicans voted with Democrats to do. I am asking Democrats to now vote with Republicans to do that. They have said no for 2 years.

So I simplifying the proposal and said: Let’s just make it straightforward and simple, taken from the same principles Harry Reid put forward under President Obama. Let’s make that permanent, that the President is now or in the future. Let’s make it consistent and straightforward.

I was told no by every single Democrat, with this one exception. I will vote for that proposal as long as it starts in January of staff. I know when President Trump was elected, Democrats have 128 times blocked President Trump from getting his nominees—128 times.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we raise this point today, not just because of what has happened to Donald Trump’s nominees over the last 2 years, but we reached a point back 16 years ago when the Senator from New York started this Senate down a path that was unprecedented in 200 years. For 200 years, any President’s nominees got an up-or-down vote. That was the custom, the unwritten rule, if you will. Starting in 2003, specifically geared toward a brilliant young lawyer named Miguel Estrada, the Senator from New York warped those unwritten rules and customs. That has brought us to where we are today. So today Senator Schumer will reap what he sowed. I will call it Miguel Estrada’s revenge.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the nomination of Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.


The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.
counterclaims about cloture votes, about rates of confirmation for circuit and district courts in different Congresses, about judicial vacancies and other arcane things that may not sound very illuminating. So I want to start by making clear what this debate is really about. I want to raise a warning about what is at stake in this fight. Underneath all of the statistics, what Leader MCCONNELL, President Trump, and Republicans in the Senate are trying to do is use the courts to adopt their right agenda that Repub-
licans know they cannot enact through the legislative process.

Why can’t they? Because it is an agenda the American people reject, an agenda set by the far right, which Repub-
licans in the Senate follow.

Senator MCCONNELL and Republicans in Washington understand that they will never persuade enough Americans to support backward goals like ending women’s reproductive freedom, taking away voting rights, rolling back civil rights, making it more difficult to vote, or abolishing safeguards for clean air and clean water.

Instead, they decided there was another route to achieving their policy goals that requires neither public support nor legislation: the courts. So Republicans, pressured by the hard right and by wealthy, special interest donors, launched a sustained effort to pack the courts with very conservative judges, preferably young ones who would sit on the bench for decades. These prospective judges were identified as early as law school, having signaled their hard-right leanings through their writings or membership in conserva-

Nominees like these started to ap-

appear during the George W. Bush admin-

istration. Take Miguel Estrada, a Bush nominee with no judicial experience, who had demonstrated in the Federalist Society but had no writings and claimed he had never even thought about Roe v. Wade.

Or take William Pryor, another Bush nominee, who called Roe “the worst abomination in the history of constitu-
tional law” and who argued that States should have the right to criminalize homosexuality.

Or take Charles Pickering, who advo-
cated a reduced sentence for a man convicted of burning a cross in the front yard of a racial couple.

Before the Republicans launched their campaign to remake the courts, neither party would have dared put for-
ward such radical nominees.

Starting with his campaign and into his Presidency, President Donald Trump has been captive—totally cap-
tive—to the conservative campaign to take over the courts. Before he was a Presidential candidate, Mr. Trump had been a Democrat and a person with no fixed ideology or philosophy, so conserva-
tives didn’t trust him. He and his ad-
visers came up with a solution: Ask the Federalist Society to produce a list of far-right Supreme Court nominees, and then have candidate Trump pledge to only nominate people on that list. And not just the Supreme Court—the Fed-
eralist Society is and continues to be a huge influence on nominees to the cir-
cuit courts.

No one Presidential candidate had so willingly and openly outsourced ju-
dicial nominations this way, but it mollified the hard right, and the Presi-
dent has dutifully nominated people from the list to the appeals Court. He has made similarly ideological choices for the circuit and district courts.

This is an alarming strategy because, over the last 2 years, President Trump has nominated and Senate Republicans have advanced the most unqualified and radical nominees in modern times.

Consider the nomination of Ryan Bounds, who misled the Oregon Sen-
ators’ bipartisan judicial selection committee about his controversial writings in which he dismissed efforts to increase diver-
sity as mere “race-think,” criticized Stanford University’s suggested pun-
ishment for students who defaced an LGBT pride statue, criticized a student group for protesting against a hotel contract with the University of Chicago, and the clerk, said they would not have recommended Bounds had they known of his college writings when they first interviewed him. Fortunately, it became clear that a few Republicans would not support Mr. Bounds on the floor, and the nomi-

Consider the nomination of Thomas Farr, who has an extensive record de-
fending discriminatory voting laws and racial gerrymandering in North Caro-

lina. He is also credibly alleged to have played a role in the voter suppression efforts of the Jesse Helms campaign, including sending over 100,000 postcards to heavily African-American precincts that “falsely told voters they could be found ineligible to vote based on sev-

eral conditions involving place and length of residence.” Amazingly, after something as despicable as that, Presi-
dent Trump and Leader MCCONNELL pushed hard for his nomination, but it could not withstand scrutiny by the Senate. Farr’s nomination was withdrawn due to the United Democratic opposi-
tion and a few conscientious Repub-
lican Senators.

I would note that in the cases of both Mr. Farr and Mr. Bounds, the Repub-
lican concern was purely at the end of postcloture debate time, which Re-
publicans now propose to limit. Had we had only 2 hours, horrible nominees—
way beyond the bounds of normal nom-
ination and discourse, even from con-
servative judges—such as Bounds would be sitting on the courts today.

I agree with what my colleague Sen-
ator KLOBUCHAR has said:
But the merits didn’t concern Senator MCCONNELL. His cynical strategy required Republicans to block the Gar- land nomination for almost a year until after President Obama’s second term ended, and that is exactly what they did. It was widely condemned as a naked power grab that nullified the President’s constitutional authority. It was a terrible, deeply lamentable moment for our democracy and our Con- stitution. Yet, as the New York Times reported, Senator MCCONNELL said it was one of his “proudest achieve- ments.”

After President Trump took office, Republicans sensed an opportunity to grease the conveyor belt even more. Senator MCCONNELL ordered the Judi- ciary Committee chairman to do away with the longstanding practice that Senators be consulted about district court nominees in their home States. The blue-slip tradition ensured that ju- dicial nominees reflected the ideology and values of the State to which they were nominated. It provided some healthy counterbalance against nomi- nees who were outside the mainstream from either party or were lacking in proper qualifications. Thanks to Sen- ate Republicans, led by Senator MCCONNELL, that protection is now his- tory.

So when Republicans complain about Democratic handling of nominees, there is no other word for it but hypoc- risy. You don’t have to take my word for it. According to the Congressional Research Service, more circuit judges have been confirmed in the first 2 years of the Trump administration than in the first 2 years of any Presidency since at least the Truman administra- tion. The majority leader himself has cele- brated the pace of confirmations. He bragged about it to the Heritage Foun- dation. He said this to them a few months ago:

We confirmed every circuit judge. We’ve now done 29 circuit judges. That is a record for this quick in any administration in his- tory.

Those are Leader MCCONNELL’s words, not mine.

Now we have to change the rules, even though you have confirmed more circuit court judges than anyone in history, That is a shame. That is a dis- grace. That is not the Senate we want. For Leader MCCONNELL to brag about confirming more judges than ever be- fore and then to complain about Demo- cratic obstruction and say that the process is broken so you have to change the rules is the height of hypoc- risy.

Leader MCCONNELL and Senate Re- publicans also complain about the pace of confirmation for President Trump’s executive branch and independent Agency choices. They conveniently omit Republicans’ sorry record of ob- struction of nominees to Democratic seats at important agencies like the NLRB, the FDIC, and the SEC, which have suffered as Republicans caused dedicated public servants like former NLRB Chair Mark Pearce to languish for months or even years.

It is actually a little surprising that Leader MCCONNELL and his Republican colleagues would draw attention to the Senate’s more than 100 filibusters, given the appalling history of incom- petence, corruption, and venality among President Trump’s so-called “best people,” not to mention the fact that there are hundreds of vacancies the President can’t even be bothered to fill.

Staffing the government is serious business and so is the system of justice assigned to the courts by our Constitu- tion. They both deserve better than the Senate Republicans’ cynical, partisan efforts to turn the Senate into a con- veyor belt for ideological conserv- atives.

The notion that President Trump’s judicial nominees have been treated unfairly is simply false. There is no truth to it, as all of these statistics that I have talked about have shown. What Republicans really want to see is the elimination of yet another norm of the Senate’s institutionate and expedite the nomination process with- out a modicum of debate. They are all for “consent” with no “advice.” With all undue haste, they want to pack the courts with partisan warriors, not im- partial jurists or jurists.

Democrats have a different view of who should sit on the Federal bench. We have a different view of the role of this Chamber. Our judicial system works best when nominees to the courts meet three simple standards: excellence, moderation, and diversity. These are not ideological litmus tests. They are the pillars of a healthy system of jus- tice. They are the benchmarks by which we can rest assured that the men and women who are appointed to the Federal bench will respect the rule of law and execute their duties impar- tially.

It cuts both ways. When Republicans are prepared to act in good faith and advance nominees of high caliber, we are ready to give them the consider- ation they deserve. For generations, the Senate has done the work of the American people through consensus, through compromise, and through co- operation. It has been a place where seemingly impossible disagreements have found sensible solutions. Indeed, the legacy of the Senate is the story of debate—ample debate—followed by compromise. It is in part thanks to the rules that govern how this Chamber works. It is crucial that those rules not be twisted or abused for par- tisan advantage.

The majority leader has taken yet another step to erode that legacy, risks turning this body into a colosseum of zero-sum infighting—a place where the brute power of the majority rules, with little or no regard for the concerns of the mi- nority party, and where longstanding rules have little or no meaning.

I am so sorry my Republican col- leagues have gone along with Senator MCCONNELL’s debasement of the Sen- ate. To do this for such blatantly polit- ical ends is simply unworthy of this in- stitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ma- jority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. One of the advan- tages of having been around the “ad- vice and consent” process for as long as I have is that I know a little history. I was actually here as a young staffer on the Judiciary Committee when Richard Nixon appointed two Supreme Court Justices who were defeated. During most of those years, our Democratic friends were in the majority here in the Senate. They could have done whatever they wanted to on the executive cal- endar to slow down, obstruct, and pre- vent Republican Presidents from hav- ing nominations confirmed.

I can remember during the Clinton years the urging of both Senator Dole and Senator Moseley Brooks, who my party was in the majority—to invoke cloture on circuit court nominees whom I opposed in order to keep the Senate from developing a process of filibustering the executive calendar, which had never been done before. What the clearest example of why it was never done before is the Clarence Thomas nomination—the most con- troversial nomination for the Supreme Court in history, with the possible ex- ception of Brett Kavanaugh. He came to the Judiciary Committee with 48 Senate votes. He had 52, with one vote. They could have killed him in committee. He went to the floor and was confirmed 52 to 48. We all know it only takes one Senator, just one, to make us get 60 votes on something?

Joe Biden and Ted Kennedy were hard over against Clarence Thomas, but nobody—not one of the 100 Sen- ators—said you have to get 60 votes. Clarence Thomas was confirmed 52 to 48 and has been on the Supreme Court for four years. He would never have been there if a single Senator—just one—had said you had to get 60 votes. My friends, I call that a pretty firm tradi- tion that you don’t filibuster the exec- utive calendar. Was it possible? Yes, it was possible. It just wasn’t done.

When did all of this start? Well, the junior Senator from New York got elected in 1998. George W. Bush gets elected in 2000. The alarms go off. They are going to appoint a bunch of crazy rightwingers to the bench.

So my good friend the Democratic leader, at a seminar or a meeting, in- vited a couple of people named Lau- rence Tribe and Cass Sunstein—two rather famous liberal law professors— and they had a discussion about what to do about these awful rightwing judges who are going to be sent up.

The conclusion was to open the tool- box, take out whatever tool would work, and save America from these kinds of people. And so they did. The poster child for that was Miguel Estrada, who they said openly they were afraid was going to give President Bush the opportunity to make the first
Hispanic appointment to the Supreme Court. We had all-night filibusters. We actually stayed up all night trying to make a point.

It didn’t make a difference. Ultimately, we thought maybe we should employ the so-called nuclear option. We ended up not doing it after the fact.

Way they did it, but this is the way the way it was done. I thought maybe they wouldn’t fill it. That was 18 months before the end of the Bush 43 term, the majority leader of the Senate, Harry Reid, and a fellow named Chuck Schumer were stopped.

Look, we know you don’t like Donald Trump, but there was an election. He is at least entitled to set up the administration and make it function. With regard to the judiciary and court judges, every President of both parties feels it is his prerogative.

Senator Alexander has pointed out the history of the blue slip. There has been a little confusion about that. He has noted that blue slips were not used as an absolute veto over judicial nominations—just like we helped you with the nominees for whom there were no objections at all—128. Goodness gracious. In the first 2 years of each of the last six Presidents, cumulatively, the majority leader of whichever party had to do that 24 times in order to try to advance a nomination.

So, don’t hand me any of this “sad day in the Senate” stuff. What has been going on here is completely and totally unacceptable. Do you know why I know that? It is because many of your Members, Mr. Leader, have told me privately that they would be happy to do this provided it would take effect in January 2021. Oh, what might happen in January 2021? I can’t imagine. Well, it might be a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate. I can understand—but, oh, not now.

Talk about being proud of something. He is acting like it is a sad day. This is a glad day. We did a great thing. We almost do get to pick them. We do get to pick them. We almost do get to pick them. We almost do get to pick them.

Senator Alexander has pointed out the history of the blue slip. There has been a little confusion about that. He has noted that blue slips were not used as an absolute veto over judicial nominations—just like we helped you with the nominees for whom there were no objections at all—128. Goodness gracious. In the first 2 years of each of the last six Presidents, cumulatively, the majority leader of whichever party had to do that 24 times in order to try to advance a nomination.

So, don’t hand me any of this “sad day in the Senate” stuff. What has been going on here is completely and totally unacceptable. Do you know why I know that? It is because many of your Members, Mr. Leader, have told me privately that they would be happy to do this provided it would take effect in January 2021. Oh, what might happen in January 2021? I can’t imagine. Well, it might be a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate. I can understand—but, oh, not now.

Look, we know you don’t like Donald Trump, but there was an election. He is at least entitled to set up the administration and make it function. With regard to the judiciary and court judges, every President of both parties feels it is his prerogative.

Senator ALEXANDER has pointed out the history of the blue slip. There has been a little confusion about that. He has noted that blue slips were not used as an absolute veto over judicial nominations—just like we helped you with the nominees for whom there were no objections at all—128. Goodness gracious. In the first 2 years of each of the last six Presidents, cumulatively, the majority leader of whichever party had to do that 24 times in order to try to advance a nomination.

So, don’t hand me any of this “sad day in the Senate” stuff. What has been going on here is completely and totally unacceptable. Do you know why I know that? It is because many of your Members, Mr. Leader, have told me privately that they would be happy to do this provided it would take effect in January 2021. Oh, what might happen in January 2021? I can’t imagine. Well, it might be a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate. I can understand—but, oh, not now.

Talk about being proud of something. He is acting like it is a sad day. This is a glad day. We did a great thing. We almost do get to pick them. We almost do get to pick them.
them. There are 47 of these guys over here who are not toothless when it comes to district judges.

So this is not a bad day for the Senate; this is a day we end this completely outrageous level of interference and obstruction with this administration. I don’t think anybody ought to be seized with guilt over any institutional damage being done to the Senate.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that postcloture time under rule XXII for all executive branch nominations other than a position at level 1 of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5 of the United States Code is 2 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the point of order is not sustained.

APPEAL RULING OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I appeal the ruling of the Chair and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—48


NAVS—51

Alexander  Barasso  Blackburn  Blunt  Boozeman  Braun  Burr  Capito  Cassidy  Cornyn  Cotton  Coons  Cortez Masto  Duckworth  Durbin  Feinstein  Gillibrand  

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate overrules the decision of the Chair.

The Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, in the last vote today we established a new precedent. The rules of the Senate are a combination of the rules of the Senate, the standing orders of the Senate, and the precedents of the Senate. Senator LANKFORD and I had hoped to do this with a permanent standing order that basically would have put the Senate exactly where the bipartisan vote was in 2013, which included my vote, to have this kind of cloture that we are encouraging now. This process is designed to speed up not only nominees for Republican Presidents but also nominees for Presidents who are Democrats.

In the last 2 years, we have seen an extraordinary use of every tool available to the minority. The Senate is designed to be a place where the minority is heard. In fact, at one time, any Senator could stop everything forever, and when Senators started doing that to excess, that rule was changed. The protections of the minority often have to be looked at again when the minority abuses those protections. That is what has happened in this case.

Now we have 2 hours of debate on the nominee we are voting right now. If we hadn’t just taken the vote we took that overruled the Chair, we would have 30 hours of debate. I guarantee that there will not be 2 hours of debate about this nominee. There may not be 2 minutes of this nominee. If we see what we have seen happened in the last 2 years.

The rules of the Senate currently say that if any Senator wants to hold up consideration of a nominee, then, the Senator can insist that we go through the process of invoking cloture. In the first 2 years of the Obama administration, that process was used 12 times, and that was more than had been the case in the past. In fact, the previous 3 Presidents had cloture invoked on their nominees a total of 12 times. That is 24 times in 4 Presidencies. In the first 2 years of President Trump’s time in office, the majority leader had to come to the floor 128 times and say we are going to have to invoke cloture to have a chance to vote on this nominee.

It is the first week of April. Eleven times this year already the Senate has had to invoke cloture on a nominee for a government job—for a judge or some other government job. While that debate time was seldom used, occasionally, at the end of the week, we would say: Well, OK, we will just go ahead and do the last one. Each time, we had to assume that 30 hours would be used up for those people to be processed and to have a chance to do the jobs that they were going to do.

The history of the Senate is exactly as the majority leader described here earlier. In the first 2 plus years of the Senate, while the Senate often used a delaying tactic to delay legislation and require the Senate to think about it more, the Senate virtually never used the rules of the Senate to slow down the process of putting people in the Cabinet.

In fact, several Presidents—and Presidents in this century—had their full Cabinet put in place within the first day or two of their administrative term. Least of all do I want to do this to this President, and it is obviously what brought us to where we are today.

Usually, in the first couple of years of a new administration, the President not only gets his Cabinet approved right away, but the President is also able to put people in the Cabinet who want to move the government in the same direction that the voters just said they wanted the country to go.

The term of an administration is only 4 years. At the end of 2 years, if you are sending back 124 nominees who just simply didn’t get voted on—they got investigated, they got the background checks done, they went through the committee, and the committee voted to send them to the floor—that was always supposed to be part of the work of the committee, and that happened for 124 people who never had a chance to get voted on in the first 2 years of this administration, many of whom had been in line for a year.

Now, if you are appointed and have a short-term job in the Federal Government and are willing to serve, the one thing that does for sure is to put your life in some chaos—coming up with the material that the Congress insists on, going through the background check, and getting your financial records out. For most people, it also means putting the way they make a living on hold. I had somebody whom I nominated as one of three people for the President to choose from to be the district judge in the Eastern District of Missouri. I made that nomination roughly 24 months ago. Twenty-two months ago, the President told the person he chose that he was going to nominate that person. Last November, after a year and a half of that person telling all his law clients, “You know, I am about to become a Federal judge; you may need to find another lawyer,” and after he closed his legal process, he hasn’t been voted on yet. That man was one of the people sent back from the White House. He had to be sent back up this year and had to go through the Judiciary Committee again. He had to get back in a line, where every single person took 30 hours of debate, after the 1 day that had to be debatable between the time the President brings you up and you come to the floor.

This sounds pretty complicated. That is because it is, and it is made more complicated by the fact that people have used it as a delaying tactic.

Now, as for the 128 people whom I mentioned—the 128 people whom the majority leader had to file cloture on—compared to 12, let’s be sure we are comparing this the way this used to be,
Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BLACKBURN. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague. He has more institutional knowledge, and he has been here longer, as he understands this process. I haven’t been here as long, but I am trying to put a little common sense to it, and I am having a hard time.

I am not naive enough to stand up thinking that if I could have given my speech before we took that vote, it might have made any difference. I wish it would have. I wish I could have. But it didn’t happen that way.

I have consistently voted against this because it is not who we are, and it is not about what we are about. For those who don’t know, the nuclear option is strictly a gimmick that allows the majority party to truly steal the power of debate and the power of the filibuster from individual Senators. Why does it matter? Because so much of our influence as Senators comes from our power to filibuster. It is the most powerful tool we have to force compromise and to stand up for the people we represent.

In spite of the importance of this power, everyone else in the body who has had the chance to use the nuclear option to lower the votes required to end debate from 60 votes to a simple majority of 50 plus 1 on different types of nominees. That is a tragedy for our constituents. For this country, it is even more of a tragedy. For the institution of the Senate, it is a disaster.

This debate is not new, and I would not be honoring the legacy of the late Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, if I did not take the opportunity to sit in, if I did not take the opportunity to at least recite a little history here on the floor of the Senate.

The Founding Fathers intended the Senate to be deliberate, and we are known as the most deliberative body in the world.

George Washington himself was said to have told Thomas Jefferson that the Senate should serve as a ‘cooling saucer’ for legislation from the House. As you know, the House works on a simple majority—218 Democrats or 218 Republicans can do anything they wish. The Senate is supposed to temper that down.

This body was created to protect the rights of individual States—small States in particular. In the Federalist Papers, John Jay notes that ‘in this spirit it may be remarked, that the equal vote allowed to each State, is at the same time a limitation of the portion of sovereignty remaining in the individual States, and an instrument for preserving that residuary sovereignty.’

The filibuster is essential to preserving that residual sovereignty, and diminishing that power should matter to anyone who comes from a small or rural State like my State of West Virginia. This power was also meant to empower individual Members, like me, who can find themselves in the minority of their own party.

That doesn’t mean we can’t make changes for efficiency. But today’s rule
change and the two that came before it in 2013 and 2017 were not meant to make this place more efficient; they were meant to take power from each and every Senator. That means you and I have given up our power and our ability to stop the administration in the Senate back in 2009, and our Democratic colleagues don't like that one bit. They just don't like it. The American people are getting in the way of what they'd like to do. So they are trying to change the rules of the game to get their way anyway.

This is precisely what the American people decided about Republicans in the 2018 election, and the Republicans have now gone done the same path. Leader McConnell warned us against. You would think that at least we would understand the definition of “insanity”—doing the same thing over and over again, thinking we are going to get a different outcome. It doesn’t work that way.

Leader McConnell went on to say: “So look, I realize this sort of wishful thinking might appeal to the uninitiated newcomers in the Democratic conference who served exactly zero days in the minority, but the rest of you guys should know better.” And he is absolutely correct. Everyone should know better. Those of you who have been in the minority before should know better because what goes around comes around.

His final warning, which I am disappointed my Republican friends didn’t listen to, was this:

If you think this is in the best interest of the United States Senate and the American people, to make advice and consent mean effectively nothing, obviously you can break the rules to change the rules to achieve that.

That is what we have done. But some of us have been around here long enough to know that the shoe is sometimes on the other foot.

While the majority leader and minority leader have flipped their positions and their perspective today, the lesson is clear: Breaking the Senate for political expedience will, over time, hurt all of us and, most importantly, our constituents and the American people.

I firmly believe the filibuster is a vital protection of minority views and exactly why the Framers of our Constitution made the Senate the cooling saucer. Lately, both parties have lit the saucer on fire and thrown it out the window. The Constitution made the Senate the cooling saucer to prevent the United States Senate and the American people from being turned into a firecracker. Someone had to put out the flame. Someone had to know to say: That is not who we are as a country, and it is not basically who we want to be as a country.

We are not the House of Representatives, and by golly, we are going there at a rapid pace—a rapid pace. It seems that when people come from the House, they bring that House mentality—scorched and burned earth. That is not what we were set up to be. This is a very different body. It is the most unique body in the world.

As the late great Robert C. Byrd himself said in the months before his death, “While I welcome needed reform, we must always be mindful of our responsibilities to preserve this institution’s special purpose.” And we are better than this, he said.

I always tell people back home that I can’t vote for something unless I can go home and explain it. I don’t care if it is an idea that my friends on the Republican side have. It makes sense to me. My constituents understand it. I go home and vote and tell them why I voted with my Republican friends. If I can’t help the constituents of the State of West Virginia? Will it make my country stronger and better? That is really what I care about. That is the purpose of my being here.

For the life of me, I can’t figure out how anyone who voted for this can explain it when they go back home, because we have given our power away. Every time you do this, you continue to erode the powers you have as a Senator by the Constitution of the United States of America and by the Founding Fathers who created this body. Now, how can we do it in such a willing way makes no sense. How do you look people in the eye and say any individual power to represent you. How do I do that? I am not going to do it. I am not going to do it, and I haven’t done it, nor will I ever do it.

You can say it was because of obstruction. Well, if there is no obstruction, there is a way around obstructions. You drive around obstructions. You have obstructions in your life every day. You learn to work around obstructions. It is basically by communication. It is basically by sitting down and looking at the other side, the other point of view.

I have always said that I am not always right. I need help. But I am not always wrong either. I have, hopefully, some input, and I try to make that as ways right. I need help. But I am not going to do it. I am not going to do it, and I haven’t done it, nor will I ever do it.

You can say it was because of obstruction. Well, if there is no obstruction, there is a way around obstructions. You drive around obstructions. You have obstructions in your life every day. You learn to work around obstructions. It is basically by communicating. It is basically by sitting down and looking at the other side, the other point of view.

I have always said that I am not always right. I need help. But I am not always wrong either. I have, hopefully, some input, and I try to make that as ways right. I need help. But I am not going to do it. I am not going to do it, and I haven’t done it, nor will I ever do it.

You can say it was because of obstruction. Well, if there is no obstruction, there is a way around obstructions. You drive around obstructions. You have obstructions in your life every day. You learn to work around obstructions. It is basically by communicating. It is basically by sitting down and looking at the other side, the other point of view.

I have always said that I am not always right. I need help. But I am not always wrong either. I have, hopefully, some input, and I try to make that as ways right. I need help. But I am not going to do it. I am not going to do it, and I haven’t done it, nor will I ever do it.

You can say it was because of obstruction. Well, if there is no obstruction, there is a way around obstructions. You drive around obstructions. You have obstructions in your life every day. You learn to work around obstructions. It is basically by communicating. It is basically by sitting down and looking at the other side, the other point of view.

I have always said that I am not always right. I need help. But I am not always wrong either. I have, hopefully, some input, and I try to make that as ways right. I need help. But I am not going to do it. I am not going to do it, and I haven’t done it, nor will I ever do it.

You can say it was because of obstruction. Well, if there is no obstruction, there is a way around obstructions. You drive around obstructions. You have obstructions in your life every day. You learn to work around obstructions. It is basically by communicating. It is basically by sitting down and looking at the other side, the other point of view.

I have always said that I am not always right. I need help. But I am not always wrong either. I have, hopefully, some input, and I try to make that as ways right. I need help. But I am not going to do it. I am not going to do it, and I haven’t done it, nor will I ever do it.
This abdication of our power and responsibility is nothing more than weakness in the face of partisanship. This is truly tribal. What tribe do you belong to? Do you belong to the Democratic tribe, or do you belong to the Republican tribe? I am an American. I belong to the American tribe, and I am going to stay right in the tribe I belong to, and I am going to be loyal to the American tribe.

This abdication of our power and responsibility is truly, truly a weakness in the face of partisanship, and my colleagues need to stand up to the leaders. We have given too much power to the leadership here.

I remember the day when people used to talk about, oh, the committee chair had so much power. They could run a bill and make sure it got on the floor and got voted on. Those days are gone. There is always a reason why something doesn’t go to the floor, even if it goes through the committee process. It goes out of the committee unanimously, and it still doesn’t come to the floor. Try to explain that one.

To protect the powers of the Senators as representatives for their States within the bicameral, not a unicameral, branch of government, and my colleagues need to stand up to the leaders. We have given too much power to the leadership here.

I know I keep calling it an individual right, but it really isn’t. It is a trust passed down from the Senators who preceded us. They had the will and they had the determination to make this place work, and we have given up on that. This belongs to our constituents, the power we have here, and we have to protect them now.

The solution to obstruction isn’t running the Senate. It is outreach. It is compromise. It is finding solutions that make a bunch of people on the far left and the far right very uncomfortable and mad sometimes. Until we are willing to do that, the hard work of this institution is going to get worse. So it is not that we are fractured, we are almost broken, and it was never intended. I have never seen anything broken that we couldn’t fix. I hope we can, I hope we can. As Americans. I hope we understand basically the whole thought process from our Founding Fathers, who had the great insight of having two bodies in a bicameral, not a unicameral, branch that was supposed to work to help each other and protect us from ourselves. Right now, we have become the worst enemy of ourselves. I hope we change.

That is why, when this administration and Republicans in Congress try to take away people's healthcare over and over and again, I take it personally. You know who else takes it personally? The American people. Certainly, I know the people of Michigan do.

Back in November, they sent a message at the ballot box. Unfortunately, the administration and Republicans in Congress missed the message. They rose up and said: My healthcare is personal. Healthcare is not political. What has that meant for the State of Michigan?

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I have come to the floor many times, and I come to the floor today to say something straightforward. Healthcare is personal. Healthcare is not political. What has that meant for the State of Michigan, for the healthy and for the insured?

Healthcare is personal to each and every one of us, not political, and it affects each and every one of us, whether we watch MSNBC, CNN, FOX News, or don’t turn on the television. That is why, when this administration and Republicans in Congress try to take away people’s healthcare over and over and again, I take it personally. You know who else takes it personally? The American people. Certainly, I know the people of Michigan do.

Last April, they issued a rule that, if your mom or dad needs to move into a nursing home, you want to make sure they are happy and that they are treated well, regardless of the specific Medicaid reimbursement rate. Healthcare is personal to each and every one of us, not political, and it affects each and every one of us, whether we watch MSNBC, CNN, FOX News, or don’t turn on the television. That is why, when this administration and Republicans in Congress try to take away people’s healthcare over and over and again, I take it personally. You know who else takes it personally? The American people. Certainly, I know the people of Michigan do.

If you are diagnosed with cancer or a chronic condition, you are more interested in receiving the care you need than the insurance plan that provides that care.

If your child gets sick in the middle of the night and needs to be taken to the emergency room, you don’t care who the doctor voted for in the last Presidential election. If you are diagnosed with cancer or a chronic condition, you are more interested in receiving the care you need than the insurance plan that provides that care.

If your mom or dad needs to move into a nursing home, you want to make sure they are happy and that they are treated well, regardless of the specific Medicaid reimbursement rate. Healthcare is personal to each and every one of us, not political, and it affects each and every one of us, whether we watch MSNBC, CNN, FOX News, or don’t turn on the television. That is why, when this administration and Republicans in Congress try to take away people’s healthcare over and over and again, I take it personally. You know who else takes it personally? The American people. Certainly, I know the people of Michigan do.

If you don’t believe me, just take a look at President Trump’s budget. This administration wants to pay for a huge tax giveaway for the wealthiest among us by taking away people’s healthcare. Let me say that again.

They are asking us to pay for a budget-busting tax giveaway for the wealthy by taking healthcare away from people who depend on Medicare and Medicaid. Many of us, when this tax bill passed, said that when they were creating almost $2 trillion in deficit, watch out because the next thing will be a discussion to say: Oh my gosh. We have a big deficit. We have to cut Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And the other things that directly affect people, with healthcare at the top of the list.

So what happens? Well, the Trump budget would cut $800 billion from Medicare over the next 10 years. That is taking away healthcare from our seniors, people with disabilities. The Trump budget would cut $1.5 trillion from Medicaid over the next 10 years. That is taking healthcare away from half of all the babies born in America who are covered by their and their moms.

That is taking healthcare away from those in three seniors who get their nursing home care from Medicaid healthcare. That is taking away healthcare from everyone who was beneﬁted from Medicaid, including low-income, minimum-wage working people, working families, including more than 650,000 people in my State of Michigan covered by a very successful program called Healthy Michigan.

That is taking away healthcare from two in three seniors who get their nursing home care from Medicaid healthcare. That is taking away healthcare from everyone who was beneﬁted from Medicaid, including low-income, minimum-wage working people, working families, including more than 650,000 people in my State of Michigan covered by a very successful program called Healthy Michigan.

Ninety-seven percent of Michigan children can see a doctor when they get sick or hurt now because of what has happened with Michigan, with Healthy Michigan and other coverage, not the number of people treated without insurance has dropped 50 percent, which means instead of folks dropping into the emergency room who can’t pay and everybody else’s insurance rates go up so you pay for it, people now have their own insurance, and those costs have dropped by 50 percent—the number of people walking in without insurance.

What has that meant for the State of Michigan? Taxpayers had more than $400 million back in the state of Michigan last year because of the savings because of Healthy Michigan.

We should be building on this progress. Instead, Republicans are, once again, trying to take your healthcare away.

Between 2010 and 2018, the Republican majority in Congress voted to repeal or weaken the Affordable Care Act more than 70 times—70—with no replacement. Now the Trump administration has stepped in to help because they weren’t successful in Congress. We were able to stop that because people rose up and said: My healthcare is personal. It is personal, not political. People from across the country engaged and we were able to stop it in Congress. So now the Trump administration has stepped in to do a number of things to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

Look at what has happened in the last year. Last February, the Trump administration announced it would provide funding to States that want to let insurance plans cover fewer services, encouraging fewer services to be covered.

Last April, they issued a rule that, among other things, allowed insurers
to hike premiums 15 percent without justification.

In June and August, they expanded access to Association Health Plans and what are called short-term plans, which we also call junk health plans because they are just a lot cheaper but they don’t cover much, and people don’t realize that until they get sick. These plans don’t have to cover prescription drugs or mental health or maternity care.

By the way, as the person who led that fight in the Senate Finance Committee, I can tell you that the vast majority of insurance plans prior to the Affordable Care Act did not cover maternity care and did away with that 10 years ago.

In July, the Trump administration slashed funding for programs that help people gain health insurance coverage and began steering people toward the junk plans. So instead of giving people information through healthcare.gov and encouraging people to find out what would be the cheapest plan that would be effective and cover what they need, they made it harder to sign up for comprehensive coverage and pushed people toward these junk plans.

In October, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services announced that healthcare.gov would be shut down for 60 hours during open enrollment season for “maintenance,” so you couldn’t even get online to be able to sign up for more affordable, comprehensive insurance that actually would cover things you and your family need.

In November, the Trump administration released information for States on how they could use waivers to undermine consumer protections. Consumer protections, no more capacity to have your child on your insurance until age 26, no more capacity to be able to expand what we are doing for minimum wage workers, et cetera.

In other words, if they can’t take away your health insurance through the legislative process, they are trying to do it now through the courts, which also goes to what is happening now in terms of changing the rules so they can more quickly put judges through and pack the courts with folks who will agree with taking away people’s healthcare.

What is the Republican alternative to the ACA? Unfortunately, these folks still don’t have one. Don’t worry, President Trump now says that he is going to have a “really great” healthcare plan after he is reelected in 2020. Just wait.

By the way, to emphasize the fact that they still don’t have one, last week the Department of Justice announced that it agrees—the Trump administration now agrees with the Federal judge in Texas who said that the entire Affordable Care Act must be struck down. There would be no more coverage for preexisting conditions, no more consumer protections, no more capacity to have your child on your insurance until age 26, no more capacity to be able to expand what we are doing for minimum wage workers, et cetera.

In other words, if they can’t take away your health insurance through the legislative process, they are trying to do it now through the courts, which also goes to what is happening now in terms of changing the rules so they can more quickly put judges through and pack the courts with folks who will agree with taking away people’s healthcare.

What is the Republican alternative to the ACA? Unfortunately, these folks still don’t have one. Don’t worry, President Trump now says that he is going to have a “really great” healthcare plan after he is reelected in 2020. Just wait.

By the way, to emphasize the fact that they still don’t have one, last week the Department of Justice announced that it agrees—the Trump administration now agrees with the Federal judge in Texas who said that the entire Affordable Care Act must be struck down. There would be no more coverage for preexisting conditions, no more consumer protections, no more capacity to have your child on your insurance until age 26, no more capacity to be able to expand what we are doing for minimum wage workers, et cetera.

In other words, if they can’t take away your health insurance through the legislative process, they are trying to do it now through the courts, which also goes to what is happening now in terms of changing the rules so they can more quickly put judges through and pack the courts with folks who will agree with taking away people’s healthcare.

What is the Republican alternative to the ACA? Unfortunately, these folks still don’t have one. Don’t worry, President Trump now says that he is going to have a “really great” healthcare plan after he is reelected in 2020. Just wait.

By the way, to emphasize the fact that they still don’t have one, last week the Department of Justice announced that it agrees—the Trump administration now agrees with the Federal judge in Texas who said that the entire Affordable Care Act must be struck down. There would be no more coverage for preexisting conditions, no more consumer protections, no more capacity to have your child on your insurance until age 26, no more capacity to be able to expand what we are doing for minimum wage workers, et cetera.
five circuit court nominees confirmed in President Obama’s 256 days for President Obama’s nominees versus 139 days for President Trump’s nominees.

The rules change is also unnecessary because Senate Democrats are in no way obstructing confirmations. Senate Democrats have not required cloture votes on more than half of President Trump’s district court nominees.

On average, the Senate has used only 3 hours of floor time for debate on President Trump’s district court nominees.

In addition, a higher percentage of President Trump’s district court nominees have been confirmed by voice vote as compared to President Obama’s district court nominees, 49 percent versus 35 percent. In other words, Senate Democrats have not held roll call votes on nearly half of President Trump’s nominees to the Federal district courts.

Finally, Democrats have worked with the Trump administration to identify qualified judicial nominees.

For example, Delaware’s two Democratic Senators, Senators CARPER and COONS, worked with the White House to identify two qualified nominees to be judges on the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware.

Senators DURBIN and DUCKWORTH of Illinois worked with this administration to identify two highly qualified nominees to be judges on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Both of these nominees were confirmed unanimously.

In addition, we are right now in post-cloture time on the nomination of Roy Altman to the Southern District of Florida. Several Democrats voted for Mr. Altman in committee, and Democrats have not demanded a full 30 hours of debate on Mr. Altman’s nomination.

Despite all of this, Republicans are nevertheless breaking the rules and pushing nominees closer to a body that is governed simply by the whim of the majority.

All of this leads to an unmistakable conclusion—shortening debate time is unnecessary. It is a response to a non-existent problem, and it is simply a power grab to stack the courts at an even faster rate.

It is also important to stress why it is so dangerous to allow the Trump administration to stack the courts in this way, without adequate debate time.

We have seen this administration fill lifetime positions with young, inexperienced nominees who are often outside the legal mainstream. We have seen them try to do this without properly vetting those nominees, as in the case of Brett Talley, who failed to disclose to the Judiciary Committee nearly 15,000 online comments, including one in which he defended the founder of the KKK.

The Senate needs sufficient time to scrutinize the records of these nominees—nominees like Matthew Kacsmaryk and Patrick Wyrick, who have led efforts to undermine the Affordable Care Act; nominees like Brian Hagedorn, who has argued that States should go after women’s reproductive rights “bit by bit”; and nominees like Wendy Vitter, who refused to acknowledge that Brown v. Board of Education was correctly decided and who falsely claimed there is a connection between the use of contraceptive pills and the incidence of cancer.

Two hours is simply not enough time to scrutinize these nominees’ records, especially when so many of this administration’s judicial nominees fail to disclose materials to the Judiciary Committee.

In conclusion, all Senators, and not just those on the Judiciary Committee, need adequate time to review the records of these judicial nominees, who, if confirmed, will serve for life.

All Senators need adequate time to make an informed decision about whether these nominees are qualified to decide the fate of thousands of people’s lives. After all, the American people deserve to know that, if they find themselves in a Federal court, they will have an impartial, qualified, mainstream jurist who has earned the right to sit on the bench.

This decision to break the rules and reduce debate time on judicial nominees not only harms the institution of the Senate, but also harms the Federal judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. I appeal the ruling of the Chair and ask for the yeas and nays. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the point of order is not sustained.

Mr. McCONNELL. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the yeas are 66, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

(Read Call Vote No. 61 Ex.)

YEAS—48

Baldwin
Hassan
Reed

Bennet
Hoeven
Rosen

Blumenthal
Hirono
Sanders

Booker
Joness
Schantz

Brown
Kaine
Schumer

Cantwell
King
Shaheen

Cardin
Klobuchar
Sinema

Capito
Leaky
Smith

Casey
Lee
Stabenow

Collins
Manchin
Tester

Coons
Markley
Udall

Cortez Masto
Menendez
Van Hollen

Duckworth
Markley
Warner

Durbin
Murphy
Warren

Feinstein
Murray
Whitehouse

Gillibrand
Peters
Wyden

NAYS—51

Alexander
Fischer
Perdue

Barrasso
Gardner
Portman

Blackburn
Graham
Risch

Blunt
Graham
Rogers

Boozman
Hawley
Romney

Braun
Hoeven
Rounds

Burr
Hyde-Smith
Rahne

Capito
Inhofe
Sasse

Cassidy
Isakson
Scott (FL)

Cornyn
Johnson
Scott (NC)

Cotton
Kennedy
Shelby

Cramer
Lankford
Sullivan

Crapo
McConnell
Tester

Cruz
McSally
Tillis

Daines
Markey
Tromey

Enzi
Markowski
Wicker

Ernst
Paul
Young

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced the bipartisan Retirement Enhancement and Savings Act of 2019, and the acronym for that is RESA, or R-E-S-A.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues, Ranking Member WYDEN of the Finance Committee, in introducing this very important piece of legislation. The workplace retirement system provides an effective way for employees to save for retirement. Not all workers have access to retirement plans, and some workers who have access to a plan don’t always participate.

The committee felt that we needed to do more to encourage and facilitate retirement savings. That is why we are providing new incentives for employers to adopt retirement plans. The bill also helps to reduce costs of operating these plans and creates new provisions to encourage workers to plan and to save for retirement.

This bill has been a long time in the making. Work on it actually began shortly after the passage of the Pension Protection Act of 2006. So when I say a long time, if it actually started back there at that time, that is 13 years ago.

Over several Congresses, the Finance Committee has held hearings on the retirement system and reviewed a number of proposals to improve the system. Many ideas were put forward. We examined each of them carefully, including the work of the Finance Committee’s Tax Reform Working Group on Savings and Investment, which did most of its work during the year 2015.

The resulting proposals were brought together to form this bill that we call RESA. It was unanimously approved by the Finance Committee in 2016. In the last Congress, many of us worked closely with former Senator Hatch, and the chairmen at that time, to advance this package. We came very close to an agreement last December, but, as a lot of times happens at the end of the year, it fell short due to politics and the process at that time. Passage of this important bill remains a top priority for me. I have continued working closely with Senator WYDEN, the ranking Democrat, other committee members, and even colleagues in the House to maintain the momentum from the end of last year so that improvements in this bill can be signed to law without further delay.

The RESA bill would reform our retirement savings laws in several important areas. For example, it would improve an existing plan called a multiple employer plan, or as we say in finance, MEP. The bill would expand these plans so that employers can join together to sponsor a single retirement plan for their workers. These open MEPs would make it much easier and more cost-effective for small businesses of all sizes, and especially small businesses, to offer retirement plans by harnessing economies of scale and reducing unnecessary administrative burdens on employers.

More importantly, these open MEPs would open the door for millions of Americans to save for retirement. Speaking of small businesses, the bill includes provisions designed to make it easier and more cost-effective for small employers to sponsor a retirement plan. Small businesses, farms, and ranches, are, of course, vital to our economy. We need to encourage a level playing field so that workers and small businesses throughout our country have equal access to retirement plans at work as Fortune 500 companies have.

RESA also would create a new fiduciary safe harbor for employers that allow employees to invest in lifetime income options in their retirement accounts. In addition, the bill would expand the portability of retirement plan assets, including those annuities. That would allow workers, then, to keep their retirement savings when they change jobs throughout their careers.

This bill also would boost employers to provide the kinds of tools and flexibility that employees need to plan for a financially secure retirement. RESA also would help employers to add to their retirement savings each year through automatic increases in contributions to 401(k) plans. Also, to help workers plan better for retirement, the legislation would require employers to provide an estimate of how much the employee’s account would provide during retirement if the employee invested the balance in an annuity.

All of this is intended to help individuals get on the path of saving for a secure retirement during their working years, but it is also with an eye toward making sure that their savings will last once they retire. I should also note that this bill is paid for.

This is the pay-for. The main offsetting provision is an increase under current law for a person to pass along his or her IRA or 401(k) account to a family member or other beneficiary. Under current law, the recipient of that account can keep the inherited funds in the tax-deferred account and save for their own retirement if they take out a required minimum amount each year. That is often referred to as “stretch IRA.”

The bill maintains this savings option for people who inherit an IRA or retirement account but replaces a limit on how large an account can be inherited on a tax-protected basis. This is a commonsense approach to encourage the next generation to save for retirement while ensuring that the changes in this bill are fiscally responsible.

Retirement security is a very important topic that is already getting a great deal of attention this year. The House Ways and Means Committee considered a retirement savings bill yesterday that is built on the provisions included in RESA, and I look forward to working with Chairman NEAL of the House Ways and Means Committee to reconcile our bills and to get a final package to the President’s desk.

So, in closing, I want to sum by stressing that increasing long-term savings in America is critically important. We know that there are ways that we can improve our private retirement system, but, it requires a further delay.

The reforms in this bill represent a very important step forward in improving Americans’ retirement security.

I know that there are other Members with additional ideas for improving retirement security. I want those Members to know that regardless of this bill’s passing, we are ready to consider those proposals and advancing those that will build on RESA and will help us to attain the goal of ensuring that all Americans achieve a security retirement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding standing rule XXII, the confirmation vote on the Altman nomination occur at 11:45 a.m. on Thursday, April 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The senior Senator from North Dakota.
Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss why we needed to reform the confirmation process. It was absolutely necessary to ensure that the Senate is able to approve the President’s nominees in a timely manner.

Delay and obstruction have prevented qualified nominees from being confirmed. In fact, at the pace the Senate has been going, it would take more than 5 years to process the remaining nominees. Clearly, the process isn’t working.

In the Senate, we take our advice and consent role very seriously. We all want to ensure that we have capable and qualified individuals serving in important positions. Delays in the confirmation process often have nothing to do with the qualifications of the candidate.

These nominees have been vetted and approved by the appropriate committee and weeks or months waiting to be considered by the full Senate. Currently, there are more than 100 nominees awaiting confirmation on the Senate calendar. That is because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been using the filibuster to delay nominees—even routine, highly qualified nominees.

In past administrations, a cloture vote was only required for high-level or controversial nominations that required additional deliberation or debate. Under President Trump, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have required cloture on hundreds of nominees, which means instead of approving these nominations in a timely manner, it often takes 3 days on the Senate floor before a final vote is taken. That is because, following a vote to invoke cloture, there is an additional 30 hours of floor debate after an intervening day.

During the first 2 years of the previous 3 Presidencies, there were a total of 24 cloture votes. During the first 2 years of President Trump’s Presidency, the Senate forced a cloture vote on 128 nominations. Think about that—24 for the prior 3 Presidents and 128 cloture votes on President Trump’s nominations. For President Obama, during his first 2 years—to compare President Trump to President Obama’s first 2 years—12 for Obama. There were 12 for President Obama and 128 for President Trump.

So let me provide another example. During the 8 years of the Obama administration, the Senate confirmed 272 district court judges. Since President Trump has been elected, the Senate has confirmed 53 district judges—272 to 53 district court judges. At that pace, only 195 district court judges would be approved over a full 8-year period, far less than the 272 during the Obama administration.

These delays impact qualified individuals across the Nation. For example, Peter Welte, the nominee to be the U.S. district court judge for the District of North Dakota, was nominated by President Trump more than 77 days ago. It has been about 230 days since Drew Wrigley, nominee to be U.S. attorney for the District of North Dakota, was originally reported by President Trump. These are qualified nominees for the District of North Dakota and the President’s home State of North Dakota who have been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support. Yet both are still waiting for confirmation by the U.S. Senate. They need to be out there doing their job. They need to get confirmed.

That is why we voted today to reduce debate from 30 hours to 2 hours for nominees like district court judges as well as many executive branch nominees, while retaining the 30 hours of debate for high-level nominees—for circuit court judges, Supreme Court judges, and for Cabinet positions. We did not change the confirmation for noncontroversial nominations, including the Supreme Court, circuit court, and for Cabinet-level officials.

This reform does streamline the process for all nominees who have languished on the Senate calendar for far too long. This is a commonsense reform to ensure that there is still debate on nominees, while making the process more efficient and effective so we can get nominees confirmed and working for the American people, as is our job.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, as you know and as we know, our Nation is facing an affordable housing crisis.

Right now, we are considering the nomination of someone who will have the power to do something about it—Mark Calabria, the President’s nominee to spend the next half decade heading the Federal Housing Finance Agency. He would be responsible for overseeing a $6 trillion housing market that provides homes for millions of American families, and $6.5 trillion is $6.5 thousand billion; that is how big a trillion is. He will oversee a $6.5 trillion housing market that provides homes for millions of families.

Far too many Americans are left behind in our housing policy. Think about this. One-third of all households spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing. A number that is even more concerning is that one-quarter of American renters spend at least half their income on housing.

One-quarter of American renters spend half of their income on housing. What does that mean?

That is not something people around here, frankly, think about very much. If you are a Senator, or you are a Congressman, if you are some of the highly paid staff people, and many aren’t, but if you are the chief of staff or legislative director or if you are a staff director, you don’t think about those things.

If you do what Lincoln used to do and say “I need to go out and get my public-opinion baths” and if you see how people live and you see that somebody is paying half their income in rent, and their car breaks down and they don’t have $600 to fix their car, what happens is they can’t pay their rent. Then, if something else happens and they get evicted, their whole life turns upside down. They have to give away their pet, no matter what their kids think. They have to move out of that apartment. They have to turn their children to a different school. They often have to live in the basement of a neighbor’s or a cousin’s home. They end up putting their things in storage and losing them.

I don’t think we understand what the housing crisis means to, literally, tens of millions of Americans. It is not just in the city, as the Presiding Officer knows. It is in rural areas. His State is pretty rural. Big parts of my State are extremely rural. It is Appalachia, small towns, and small cities like Zanesville, OH, and Mansfield, OH—places where you can’t pay the rent or you get your home foreclosed and you lose your job, you get thrown out of your home, and your whole life turns upside down. That is why this is so important.

We are not only talking about renting but also about homeownership too. This homeownership rate among African Americans is at the same dismal level it was before we had laws in place to protect against discrimination. Those laws are barely being enforced. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development seems to have little interest in enforcing housing discrimination laws. The Senate Banking Committee majority seems to have little interest in enforcing anti-discrimination laws. Hispanic households are hardly better off than African-American households. Those are serious issues we have to solve.

As we face this crisis, Mark Calabria, the President’s nominee for FHFA will be on the frontlines. He will set policies that determine how many families can afford to buy a home and how much they pay. He will have the power to promote or discourage building affordable apartments to serve the lowest income renters. It is not just that people’s wages are stagnant in the Trump economy. Wages are flat. It is not just that. As prices go up, there simply isn’t enough housing, so rental units are getting more and more expensive.

If your wages are flat, no matter how hard you work—you might have two jobs, a job making $9 and a job making $14, but it is not enough if your rent keeps going up, as it does in far too many cases.

The record shows that Dr. Calabria is exactly the wrong person for this job. He actually questioned the need for the 30-year fixed-rate mortgage. Think about that. That is the primary tool...
families use to afford homes and build wealth. I am guessing that almost every one of my colleagues, except those born extraordinarily rich—I am guessing that for most of us in this body, most people watching this, most of our Aoffs, and most Americans who own homes generally the first home they bought had a 25- or 30-year fixed mortgage. Before people owned homes much in this country, a century ago, they had to pay off their home in 3 or 4 or 5 years, typically. Almost nobody can do that. That is why we have the 30-year fixed-rate mortgage.

Dr. Calabria wonders whether we need the 30-year mortgage at all. President Trump clearly doesn’t know. President Trump knows how to build the big apartment buildings and borrow money from Deutsche Bank because no reputable bank in the United States will lend to him. But he doesn’t know what it is like to pay off a mortgage and for people who think in terms of, “How am I going to pay off my mortgage?” He doesn’t understand what the importance of a 30-year mortgage is. Presumably, that is why President Trump picked somebody like Dr. Calabria to be one of Dr. Calabria’s top priorities, but he doesn’t think we need the current affordable housing goals. He told Congress that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which he would be in charge of, should be eliminated. He would be the one overseeing a housing finance system that has helped more than 28 million American families become homeowners. He has questioned the need for 30-year fixed-rate mortgages. He has called for repaying the affordable housing goals. One-third of households are spending more than one-third of their income on housing, and it is worse for renters. You would think that someone like Dr. Calabria who makes a fortune from Wall Street traders—that is t-r-a-d-e-r-s, presumably, that is why President Trump clearly doesn’t know. He is saying that these people are deadbeats—those who are working hard. They lost their jobs. That is the main reason most of them couldn’t keep up with their mortgages. These families are working as hard as they can do that. They work a lot harder than the Wall Street traders—that is t-r-a-d-e-r-s, perhaps—who are taking big risks with other people’s money.

Some of Ohio’s families were laid off, and they tried to find new jobs. They were making $22 an hour, and they found new jobs at $14 an hour. They work just as hard, maybe harder, but the new jobs don’t pay as much. Some couldn’t find new jobs because the new jobs don’t pay as much. In 2010, one in five homeowners in Ohio was underwater in his mortgage. Yet he calls them deadbeats? One out of five people is a deadbeat because the worth of his home dropped, and he couldn’t keep up with his mortgage?

At that time, Ohio had lost 375,000 jobs. In that year, Dr. Calabria criticized one of the most important tools that States like Ohio had in trying to help homeowners—the Hardest Hit Fund—and he asked, “Why?” The Government said that the people who were underwater—what does underwater mean? Underwater means that you have been paying your mortgage, but because of a drop in the economy or in your community, what you owe is more than what the house is worth. The house becomes devalued because of the neighborhood, because of other foreclosures, because of other people being evicted, and your house is worth less than what you owe the bank for your mortgage. That is called being underwater. Dr. Calabria called those people deadbeats. Those people probably work every bit as hard as Dr. Calabria does—not to make it personal—or as hard as most of us in the Senate work. These are people working hard to try to get ahead. Because of circumstances in this global economy where wages are flat, where the rich are getting richer, where most of America is treading water, those people were underwater—what does underwater mean? Underwater means that they were underwater in their homes has clearly never met those who have actually had their homes foreclosed on. I have met those families.

My wife, Connie, and I live in ZIP Code 41405 in Cleveland, OH. That means nothing to anybody who is listening, but the ZIP Code in which we live is one of those in the United States. We live in a development of about 200 homes that are priced at $100,000 to $200,000 to $250,000, but not far away, in the rest of this ZIP Code, there is no home, after home, after home that has been foreclosed on. These homes are generally old. They are generally not in good shape. They generally have very toxic levels of lead that poison children in their centers.

He is saying that these people are deadbeats—who are working hard. They lost their jobs. That is the main reason most of them couldn’t keep up with their mortgages. These families are working as hard as they can do that. They work a lot harder than the Wall Street traders—that is t-r-a-d-e-r-s, perhaps—who are taking big risks with other people’s money.

Some of Ohio’s families were laid off, and they tried to find new jobs. They were making $22 an hour, and they found new jobs at $14 an hour. They work just as hard, maybe harder, but the new jobs don’t pay as much. Some couldn’t find new jobs because the new jobs don’t pay as much. In 2010, one in five homeowners in Ohio was underwater in his mortgage. Yet he calls them deadbeats? One out of five people is a deadbeat because the worth of his home dropped, and he couldn’t keep up with his mortgage?

At that time, Ohio had lost 375,000 jobs. In that year, Dr. Calabria criticized one of the most important tools that States like Ohio had in trying to help homeowners—the Hardest Hit Fund—and he asked, “Why?” The Government said that the people who were underwater—what does underwater mean? Underwater means that you have been paying your mortgage, but because of a drop in the economy or in your community, what you owe is more than what the house is worth. The house becomes devalued because of the neighborhood, because of other foreclosures, because of other people being evicted, and your house is worth less than what you owe the bank for your mortgage. That is called being underwater. Dr. Calabria called those people deadbeats. Those people probably work every bit as hard as Dr. Calabria does—just to make it personal—or as hard as most of us in the Senate work. These are people working hard to try to get ahead. Because of circumstances in this global economy where wages are flat, where the rich are getting richer, where most of America is treading water, those people were deadbeats for something they didn’t even do. Anybody who doesn’t think families will do everything they possibly can to stay in their homes has clearly never met those who have actually had their homes foreclosed on. I have met those families.

My wife, Connie, and I live in ZIP Code 44105 in Cleveland, OH. That means nothing to anybody who is listening, but the ZIP Code in which we live is one of those in the United States. We live in a development of about 200 homes that are priced at $100,000 to $200,000 to $250,000, but not far away, in the rest of this ZIP Code, there is no home, after home, after home that has been foreclosed on. These homes are generally old. They are generally not in good shape. They generally have very toxic levels of lead that poison children in their centers.

He is saying that these people are deadbeats—who are working hard. They lost their jobs. That is the main reason most of them couldn’t keep up with their mortgages. These families are working as hard as they can do that. They work a lot harder than the Wall Street traders—that is t-r-a-d-e-r-s, perhaps—who are taking big risks with other people’s money.
to give less time to debate nominees who will have immense power over people’s lives.

We talk about judges who serve lifetime appointments. We talk about the heads of Agencies, like of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, who have the authority to hold corporations accountable if they use that power. Of course, we are talking about Dr. Calabria, who is supposed to make the housing market work for all Americans, yet who isn’t sure we need the 30-year fixed mortgage. Why is that?

I would hope my colleagues would agree that these nominees deserve thoughtful consideration; they deserve debates; they deserve somebody who will defend them to come to the Senate floor. Let my fellow Republicans from the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee—people with whom I get along well and personally like—make the case for Dr. Calabria. Let them answer why he is not for the 30-year fixed mortgage, why he calls people who are underwater in their mortgages deadbeats. Why is that?

I would hope my colleagues would come to this floor and debate. I would hope that Senator McConnell would allow enough time for us to debate. I would hope my colleagues would reject Dr. Calabria’s nomination and tell the President to send us a new nominee. I would hope that Americans, who have the power to hold corporations accountable if they use that power, who have the power to make it easier, not harder, for Americans to afford housing.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO SEDAT ACTON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today it is my privilege to pay tribute to a Louisville, KY, legend, who is simply known as the Handstand Man. Like so many other University of Louisville Cardinals fans, I have vivid memories of cheering on our men’s basketball team at Freedom Hall. During high-profile games, when the tension reached its peak, the eyes of every Cardinal would look upward gazing upon the gymnastic feats of Sedat Acton.

When the team and the crowd most needed his particular form of inspiration, Sedat would leave his seat and head toward a railing on the second level. As the Cardinals officials blew their whistles for a timeout, Sedat would lift his body off the ground into an impressive handstand, dozens of feet above the arena’s floor. Then, as the fans cheered, he would stretch out his legs under his torso into an L. For so many Louisville fans, Sedat’s iconic handstand became an essential part of the basketball game experience, but for this fan in particular, his story holds even greater significance.

Like me, Sedat contracted polio at an early age. As a child in Turkey, he endured bullying because of the disease’s lasting effects. Sedat would walk the beaches and watch groups of acrobats. He was inspired by their skills and became determined to use gymnastics to gain his own strength and off bullies, and prove he had defeated the terrible disease.

Under the caring and watchful eye of my mother, I was able to eventually get back on my feet. By practicing the gymnastics I saw on the beach, Sedat overcame the disease as well. Then, as a teenager, he joined a professional acrobatics club in Switzerland. Sedat performed around Europe for years and showcased his tremendous strength.

In his early 20s, Sedat came to Louisville to live with his sister. Joining a local gymnastics squad at the YMCA on 3rd and Broadway, they performed with the cheerleaders at halftime during UofL men’s basketball games. Over the years, Sedat could be found performing during several Cardinals’ basketball and football games and even for the Kentucky Colonels.

Around 1980, he began a new type of act. This time, he was in the stands, where he earned the title of Handstand Man. His daring stunt provoked shocks and cheers from those below as he renewed the crowd’s enthusiasm and inspired the players.

Over the next 30 years, Sedat’s handstands became a regular part of Cardinals’ basketball. I remember attending many of those games, and right when we needed it most, we would look to the rafters to see Sedat. He provided a much-needed thrill, helping cheer on the Cards during important games, and eventually to win conference tournaments and even the NCAA national championship.

Sedat’s last performance at a UofL game was in 2009, but his legendary status among the people of Louisville remains. A local celebrity, Sedat is frequently recognized for his years of passion for the Cardinals. Now at the age of 74, he remains as dedicated a fan as ever.

Last year, Sedat and his family celebrated the 50th anniversary of his arrival in the United States. He speaks with such pride for the blessings of this great country and for the opportunities he has received here. One of Sedat’s prized possessions is a decades-old American flag. Throughout the years, he turned down many opportunities to leave Kentucky because he loves the city of Louisville, its people, and is so proud to call it home.

It wasn’t that long ago that polio represented a real crisis. Through the concentrated efforts of many, the number of polio cases worldwide has plummeted dramatically. Thankfully, we must remain vigilant in eliminating this disease for good.

I am grateful for the chance to honor Sedat’s remarkable life today. With his wife of 40 years, Teresa, their three children, and their growing family, Sedat is fulfilling the American dream. As the Louisville Cardinals look forward to the beginning of the next basketball season, I know my Senate colleagues will join me in congratulating Sedat Acton on his lifetime of accomplishments.

COLORADO RIVER DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleagues from the Colorado River Basin and with Senator MANCHIN, the ranking member on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, regarding the Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan Authorization Act.

I am pleased that we are considering this bill so quickly on the Senate floor. We need to act now as the historic drought conditions in the basin are a real threat to the water supply of 40 million people and 5.5 million acres of farmland.

As the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I think it is important to take some time clarifying the intent behind this bill. We started last month with an oversight hearing in the Water and Power Subcommittee to examine the Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan, which was chaired by my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, Ms. MCSALLY.

We also need to understand what the legislation that we are passing today does and does not do. As I read it, the legislation does not address the Shortages and Coordinated Operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead enables the Secretary to do so immediately as this document covers all of the Federal actions contemplated in the agreements.

Mr. President, Ms. MCSALLY, is that the correct reading of the bill?

Ms. MCSALLY. Yes, the Senator is exactly
right. The Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan, or DCP, consists of the Agreement Concerning Colorado River Drought Contingency Management and Operations and additional agreements that appear as attachments A1, A2, and B to that agreement. It is a response to the ongoing and severe drought and is designed to get us to 2026 without a serious crisis. In the lower basin, this will be done by increasing the contributions and providing incentives to leave water banked in Lake Mead as intentionally created surplus, among other things. My bill reflects the urgency of the situation through its directive that the Secretary of the Interior act without delay to sign the agreements upon execution by the seven Colorado River Basin States.

As Chairman MURKOWSKI mentioned, it is expected that the Secretary will sign these agreements without delay since the actions to be undertaken are well within the language of the legislation for resolutions and range of effects reviewed in the environmental documents prepared pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, ESA, and in the 2007 final environmental impact statement, EIS, on Colorado River Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and Coordinated Operations for Lake Powell and Lake Mead; and the EISs and ESA documents prepared for operation of the Colorado River Storage Project Act initial storage unit reservoirs. Additional environment is only if Federal actions be undertaken that are outside the range of effects analyzed in those documents or the applicable records of decision.

I ask Senator CORTEZ MASTO, does she agree with this characterization of our bill?

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I thank my colleague from Arizona. I agree with her assessment. I would also add that this legislation was developed to ensure water conservation activities in the Colorado River Basin are able to begin in 2019 and be built into the planning of operations for 2020. For this to happen, there can be no delay between execution of the DCP by the States and the signing and implementation by the Secretary of the Interior.

I ask Senator GARDNER, is this also his understanding from the upper basin perspective?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, the statements Senator CORTEZ MASTO and Senator MCSALLY have made regarding the existing environmental compliance documents and actions contemplated in the DCP agreements and the Secretary’s expected immediate implementation of those agreements once acted upon by the basin states are consistent with my understanding.

This legislation is an important steppingstone to helping assure the long-term sustainability of the Colorado River and enables the seven Colorado River Basin States to take advantage of flexible water management tools they have created under the Upper and Lower Basin Drought Contingency Plans to address variable water supply conditions in the face of an almost two-decades-long drought that has no end in sight.

The Upper Basin Drought Contingency Plan involves planning for how water may be transferred from the Initial Unit of the Colorado River Storage Project Act, otherwise known as the CRSP Initial Units, to protect critical elevations at Lake Powell and subsequently recover storage at the Units. It also means implementing the Resilience Management for the upper basin to conserve water to help assure continued compliance with the Colorado River Compact which will improve the resiliency of the entire Colorado River System. In the Upper Basin DCP, the “applicable Colorado River System reservoirs” include and are limited to the Initial Units of the Colorado River Storage Project Act, which include the Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Aspinall, and Navajo facilities.

I ask Senator BENNET, who has been asked about the urgency and path forward for DCP implementation. I would like to reiterate that this bill does not exempt or waive any environmental laws. In drafting the DCPs, both the upper and lower basin carefully considered the environment and the existing environmental analyses and compliance documents. Additional NEPA compliance analyses and actions are outside the scope of effects analyzed in the existing compliance and decision documents.

I ask Senator SINEMA, is this also her understanding?

Ms. SINEMA. I agree with my colleagues’ statements and am proud to continue the legacy of water policy leadership in Arizona. Water plays a pivotal role for the environment, economic development, and cultural heritage. I am proud to have worked closely with the State of Arizona and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep this process moving forward. Arizona takes a huge step towards securing its water future under the Drought Contingency Plan. The plan provides all Arizona communities, from Native American tribes to rural and agricultural regions to metropolitan cities, with greater certainty for critical water supplies. It shows what can be accomplished when stakeholders work together. I thank my colleagues for the discussion here today and urge passage of this legislation to ensure all Colorado River Basin States are able to implement the DCP as soon as possible.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank all of the Senators for providing their views on the language and for sponsoring this important legislation.

I ask Senator MANCHIN, has he heard the discussion among the sponsors of this bill? What is he heard from them about the intent of the legislation in line with his understanding?

Mr. MANCHIN. It is. I thank my colleagues for their support of this critical legislation and for participating in the discussion here today.

Ms. MCSALLY. I would like to thank Chairman MURKOWSKI and Ranking Member MANCHIN for their time, attention, and support of this critical legislation. I also associate myself with the comments added by the bill cosponsors and thank them all for their work on this issue and their comments about this bill’s effect.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank my colleagues for this clarification and explanation of the Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan Authorization Act. As we have just explained, the bill sponsors, along with the chair and ranking member of committee of jurisdiction are unified in the expectation that enactment of this bill will lead to immediate action by the Secretary of the Interior, and the DCP will be signed and implemented upon execution by the States.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING JEROME COUNTY

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, my colleagues Senator MIKE CRAPO and Representative MIKE SIMPSON join me today in recognizing the 100th anniversary of Jerome County, ID.

Established February 8, 1919, by the Idaho Legislature, the county was named for either Jerome Kuhn, son of William S. Kuhn, or Jerome Hill, who was commissioned by Kuhn to find a suitable town site north of the Snake River Canyon. With the city of Jerome as the county seat, the small farming communities of Eden and Hazelton also make up the eastern portion of Jerome County.

One of the early pioneers of Jerome County, I.B. Perrine, was looking for a place to winter his cattle, and Charles Walgamott showed him a spot with beautiful clear blue lakes bubbling up from an underground aquifer. Mr.
Perrine settled this area and called it the Blue Lakes Ranch. These blue lakes continue to provide water for irrigation, raising rainbow trout, and pristine drinking water to the residents of this area. It also features the beauty of Blue Lakes Country Club with one of the most scenic 18-hole golf courses in the State.

Although not officially recognized, local historians have documented the Hudson Bay Trail as an alternate route of the Oregon Trail, which goes through Jerome County. The tradesmen of the Hudson Bay Company seemed to have preferred the trail going north of the Snake River Canyon to make their way to Fort Boise in the West and Fort Hall in the East.

With water, Mr. Perrine saw the magic this area produced and, with the help of Eastern United States Financiers, created the Milner Dam along the Snake River. The Milner Dam and subsequent irrigation system opened the door to the Southern Snake River Plain to farmers, ranchers, and new communities. As a result, the communities of Jerome, Eden, Hazelton, and Greenwood were established between 1905 and 1911.

In 1919, the Idaho Legislature took the south portion of Lincoln County and the western portion of Minidoka County to carve out Jerome County. As one of the youngest counties in Idaho, it is the 43rd county, out of 44, in the State.

A notable part of Jerome County is the Minidoka Relocation Center north of Eden; it is one of the 10 Japanese internment camps created by the U.S. Government during World War II. Currently, it stands as the Minidoka National Historic Site as a memorial of the sacrifice and suffering of the Japanese-Americans during this period of our history.

Today, Jerome County boasts a thriving economy led by the dairy industry, producing more than 100 million pounds of cheese, whey protein, and other dairy products. They also produce the agricultural commodities of alfalfa hay, silage corn, barley, winter wheat, sugar beets, potatoes, beans, and spring wheat.

Senator CRAPOL, Representative SIMPSON, and I are proud to recognize this landmark anniversary. We congratulate Jerome County residents on this centennial, and we wish its communities many more years of success.

REMEMBERING LEON E. BRAXTON
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the memory of Leon E. “Bill” Braxton, a World War II veteran and teacher who dedicated his life in service to our Nation and educated countless students throughout his career.

Bill Braxton was born near Hope Hills, NC, on May 1, 1917. After graduating high school in 1934, he enlisted with the U.S. Army in April 1935, serving in Panama, Austria, Germany, Japan, and Korea. He was an honor graduate of the Coast Artillery School, European Air Transport Service’s Flight Captain’s School, and the Air Force Office of Special Investigations. Bill flew combat missions in Indo China and France at the Battle of Dien Bien Phu.

In 1959, he retired from the U.S. Air Force and enrolled at the University of Miami, graduating magna cum laude with a degree in German. He then returned to Idaho and the National Defense Education Act to attend Kent State University, earning a master’s degree in German in 1964.

Bill’s first teaching position was at Haleah High School, teaching German and English. He taught at Stetson University before moving to Satellite Beach in 1971, where he joined Satellite High School. While there, he developed the school’s German Student Program and was named teacher of the year for southern Brevard County. His proudest achievement was establishing the school’s Fulbright Student Exchange program for German students before retiring from the school in 1979.

In retirement, he continued to teach French, German, and Spanish at Brevard Community College and co-authored four nonfiction books based on his life experiences, people he met at home and abroad, and events he witnessed while serving in the military.

Bill Braxton lived a full life and made a difference for his community and his country. I express my sincerest condolences to his four children—Thomas Braxton, Patty Braxton, and Susan Braxton—his seven grandchildren, and his three great-grandchildren. May God bless his family during this time of sorrow, and may they be strengthened by the memory of his life’s service.

TRIBUTE TO CAROLINE BUECHNER
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Caroline Buechner, the Santa Rosa County Teacher of the Year from Navarre High School in Navarre, FL.

Caroline was named teacher of the year after being selected among 33 teachers nominated from each school in her district. Santa Rosa superintendent, Tim Wyrosdick, visited her classroom during one of her chorus lessons to present the award. Caroline was humbled to receive this honor and wished to convey a message to all educators: “Join together to better the educational experience for students.”

Caroline considers her students the best she could ever ask for, many of them are training for an upcoming singing competition. While she was shocked at the honor, her students knew she deserved the award and gave her a round of applause. She is credited for marrying academia and the performing arts and growing the school’s choir program.

Caroline has been a choral music educator at Navarre High School for the past 9 years and is the coordinator of the 2019 All State High School Concern Choir. Her chorus program is considered one of the more prestigious programs in Florida.

I extend my sincere gratitude to Caroline for her dedication to teaching her choir students and look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO EVAN GOULD
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Evan Gould, the Clay County Teacher of the Year from Lake Asbury Junior High School in Green Cove Springs, FL.

Evan regards it a tremendous honor to represent all school employees as teacher of the year. He believes support staff play a critical role in the success of students and teachers. His colleagues note he leads, inspires, and coaches his students to perform at the highest level. Evan believes every student can succeed academically, artistically, and socially.

Evan currently teaches chorus and drama classes at Lake Asbury Junior High School. He has been a teacher for 30 years, with 22 years in Clay County. His chorus and drama programs are highly regarded in Florida, winning awards and superior ratings at district and State competitions. He also serves as chair of District 1 Junior Thespians, hosting more than 500 drama students from across the region for their annual festival.

I express my sincere thanks and best wishes to Evan for his work to educate his students in chorus and drama. I look forward to learning of his continued success in the years ahead.
TRIBUTE TO DEBRA HARTLINE
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Debra Hartline, the Manatee County Teacher of the Year from Braden River High School in Bradenton, FL.

Debra works closely with her students who need to improve their reading comprehension scores in order to meet the requirement for graduation. Each year, more than 96 percent of her students reach that goal. Her students note she spends many hours of work regularly re-instilling their confidence in themselves and preparing them before they take the reading tests.

Debra’s proudest moments are when she watches her students walk across the stage at their graduation. Many of them thought they would never graduate and credit Debra’s reading methods with helping them improve their reading comprehension.

Debra has taught for 13 years, with the last 8 years at Braden River High School as a reading and English teacher. She previously managed a law in Cleveland, OH, when she noticed her daughter was struggling with reading comprehension. After she moved to Florida in 2000, she began to tutor at her home and later became a volunteer teacher at Braden River Elementary School.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Debra for her dedication in helping students achieve the important steps of graduating from high school. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO ANGELA HIRTZ
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Angela Hritz, the Okaloosa County Teacher of the Year from Davidson Middle School in Crestview, FL.

Angela received this award at her school district’s annual banquet at the Emerald Coast Conference Center. She values the balancing act between challenging students and empowering them, and believes the most rewarding part of her job are the connections she makes with her students.

In her classes, she incorporates English language arts standards and keeps her students engaged by using Socratic seminars to deepen their understanding and develop communication skills. She ensures that her classroom is a respectful environment for her students.

Angela is a world history teacher and has taught at Davidson Middle School for more than 20 years. She earned a master’s degree in educational leadership in 2008.

I congratulate Angela for receiving this important recognition after decades of teaching and extend my best wishes to her. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO TONYA MILES
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am honored to recognize Tonya Miles, the Putnam County Teacher of the Year from William D. Moseley Elementary School in Palatka, FL.

Tonya was honored to receive this award, noting that she was overwhelmed with joy. Her colleagues commended her on the difference she has made within the school district.

Tonya’s students describe the culture in her classroom and their school as one of a big family. It is an atmosphere where everyone works to help others feel like she is their biggest supporter, both in the classroom and in their extracurricular activities.

Tonya has taught for 15 years and has been a fifth grade math teacher at William D. Moseley Elementary School for the past year and a half. I extend my best wishes to Tonya for her dedication to her students and community and congratulate her on this award.

TRIBUTE TO MEREDITH NESS
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I honor Meredith Ness, the Walton County Teacher of the Year from Mossy Head Elementary School in Defuniak Springs, FL.

Meredith’s colleagues describe her as possessing the skills and dedication of a true leader and note that she is highly respected by all at her school. She views herself as a lifelong learner with a love for teaching students.

In Meredith’s classes, she uses her knowledge for research in education and technology in designing lesson plans to teach her students. She currently serves as a professional learning facilitator, sponsor of Lego league and robotics club, a teacher mentor, and a member of the MHS school improvement team.

Meredith has been a teacher for 16 years, with the past 8 years at Mossy Head Elementary School. She is currently a fourth grade teacher.

I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to Meredith for all of the great work she has done for her students and congratulate her for winning this award.

TRIBUTE TO BRYAN POEPPELING
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Bryan Poeppeling, the Hendry County Teacher of the Year from Clewiston High School in Clewiston, FL.

In Bryan’s classroom, his teaching of philosophy is based off a quote from Thomas Edison, “There is no substitute for hard work.” He works to instill this mentality to both his students in the classroom, and the student-athletes he coaches.

Bryan is the social studies department lead and teaches advanced placement U.S. history and U.S. history classes to sophomore and juniors at Clewiston High School. He also coaches cross country and junior varsity basketball. He earned his bachelor’s degree in secondary education and social studies at the Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Bryan for his dedication to helping his students succeed in school. I look forward to learning of his continued good work in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO TAMI PORTER PARISH
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Tami Porter Parish, the Washington County Teacher of the Year from Vernon Middle School in Vernon, FL.

Tami’s students find her more than their academic influencer, she is also a kind and admirable friend. Her students view her as someone who is always there for them and inspires them to achieve academic success. Tami considers herself blessed to teach her students, with many seeking her advice after class.

Tami is an eighth grade teacher at Vernon Middle School. She believes she is fortunate to work in the Washington County School District and would not trade a day of her teaching for anything.

I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tami and extend my best wishes on her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ALANNA ROHLING
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Alanna Rohling, the Escambia County Teacher of the Year from Lincoln Park Elementary School in Pensacola, FL.

Alanna’s colleagues describe her as a teacher who embraces students with emotional challenges and helps them to succeed through her creative teaching style. She has been credited as a significant factor of the school’s turnaround model to improve students’ academic success in recent years. She dedicates her time not only to her students, but also to their parents, keeping them informed of their students’ progress throughout the school year.

Her students’ parents are grateful for this dedication, noting she is always willing to communicate, no matter the time of day. They believe her efforts have resulted in their young students being better prepared for future schooling.

Alanna is a kindergarten teacher and has been at Lincoln Park Elementary School since 2015. She also serves as the STEM committee cochair, a member of her school’s leadership team, and works as a mentor to students outside of school.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Alanna for her work and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.
TRIBUTE TO LINDSAY SUMMERLIN

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Lindsay Summerlin, the Gulf County Teacher of the Year from Port St. Joe Junior—Senior High School in Port St. Joe, FL.

Lindsay was shocked and overwhelmed when she was awarded in front of her students when her daughter presented her with a bouquet of golden roses. She credits her students with making her a better teacher and was honored to receive Gulf County’s support.

Lindsay works to build relationships with her students and seeks to help others in need. Following Hurricane Michael, she opened her home as a haven for neighbors and school district personnel whose homes sustained damage.

Lindsay is an exceptional student education teacher at Port St. Joe Junior—Senior High School. Her family moved from Georgia last year after her husband accepted the head baseball coaching position for the high school’s team, the Tiger Sharks.

I express my best wishes and gratitude to Lindsay for her work and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO LAURA ADAMS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in 2002, as Rhode Island’s attorney general, I had the pleasure of working with an organization dedicated at helping Rhode Island’s healthcare system reduce waste and improve care for our patients. The first hire at the new Rhode Island Quality Institute was Laura Adams. Convincing her to join us as president and CEO was our extremely good fortune. As Laura steps aside from those duties, I come to the floor today to recognize her many contributions to our healthcare system, in Rhode Island and nationwide, and to wish her well in her next adventure.

Lowering costs and improving quality in our healthcare system is, to say the least, a vital purpose. The Rhode Island Quality Institute was established to tackle some of the main drivers of America’s healthcare problems, to improve health and advance the quality and value of care in Rhode Island. Under the leadership of Laura Adams, that mission achieved national recognition. As Laura prepares to leave, the institute’s innovation and expertise in improving care around the country.

Laura got off to a very strong start. In 2002, the RIQI collaborated with Surescripts to pioneer a first in the nation, end-to-end electronic prescribing system. Today, Surescripts has scaled up to every state in the country, with virtually every prescriber using it. In 2007, Child Magazine pointed to the State’s uptake in e-prescribing as a key reason for ranking Rhode Island first overall on its list of the “Safer Places in the Nation to Raise a Child.”

Laura then turned to another big challenge for our healthcare system: hospital-acquired infections. In 2005, with Laura as Principal Investigator, RIQI launched the Rhode Island Intensive Care Unit Collaborative to identify ways to reduce the incidence of infections among ICU patients. By 2012, Rhode Island ICUs had shown significant improvement on several key types of infections.

In 2004, Laura and RIQI joined the Rhode Department of Health to apply for Federal funding to build an ambitious, innovative statewide health information network aimed at taking the lead building and maintaining the resulting system, CurrentCare. It took tremendous technical expertise to confront the complex governance, business, privacy, and security challenges involved. Laura, with the assistance of a talented lawyer, Linn Freedman, proved more than equal to the task. A 2017 analysis shows that CurrentCare returns millions of dollars in savings to our healthcare system.

Over the course of the development of CurrentCare, RIQI became the only organization in the country to win all three major health information technology grants under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, bringing in a total of $27 million to Rhode Island. Federal agencies like the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology awarded RIQI substantial Federal grants to tackle difficult specialized challenges. RIQI has been led by government and healthcare leaders, chambers of commerce, and leading business publications for its numerous innovations. It has also been consistently recognized as one of the best places to work in Rhode Island.

In the process, Laura has won national acclaim. This year, a leading national hospital publication placed her on their list of “Female Health IT Leaders to Know” for her “significant contributions to health IT advancements, leading large teams, initiatives and companies focused on improving patient care.” She has delivered hundreds of keynotes and presentations in 48 States and a dozen foreign countries. She has been named a cochair of the National Academy of Medicine Health Data Trust Initiative Steering Committee, and she has been appointed to numerous professional and corporate boards.

Laura Adams has poured her considerable talent, experience, and dedication into making the Rhode Island Quality Institute a national leader in health innovation and transformation. I thank her for years of service to Rhode Island and to our healthcare system nationwide.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 725. An act to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 540. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayarault Road in Fairport, New York, as the “Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office.”

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 540. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayarault Road in Fairport, New York, as the “Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–840. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph Anderson, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–841. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers approved to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–842. A communication from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Department of Defense Annual Report on Audit for Fiscal Year 2018”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–843. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Consumer Response Annual Report”; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–844. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection’s Office of Minority and Women Inclusion Annual Report to Congress”; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

CFR Part 910) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–846. A joint communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting proposed legislation; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–847. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department of Education annual report fiscal year 2018 Annual Performance Report and fiscal year 2020 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–848. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau’s fiscal year 2018 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–850. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau’s fiscal year 2018 annual report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–851. A communication from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board’s fiscal year 2018 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–852. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Appropriations for the current fiscal year; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–853. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Uniform Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress: First Quarter of Fiscal Year 2019”; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC–854. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2017 Annual Report of the activities of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Science, Transportation, and Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–27. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to pass legislation permitting vehicles traveling on interstate highways in West Virginia to have the same maximum gross vehicle weight and axle configuration as currently permissible for vehicles traveling on United States routes in West Virginia; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION 78

Whereas, Federal law currently imposes a maximum gross vehicle weight of 80,000 pounds on interstate highways, without any tolerance, and with axle weight restrictions and the bridge formula often reducing such maximum weight significantly; and

Whereas, West Virginia also has an 80,000-pound maximum gross vehicle weight limit, but permits a 10-percent tolerance, raising the permissible maximum weight to 88,000 pounds; and

Whereas, Vehicles transporting commodities through West Virginia often reach our state on interstate highways, but leave the interstate highways system and switch to West Virginia’s local roads, taking advantage of the higher weight limit on such routes; and

Whereas, Such practice increases traffic on West Virginia’s mountainous countryside, raises safety concerns, and limits economic avenues; and

Whereas, Interstates could safely support the same weight restrictions as those on U.S. routes in West Virginia given that the design standards used for both systems are identical, and the weight increase would be minimal; and

Whereas, The West Virginia Department of Transportation, Division of Highways, is poised to address any questions Congress or the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, may have to demonstrate the feasibility of this request; and

Whereas, Providing an exception to the existing weight limits and restrictions in Title 23 of the United States Code, including the bridge formula, for vehicles operating on interstate highways in West Virginia will allow more vehicles to travel the safer interstate highways and expand economic access throughout West Virginia; and

Whereas, Congress has previously provided exceptions to the maximum gross vehicle weight on interstate highways for several states of the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia: That Congress is urged to allow vehicles traveling on interstate highways in West Virginia to have the same maximum gross vehicle weight and axle configuration as currently permissible for vehicles traveling on U.S. routes in West Virginia; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to the members of West Virginia’s congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted for consideration:

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:


By Mr. RUBIO, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 862. A bill to repeal the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Nominees: John P. Abizaid.

Post-Saudi Arabia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform the Senate of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Conroy, amount, date, and done: 1. Self: $0.00.


4. Parents: Ernest Abizaid—deceased; Fae Williams Abizaid—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Arthur Jepsen—deceased; Ed Jepsen—deceased; Amin Abizaid—deceased; Martha Abizaid—deceased.


ATTACHMENT

Contributor name, recipient, state, employer, receipt, date, amount:

Murphy, Jill, Beto for Texas, VA, Federal Government, 11/05/2018, $50.00.

Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 11/05/2018, $50.00.

Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 11/03/2018, $25.00.

Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 11/03/2018, $25.00.


Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 09/25/2018, $5.00.

Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 09/25/2018, $50.00.

Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 09/19/2018, $5.00.

Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 09/10/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 11/01/2018, $50.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 10/17/2018, $100.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 10/17/2018, $50.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 09/24/2018, $150.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 09/24/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 09/19/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 09/10/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, Gina Ortiz Jones for Congress, TX, Dell, 01/02/2018, $350.00.

Abizaid, Christy, Gina Ortiz Jones for Congress, TX, Dell, 07/30/2018, $90.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 03/20/2018, $50.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 03/20/2018, $5.00.

Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 03/20/2018, $50.00.
Abizaid, Christy, Elissa Slotkin for Congress, TX, self, 02/20/2018, $50.00.
Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 02/20/2018, $50.00.
Abizaid, Christy, Elissa Slotkin for Congress, TX, self-employed, 12/20/2017, $50.00.
Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 02/20/2018, $5.00.
Abizaid, Christy, ELISA SLOTKIN for Congress, TX, self-employed, 12/20/2017, $50.00.
Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 02/20/2018, $5.00.
Abizaid, Christy, Relativity—None.
Abizaid, Christy, None; Christy Abizaid: None; Luke Abizaid: None; Claire Abizaid: None; Hope Abizaid: None.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, amount, date, donee:
1. Self: $2,700.00, 11/5/2016, Martha Roby for Congress; $2,500.00, 10/31/2016, Reaching for a Brighter America PAC; $5,000.00, 9/30/2016, Common Sense Common Solutions PAC; $1,500.00, 5/18/2016, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; $500.00, 5/13/2016, Gary Palmer for Congress; $1,000.00, 2/11/2016, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; $25,000.00, 8/1/2017, Republican National Committee; $9,275.00, 11/30/2017, Republican National Committee; $5,000.00, 10/26/2017, HALPAC; $1,500.00, 10/18/2017, Reaching for a Brighter America PAC; $5,000.00, 9/30/2016, Common Sense PAC.

2. Children and Spouses: Christopher John Abizaid (sp), none; Adam Nicholas Abizaid, deceased; Alaina Marie Abizaid (sp); none; Taylor Danielle Abizaid (sp); none.


5. Great Grandparents: Oscar Hale—deceased; Benjamin Nicholas Blanchard—deceased; George Abizaid—deceased; Harry Abizaid—deceased.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Yvonne Annette Schneckenberg—None; Donald Michael Schneckenberg—None; Cynthia Cleveland Burns—None; Sheldon John Burns—None.

Lynda Blanchard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.
Nominee: Lynda C. Blanchard.
Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:
1. Self: $2,700.00, 11/5/2016, Martha Roby for Congress; $2,500.00, 10/31/2016, Reaching for a Brighter America PAC; $5,000.00, 9/30/2016, Common Sense PAC; $1,500.00, 5/18/2016, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; $500.00, 5/13/2016, Gary Palmer for Congress; $1,000.00, 2/11/2016, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; $25,000.00, 8/1/2017, Republican National Committee; $9,275.00, 11/30/2017, Republican National Committee; $5,000.00, 10/26/2017, HALPAC; $1,500.00, 10/18/2017, Reaching for a Brighter America PAC; $5,000.00, 9/30/2016, Common Sense PAC.

2. Children and Spouses: Christopher John Blanchard, deceased; Benjamin Nicholas Blanchard, deceased; George Abizaid, deceased; Harry Abizaid, deceased.


4. Grandparents: William Abizaid—deceased; Flava Abizaid—deceased; Johannes Herzog—deceased; Dorothea Herzog—deceased.

5. Great Grandparents: Oscar Hale—deceased; Benjamin Nicholas Blanchard—deceased; George Abizaid—deceased; Harry Abizaid—deceased.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Yvonne Annette Schneckenberg—None; Donald Michael Schneckenberg—None; Cynthia Cleveland Burns—None; Sheldon John Burns—None.

Lynda Blanchard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.
Nominee: Lynda C. Blanchard.
Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:
1. Self: $2,700.00, 11/5/2016, Martha Roby for Congress; $2,500.00, 10/31/2016, Reaching for a Brighter America PAC; $5,000.00, 9/30/2016, Common Sense PAC; $1,500.00, 5/18/2016, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; $500.00, 5/13/2016, Gary Palmer for Congress; $1,000.00, 2/11/2016, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; $25,000.00, 8/1/2017, Republican National Committee; $9,275.00, 11/30/2017, Republican National Committee; $5,000.00, 10/26/2017, HALPAC; $1,500.00, 10/18/2017, Reaching for a Brighter America PAC; $5,000.00, 9/30/2016, Common Sense PAC.

2. Children and Spouses: Christopher John Blanchard, deceased; Benjamin Nicholas Blanchard, deceased; George Abizaid, deceased; Harry Abizaid, deceased.


4. Grandparents: William Abizaid—deceased; Flava Abizaid—deceased; Johannes Herzog—deceased; Dorothea Herzog—deceased.

5. Great Grandparents: Oscar Hale—deceased; Benjamin Nicholas Blanchard—deceased; George Abizaid—deceased; Harry Abizaid—deceased.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Yvonne Annette Schneckenberg—None; Donald Michael Schneckenberg—None; Cynthia Cleveland Burns—None; Sheldon John Burns—None.
The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of any pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate. I have also compared this data to that which is publicly available via FEC.gov website, and am aware of no inconsistencies.)

Contributions: amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: $375, 5–12–06, Fidelis America PAC; $250, 9–7–08, McCain-Palin Victory 2008; $250, 9–28–08, Republican National Committee; $150, 3–31–11, for President; $100, 3–31–12, Rick Santorum for President, Inc.
3. Children: Francesca Teresa Cella: $0; John Paul Cornelius Cella: $0; Dominic Pasch Cella: $0; Rita Rose Beneficita Cella: $0; Mariacarla Lucilla Cella: $0; Anthony Gilbert Cella: $0.
4. Parents: Janice Jean Cella: $0; Robert Francis Cella: $0.
5. Grandparents: Irene Rose: (deceased) $0; Emmett Rose: (deceased) $0; Angela Cella: (deceased) $0; Joseph Cella: (deceased) $0.

Michael J. Fitzpatrick, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ecuador.

Nominee: Fitzpatrick, Michael Joseph.
Post: Quito, Ecuador.
(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of any pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate. I have also compared this data to that which is publicly available via FEC.gov website, and am aware of no inconsistencies.)

Contributions: amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: none, N/A, N/A.
2. Spouse: Silvana V. Fitzpatrick: none, N/A, N/A.
3. Children and Spouses: Michelle N. Fitzpatrick: none, N/A, N/A.
4. Parents: John R. Fitzpatrick, Jr.—deceased; Ruth M. Fitzpatrick: none, N/A, N/A.
6. Brothers and Spouses: John F. and Ellen C.B. Fitzpatrick: none, N/A, N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: P. Kelly Fitzpatrick: none, N/A, N/A.

Jeffrey Ross Gunter, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iceland.

Nominee: Jeffrey Ross Gunter.
Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Iceland.
(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of any pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)
Henry Gordon; $259 (total), 20 periodic contributions, between 4/30/15 & 10/1/15, Act Blue; $2,50, 5/25/16, Progressive Change; $1,007 (ttl.), 28 periodic contributions, between 4/30/15 & 5/25/16, Bernie Sanders for Congress; $1,250, 1/21/16 & 10/21/16, Russ for Wisconsin; $279.69 (ttl.), 1/21/16 & 10/21/16, Catherine Cor- tez Masto for Senate; $47.50 (ttl.), 4 periodic contributions, between 11/7/16 & 10/21/16, Flores for Congress; $35.19 (ttl.), 3 periodic contributions, between 4/13/16 & 10/21/16, Pramila for Congress; $60 (ttl.), 5/23/16, Zephyr Teachout for Congress; $27.70 (ttl.), 10/21/16 & 12/16, Deborah Ross Senate; $7.69, 10/21/16, Clements for Congress; $7.69, 10/ 21/16, Committee to Elect Chase Iron Eyes; $7.69, 10/21/16, kne for Congress Volunteer Committee; $7.69, 10/21/16, Berragan for Congress; $7.69, 10/21/16, Maggie for NH; $7.69, 10/ 21/16, Carroll for Colorados; $7.69, 10/21/16, Nel- son for Wisconsin; $7.69, 10/21/16, Katie McGinty Senate; $10, 10/5/18, Heid for Sen- ate.


Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None, N/A, N/A.

2. Spouse, $2,700, 2/21 & 3/14/2016, Hillary for America (Primary); $1,750, 7/5 & 9/18/2016, Hil- lary Victory Fund (Primary); $1,675, 7/5, 8/17 & 9/30/2016, Hillary for America (General); $1,000, 9/18/2016, Hillary Victory Fund (Gen- eral); $250, 12/23/2017, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; $250, 2/18/2018, Soderberg for Congress.


4. Parents: Warren P. Murphy, Sr., none; Margaret L. Murphy, none.

5. Grandparents: Robert Murphy—deceased; Theresa Murphy—deceased; George Albert—deceased; Alice Albert—deceased. 

6. Sisters and Spouses: Jennifer Murphy—deceased; Theresa Murphy—deceased; George Albert—deceased; Alice Albert—deceased.


8. Grandparents: Thorthon Snapp—Deceased; Alice Albert—Deceased; Margaret R. Murphy, none.

9. Parents: Warren P. Murphy, Sr., none; Margaret L. Murphy, none.


11. Spouses: Sean Murphy, none; Meghan V. Murphy, none; Gillian L. Murphy, none.

Heywood—deceased; Marie E. Heywood—deceased.


7. Sisters and Spouses: Leslie and David Loomis, None. Pat and Carl Napor, None. Nicolas Kennet Scott: None.

Post: Malawi.

* Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

** 

* Robert K. Scott, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malawi.

Nominee: Robert K. Scott.

** 

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKETY, Mr. MENCHENDEZ, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. SHAHEEN):

S. 997. A bill to recognize and honor the service of the nurses who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

** 

By Mr. SCOTT: Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BURKETT, Mr. CONDIE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida; and Mr. ROSEN:

S. 998. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. KLOBUCAR):

S. 999. A bill to provide for Federal coordination of activities supporting sustainable chemistry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 1000. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the designation of reservoirs for the conservation of fish and water and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1001. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase usage of the Federal student loan program, reauthorize and improve loan repayments, and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study of the Department of Education's fraud prevention programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1003. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration and the Under Secretary for Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. PERTERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1004. A bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations officers and staff, and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 1005. A bill to stop financial institution crime, require certain officers of companies to certify that they have conducted due diligence relating to criminal conduct or civil fraud, create accountability in deferred prosecution agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1006. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to require certain officers of companies that have conducted due diligence relating to criminal conduct or civil fraud, create accountability in deferred prosecution agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPPO (for himself, Mr. WARBURG, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKETY, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1007. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1008. A bill to amend and enhance the High Seas Drift Net Fishing Moratorium Protection Act to improve the conservation of sharks and Other Marine Species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1009. A bill to establish a demonstration program to explore effective practices to improve early detection and management of injuries inflicted by non-fatal infant Shaken Baby Syndrome, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
contribution arrangements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1998 to authorize and make certain revisions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. JONES):

S. 1012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for multiple employer plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KING, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1012. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. CAPITO):

S. 1013. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize school-based health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 101. A bill to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1015. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to review and make certain revisions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1016. A bill to prohibit the sale food that is, or contains, unsafe puppy seeds; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1017. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to address the needs of caregivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. JONES, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1018. A bill to establish the Refund to Rainy Day Savings Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1019. A bill to allow employers to offer short-term savings accounts with automatic contribution arrangements for financial emergencies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. JONES):

S. 1020. A bill to provide for an additional nondiscrimination safe harbor for automatic contribution arrangements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 1021. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to a portion of the Wendell H. Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. BIERENSTEIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1022. A bill to clarify the effect of certain final rules and determinations of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to greenhouse gas emissions standards for light-duty vehicles; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1023. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans, members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and dependents who were stationed at military installations at which they were exposed to perchloroethylene or other per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, to provide for a presumption of service connection for those veterans and members of the reserve components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1024. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans, members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and dependents who were stationed at Wurtsmith Air Force Base in Oscoda, Michigan, and were exposed to volatile organic compounds, to provide for a presumption of service connection for those veterans and members of the reserve components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUSSHU, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KAINÉ, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. SHAKESPEARE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1025. A bill to provide humanitarian relief to the Venezuelan people and Venezuelan migrants, to advance a constitutional and democratic solution to Venezuela’s political crisis, to address Venezuela’s economic re- construction, to combat public corruption, narcotics trafficking, and money laundering, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 149. A resolution urging the establishment of a Cyber League of Indo-Pacific States to address cyber threats; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COPSPONSORS

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, for other purposes.

S. 169

At the request of Mrs. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUISHIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons.

S. 179

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BUMMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 179, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a clinical trial of the effects of cannabis on certain health outcomes of adults with chronic pain and post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 192

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to provide extensions for community health centers, the National Health Service Corps, teaching health centers that operate GME programs, and the special diabetes programs.

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, supra.

S. 206

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the “Hello Girls”.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 427, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism spectrum disorder and enhance programs relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 433

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.
ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to provide for certain additional requirements with respect to patent disclosures.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 693, a bill to require the President, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, to establish a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTQI Peoples, and for other purposes.

S. 909

At the request of Mr. SÁSSE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 909, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions.

S. 919

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 919, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. BINGLER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 993, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 995

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 995, a bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TOOHEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. ROGERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 821

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain member banks from using discount window lending programs, and for other purposes.

S. 827

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to designate certain National Forest System lands and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 846, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes.

S. 861

At the request of Mr. MARKLEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 861, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTQI Peoples, and for other purposes.

S. 887

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 887, a bill to require the President to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes.

S. 909

At the request of Mr. SÁSSE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 909, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions.

S. 919

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 919, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 1001

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS: S. 1001. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to allow the Indian Health Service to cover the cost of a copayment of an Indian or Alaska Native veteran receiving medical care or services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1001

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 “Tribal Veterans Health Care Enhancement Act”.

SEC. 2. LIABILITY FOR PAYMENT.
Section 222 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 2006 (25 U.S.C. 1621u) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) VETERANS AFFAIRS COPAYMENTS.—The Secretary may, in accordance with section 412, the cost of a copayment assessed by the Department of Veterans Affairs to an eligible Indian veteran (as defined in section 412) for covered medical care (as defined in such section).”.

SEC. 3. COPAYMENTS FOR TRIBAL VETERANS RECEIVING CERTAIN MEDICAL SERVICES.

Title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 2006 (25 U.S.C. 1641 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 412. PAYMENTS FOR ELIGIBLE INDIAN VETERANS RECEIVING COVERED MEDICAL CARE AT VA FACILITIES.

Title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 2006 (25 U.S.C. 1641 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) in the Senate—

“(i) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs; and
“(ii) the Committee on Indian Affairs; and
“(B) in the House of Representatives—
“(i) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs; and
“(ii) the Committee on Natural Resources.

“2. COVERED MEDICAL CARE.—The term ‘covered medical care’ means any medical care or service that is—

“(A) that provides to an eligible Indian veteran under the contract health service and referred by the Service; and

“(B) administered at a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including any services rendered under a contract with a non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care provider.

“3. ELIGIBLE INDIAN VETERAN.—The term ‘eligible Indian veteran’ means an Indian or Alaska Native veteran who is eligible for assistance from the Service.

“b. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary (or a designee, including the director of any area office of the Service), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (or a designee), and any tribal health program, as applicable, shall enter into a memorandum of understanding, in consultation with Indian tribes to be impacted by the memorandum of understanding (on a national or regional basis), that authorizes the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and any tribal health program, as applicable, to pay to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs any copayments owed to the Department of Veterans Affairs by eligible Indian veterans for covered medical care.

“(2) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In entering into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), the Secretary, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and any tribal health program, as applicable, shall take into consideration any findings contained in the report under subsection (e).

“(3) Tendering.—The Secretary, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and any tribal health program, as applicable, shall not be required to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1) if the Secretary, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and any tribal health program, as applicable, jointly certify to the appropriate committees of Congress that such a memorandum of understanding would—

“(A) decrease the quality of health care provided to eligible Indian veterans;

“(B) impede the access of those veterans to health care; or

“(C) substantially decrease the quality of, or access to, health care by individuals receiving health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs or beneficiaries of the Service.

“c. PAYMENT BY SERVICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and in accordance with the relevant memorandum of understanding described in subsection (b), the Service may cover the cost of any copayment described in subsection (a) to veterans under the contract health service and referred by the Service, the Secretary, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, or any tribal health program, as applicable, as follows:

“(A) are eligible for assistance from the Service; and

“(B) have received health care at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

“(2) the number of veterans, disaggregated by State and calendar year, who—

“(A) are eligible for assistance from the Service; and

“(B) were referred to a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs from a facility of the Service during the period—

“(i) beginning on January 1, 2012; and

“(ii) ending on December 31, 2018; and

“(3) an update regarding efforts of the Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into or update an agreement with a Department of Veterans Affairs service provider who are eligible for assistance from the Service and have received health care at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs and at a facility of the Service, including a description of—

“(A) any changes to the provision of health care required under this Act; and

“(B) any may be efficiently streamline the provision of health care to veterans who are eligible for assistance from the Service.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KAIN):

S. 1017. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to address the needs of caregivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1017

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 “Supporting America’s Caregivers and Families Act”.

SEC. 2. ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF CAREGIVERS.

(a) AUTOMATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FAMILY CAREGIVER SUPPORT.— Section 303(e) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023(e)) is amended by striking “$154,336,482” and all that followed the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting “$360,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024”.

(b) IMPROVING CAREGIVER ASSESSMENT.—

(1) INCREASING USE OF CAREGIVER ASSESSMENT TOOLS.— Section 202 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 302(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(A) directly or through grant or contract, provide information, education, and assistance to family caregivers in a manner that is accessible and understandable to the family caregivers;.

“(B) by redesigning paragraph (11) as paragraph (12); and

“(C) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(1) establish and operate the National Family Caregiver Resource and Technical Assistance Center, which will—

“(A) by grant or contract with a public or private nonprofit entity, provide information and assistance to State agencies, area agencies on aging, and community-based service providers funded under this Act, including—

“(i) through technical assistance, research, training, program analysis, and data collections.

“(ii) activities described in section 411(a); and

“(iii) disseminate of best practices, including best practices for conducting assessments of caregiver needs using comprehensive assessment tools standardized across a planning and service area, and

“(B) directly or through grant or contract, provide information, education, and assistance to family caregivers in a manner that is accessible and understandable to the family caregivers;.

“(C) BUSINESS ACUEN PROVISIONS.—

“(1) ASSISTANCE RELATING TO GROWING AND SUSTAINING CAPACITY.— Section 202(b)(9) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 302(b)(9)) is amended—

“(A) by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

“(B) by redesigning paragraph (10) as paragraph (12); and

“(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) by not later than January 1, 2021, the Assistant Secretary shall—

“(i) in consultation with caregivers, older individuals, the aging network, and other experts and stakeholders, develop and implement a strategy to increase the use of comprehensive caregiver assessment tools that—

“(A) are standardized across a planning and service area;

“(B) assess the specific problems, needs, strengths, and resources of caregivers—

“(i) as identified by a recognized caregiver, as appropriate, through voluntary participation;

“(ii) through direct contact with the caregiver, which may include in-person, phone, or online contact; and

“(iii) at appropriate intervals, including to accommodate significant changes in the caregiving situation;

“(C) determine whether a caregiver would benefit from support services; and

“(D) lead to providing targeted caregiver support services to best benefit caregivers, where appropriate and available based upon identified unmet needs, including through referrals.

“(2) CLARIFYING PARTNERSHIPS FOR AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.— Section 306 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 306(b)) is amended—

“(A) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

“(B) by redesigning paragraph (11) as paragraph (12); and

“(C) by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

“(D) by redesigning paragraph (10) as paragraph (12); and

“(E) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(1) notwithstanding any other provision of law and in accordance with the relevant memorandum of understanding described in subsection (b), the Service may cover the cost of any copayment described in subsection (a) to veterans under the contract health service and referred by the Service, the Secretary, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or any tribal health program, as applicable, as follows:

“(A) are eligible for assistance from the Service; and

“(B) have received health care at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs;
Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 140

WHEREAS the world has benefitted greatly from technological innovations under the leadership of the United States in the post-World War era, including the creation of the World Wide Web which has provided an entirely new platform for wealth creation and human flourishing through cyber-commerce and connectivity:

WHEREAS cybercrime affects companies large and small, as well as infrastructure that is vital to the economy as a whole:

WHEREAS a 2018 study from the Center for Strategic and International Studies, in partnership with McAfee, estimates that the global economic cost of cybercrime are approximately $600,000,000,000 annually and rising;

WHEREAS, according to the Pew Charitable Trust, 64 percent of people in the United States had fallen victim to cybercrimes as of 2017;

WHEREAS, on July 9, 2012, General Keith Alexander, then-Director of the National Security Agency, termed theft of United States intellectual property "the greatest transfer of wealth in history";

WHEREAS, on September 25, 2015, the United States and the People's Republic of China announced a commitment that "neither country's government will conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors";

WHEREAS the People's Republic of China nonetheless contributed to the rise of cybercrime, exploiting weaknesses in the international system to undermine fair competition in technology and cyberspace, including theft of intellectual property and state-sponsored malicious actions to undermine and weaken competition;

WHEREAS, according to the 2019 Worldwide Threat Assessment by the Director of National Intelligence: "China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea increasingly use cyber operations to threaten both minds and machines in an expanded number of ways—to steal information, to influence our citizens, or to disrupt critical infrastructure."

WHEREAS, from 2011 to 2018, more than 90 percent of cases handled by the Department of Justice involving economic espionage by or to benefit a foreign country involved the People's Republic of China;

WHEREAS experts have asserted that the United States has effective sanctions against at least a dozen companies in the Indo-Pacific region and "authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to enhance cooperation between the United States and the Indo-Pacific nations for the purpose of combating cybercrime and other destabilizing national and economic outcomes; and

WHEREAS section 215 of the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–409) calls for "robust cybersecurity cooperatives between the United States and nations in the Indo-Pacific region and "authorized to be appropriated [100,000,000] for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to enhance cooperation between the United States and the Indo-Pacific nations for the purpose of combating cybercrime and other destabilizing national and economic outcomes; and

WHEREAS the United States has taken action on its own against international cybercrime, including through—

(1) the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–122), which imposed mandatory sanctions against persons engaging in significant activities undermining cybersecurity on behalf of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; and

(2) criminal charges filed by the Department of Justice on October 25, 2018, in which the Department alleged that the Chinese intelligence services conducted cyber intrusions against at least a dozen companies in order to obtain information on a commercial jet engine;

WHEREAS the March 2016 Department of State International Cyberspace Policy Strategy noted that "the Department of State anticipates continued expansion of our cyber-focused diplomatic efforts for the foreseeable future";

WHEREAS concerted action by countries that share concerns about state-sponsored cyber theft is necessary to prevent the growth of cybercrime and other destabilizing national security and economic outcomes; and

WHEREAS the March 2016 Department of State International Cyberspace Policy Strategy noted that "the Department of State anticipates continued expansion of our cyber-focused diplomatic efforts for the foreseeable future";

WHEREAS the United States Congress, and the Senate in particular, has taken steps to address the threats posed by state-sponsored cyber theft, including:

(A) to consult on emerging cyber threats;

(B) to pledge not to conduct or support theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information;

(C) to introduce and enforce minimum criminal punishment for cyber theft;

(D) to extradite alleged cyber thieves, consistent with existing agreements and respect for national sovereignty;

(E) to support efforts to protect intellectual property, including patents;
(F) to ensure that government agencies comply with software license terms;

(G) to minimize data localization requirements (consistent with the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada, signed at Buenos Aires November 30, 2018 (commonly known as the “United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement”));

(H) to seek cooperation with respect to the standards described in the Arrangement on the Recognition of Common Criteria Certificates in the field of Information Technology Security, dated May 14, 2014;

(I) to provide for public input when devising legislation on cybersecurity; and

(J) to cooperate on the attribution of cyberattacks and impose appropriate consequences.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 247. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 247. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 16, strike “milk” and insert “milk, on-farm stored commodities, crops prevented from being planted in 2019.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Enhancing Tribal self-governance and safety of Indian roads.”

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 2:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Reauthorization, of the SBA’s access to capitol programs.”

COMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2019

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Thursday, April 4; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning business be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Calabria nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:42 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 4, 2019, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 3, 2019:

JEFFREY KESSLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

KYLIE FLANNERY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kyle Flannery for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kyle Flannery is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kyle Flannery is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kyle Flannery for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. A. DONALD McEACHIN
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. McEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on January 17, 2019 during roll call no. 42, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.J. Res. 30. Had I been present, I would have voted, “yea.” I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 43, on Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.J. Res. 28. Had I been present, I would have voted, “nay.”

HIGHLIGHTING ONE OF UTAH’S OUTSTANDING WOMEN LEADERS

HON. BEN McADAMS
OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. McADAMS. Madam Speaker, Utah Valley University is my state’s largest public university, with an enrollment of nearly 40,000 students. Yesterday, UVU inaugurated its first woman president—Astrid S. Tuminez. UVU is calling this week “The Week of Dreams” and certainly, President Tuminez is an example for all women seeking to achieve their dreams.

She was raised in the slums of the Philippines, went to college at age 15 as a pre-med student at the University of the Philippines. She later immigrated to the U.S. to join family, was accepted at Brigham Young University, eventually graduated from Harvard University and received her doctorate at MIT. She has held leadership positions in corporations and universities throughout the world. As she considered the UVU offer, she said she thought there was “no better place than a university where I could bring the total-ity of my interests, passions, skills, competences and life experiences.”

Her presidency is historic for another reason: Half of Utah’s public colleges are now led by women.

President Tuminez is the latest example of how women are shaping our future—one ground-breaking position at a time.

Danielle Fleming

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Danielle Fleming for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Danielle Fleming is a student at Three Creeks K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Danielle Fleming is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Danielle Fleming for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

REMEMBERING HERBERT FRANCIS COLLINS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Herbert Francis Collins, a giant in the affordable housing industry and champion for a cause that would become his enduring professional legacy. Herb passed away at the age of 89 on March 30, 2019, in Gloucester, Massachusetts.

Born on March 17, 1930, Herb was raised in Medford, Massachusetts in a single-parent household with his mother and three siblings. He worked numerous jobs to help support his family, but still excelled in school. He played football and ran track at Medford High School, earning a track and field athletic scholarship to Harvard University, where he graduated in 1955. While living in Cambridge, Herb met Sheila Sellew, the love of his life and future wife of 57 years. Following graduation, Herb served in the Marine Corps, and then returned to Massachusetts with his young family to settle in Sheila’s hometown of Gloucester.

Early on, Herb held a variety of sales and marketing positions in the defense and electronics industry. At age 44, Herb entered into a new industry co-founding Boston Capital, Inc. in 1974. From the humble beginnings of a one-room operation, Herb and his partner Jack Manning built Boston Capital into one of the nation’s top real estate firms focused on providing affordable housing.

Herb strongly believed access to safe and affordable housing would provide benefits far beyond simply providing shelter, including facilitating employment opportunities and greater economic mobility for low-income residents. In 1986, Herb was a tireless advocate in passing the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program—he also championed making it permanent in 1993.

Above all, Herb was most proud of and derived the greatest joy from his family. He was a steadfast source of support for his children and grandchildren, and instilled in them the value of hard work, kindness, and humility.

Herb was and will forever be an inspiration to his family, colleagues, and the countless number of families that, through Herb’s vision and leadership, live in quality affordable housing.

IN RECOGNITION OF 160TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HIGH POINT POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THOSE THAT HAVE FALLEN IN SERVICE

HON. TED BUDD
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the High Point Police Department, which has honorably served the Guilford County community for 160 years. Additionally, I would like to share the stories of five High Point police officers that died in the line of service, protecting their community. These
men and women were heroes and it is my honor to recognize their service.

Officer James Witcher passed away on September 13, 1913 while responding to a disturbance call at a moving picture show in High Point. Officer Witcher, and others, attempted to arrest a subject for fighting. During the arrest a crowd gathered, and a shot was fired. Officer Witcher was shot in the abdomen and died two days later.

Officers Carey James Reaves and Fred Claywell were both shot during a raid on a liquor house on June 9, 1925. Officer Reaves died the following day. Officer Claywell died nine days later.

Captain Allen Jerome Morris arrested a subject for being drunk and disorderly on the afternoon of September 16, 1928. While escorting him toward the jail, the subject attempted to escape. During the scuffle, Captain Morris was kicked in the stomach and died within minutes of the blow.

Master Officer Shelia Twyman was on a routine patrol on December 20, 2001, when a tractor trailer ran a red light and struck her patrol car at the intersection of South Centennial Street and East Russell Avenue. She was severely injured and died three days later.

These individuals all died while protecting the citizens of High Point and I think it is critical that we remember those that paid the ultimate sacrifice. They will never be forgotten, and their legacy lives on.

Additionally, I would like to recognize High Point Chief of Police Kenneth Shultz and all the officers who have served with the department over the past 160 years. I have nothing but the utmost respect for the work they do each day.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in honoring these five officers and the 160th anniversary of the High Point Police Department.

Christopher Garcia-Sandoval

Hon. Ed Perlmutter
Of Colorado
In the House of Representatives
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Christopher Garcia-Sandoval for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Christopher Garcia-Sandoval is a student at Sobesky Academy and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Christopher Garcia-Sandoval is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Christopher Garcia-Sandoval for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

Recognizing the Miami Winners of C-SPAN’s 2019 StudentCam Competition

Hon. Donna E. Shalala
Of Florida
In the House of Representatives
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of two groups of Miami high school students who were among the winners of C-SPAN’s 2019 StudentCam documentary competition. The StudentCam competition tasked middle and high schools with creating a documentary that addressed the question “What Does It Mean to Be American?” Dahlia Harris, Neena Deosaran, and Ceci Richardson, students at South Miami Middle School, won third prize for their documentary What is Your Limit, which addressed the issue of gun violence. The Immigrant Dream, by Bianca Vucetic, Javier Pujols, and Aimet Ruiz of iPrep Academy in Miami earned an honorable mention.

What is Your Limit centers on its title’s question: what is our limit before we act to counter the epidemic of gun violence in our country? They focus on the young students whose lives are torn apart by school shootings, who fear for their safety sitting in classrooms. These young directors have more insight into what needs to be done to stop gun violence than many adults. This documentary holds us all accountable for what we need to do if we do not want America to be defined by our gun violence.

The Immigrant Dream is both a stunning indictment of the anti-immigrant rhetoric and policies in the United States in recent years as well as a celebration of all that immigrants have brought to our country. Watching their work celebrate the diversity of the United States, I am filled with pride in remembrance of my own grandparents’ journey to this country from Lebanon. These young directors remind us there is more that unites us than divides us.

Dahlia Harris, Neena Deosaran, Ceci Richardson, Bianca Vucetic, Javier Pujols, and Aimet Ruiz exude incredible talent, intellect of South Florida. I am pleased to celebrate their achievements as documentarians and look forward to seeing all achieve in the future.

Proud to Return the Balangiga Bells to the Philippines

Hon. Don Bacon
Of Nebraska
In the House of Representatives
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, late last year, an historic moment in the relations between our country and the Republic of the Philippines. In December of 2018, the United States returned the historic “Bells of Balangiga” to the Church of San Lorenzo de Martir on the Island of Samar. The three Bells had been brought to the U.S. following the Philippine-American War in the early 1900s. The return of the Bells by the Department of Defense became a moment of national jubilation for the Philippines.

The history of the Bells began on a Saturday morning in September 1901 when a company of American soldiers were caught in a surprise attack by Philippine revolutionaries and the U.S. Army unit was nearly decimated. Some reports indicate that one of the bells was thought to be useful in the attack. U.S. forces launched a counter-attack in response, killed many of the people of the town, destroyed the church with the bells and took all three as war trophies. The three bells were then shipped to America by the U.S. Army, despite orders that Church property was never be subject to retention after the end of hostilities. For over a century they remained unlocated until twenty years ago when Philippine President Fidel Ramos, a West Point graduate and American patriot in the Korean and Vietnam wars, asked for the return of two bells from a U.S. Air Force base in Wyoming, a base that a century ago was an Army cavalry post. Since then, every Philippine president has asked for repatriation and over the years, the “Bells of Balangiga” have become national historic icons; sacred artifacts of a nation whose historical patrimony was largely destroyed in World War II.

Despite disagreement in the U.S. about the return of the Bells, three retired U.S. Navy officers, later referred to as the “three sailors” believed that it was the right thing to do and set out to advocate for the return. They knew well the bond of friendship forged between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines in World War II and strengthened ever since. Thus, the three Naval officers began a journey of discovery and learning spanning the U.S. Army and Air Force centers, a private library in Arizona, and the battle site in Balangiga to fully realize the story of the historic bells.

The “three sailors” discovered that the two bells in Wyoming were not used as signals for the attack and were the property of the Catholic Church and sacred icons of the Philippines. They also discovered that our possession of them stood in stark contrast to other church bells previously returned by the U.S. to Russia, Japan, and Germany. Most importantly, they concluded that returning bells to their rightful nations and church parishioners have only strengthened the bonds between those nations and reflect the highest standards of military honor.

For twenty years legislation existed that prevented removal of the Balangiga Bells from the United States. Last year I was honored to advance and advocate legislation that amended the law to permit the Secretary of Defense to approve return of the Bells and on the 14th of November in 2018, former Secretary of Defense James Mattis announced that the Bells were going home. On the 15th of December, the President of the Philippines, with leaders of the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the United States in attendance, expressed gratitude to the American people as the Bells rang once again in the coastal town of Balangiga. As we commit to the work of this new Pacific Century, let us reaffirm our long partnership with the Republic of the Philippines, now made stronger by the return of the Bells of Balangiga, a noble act that will ensure that a century long Philippine-American friendship will endure and echo in eternity.

I am also pleased to share another story of the Bells less known, that includes a heroic young man from Nebraska, Private Adolph
Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexis Gavaldon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexis Gavaldon is a student at Jefferson Jr./Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversity.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexis Gavaldon is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexis Gavaldon for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. A. DONALD McECHIN
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. McEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on March 14, 2019 during roll call no. 125, On Agreeing to the Resolution, H. Con. Res. 24, Expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress. Had I been present, I would have voted, "yea.

HONORING MAYOR JOHN COIRIO

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the many outstanding achievements of Mayor John Coiro.

With this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I recognize the many contributions he has made to the people of the Ninth Congressional District.

Mayor Coiro is a native of Totowa, New Jersey. He was born to Ralph and Rose Coiro, who settled in the borough following their emigration from Italy. John presently resides in Totowa with his wife, Marygrace, and their children, Alyssa and Matthew.

In his youth, John attended Passaic Valley High School, where he excelled in his studies. Following high school, John chose to continue his education at Seton Hall University. His hard work earned him a Bachelor of Science in Accounting and the Magna Cum Laude status upon his graduation in 1981.

Nine years later, he received his Master's Degree in Taxation from Seton Hall. John continues to work with Seton Hall as an advisor for their Center for Entrepreneurial Studies.

In 1985, John was first elected to the Totowa Board of Education. This was a pivotal moment for John as this would start his dedication to public service. Two short years later, John was elected to the Borough Council at just 28 years old. This position afforded him the opportunity to put his degrees to use and concentrate on the finances of the municipality. John was elected as Mayor of Totowa in 1999. He is currently serving his sixth term, the second longest tenure in the town's history. Throughout his 20 years as Mayor, John has set big milestones in his community, most notably by swearing in the borough's first female police officer.

In 2012, he was inducted into the League of Municipalities Mayors Hall of Fame and serves as a member of the Legislative Committee for the League of Municipalities.

John continues to serve New Jersey as a certified public accountant. He is currently employed as an executive tax director with the international accounting firm Ernst & Young located in Iselin, NJ, where he has worked for 38 years. John has served as president of the New Jersey Society of Certified Public Accountants (NJSCPA), an organization with 15,000 members. In 2013, John was honored by the NJSCPA and placed on their 50 over 50 list of CPA's for his ongoing contributions to the CPA profession and the community.

The job of a United States Congresswoman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to working with and recognizing the efforts of dedicated individuals like Mr. John Coiro.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing his outstanding character and service to his community.
Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding citizen from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who was recently honored with the 38th Annual Bucks County Women’s History Month Award.

Jane Grim, a resident of East Rockhill Township, has distinguished herself as a leader in our community. She was originally nominated for this distinction by the League of Women Voters of Bucks County, an organization she joined in 1970 to promote civic awareness and good citizenship.

Jane’s record of service is truly impressive. She has the unique distinction of being named the first female trustee of Grand View Hospital, has served as a member and chair of the Pennridge Youth Aid Panel, and has worked as a docent at the James A. Michener Art Museum.

I cannot think of a worthier choice for the Bucks County Women’s History Month Award than Jane Grim. I wish Jane and her family all of the best, and congratulate her on this well-deserved recognition.

RECOGNIZING JOHN NAVARRA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent, First Sergeant John Navarra, who is retiring as the leader of the Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (JROTC) at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School.

John N. Navarra is a retired U.S. Army First Sergeant with 22 years of service to our country. During this time, he served in multiple locations including the United States and Germany and primarily worked in the administration and logistics fields.

Coupled with his service, John has demonstrated a life-long commitment to education by earning an Associate’s degree in Business and Computer Science, a bachelor degree in Interdisciplinary Studies from the University of Scranton, a Master’s degree in Education with Concentrations in Teaching and Evaluation and a MBA in Leadership.

However, it is not just his own education that John has been committed to. John has served as the JROTC Army Instructor at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School for 12 years, beginning in 2007. In this role, John educated, provided guidance, and mentored the students in the JROTC program in doing so, he instilled in them the values of citizenship, service to the United States, personal responsibility and a sense of accomplishment.

Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to honor and thank Mr. John Navarra for his service to his country and his community. I congratulate John on his retirement.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LEON ARTHUR BELLOT, JR.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Leon Arthur Bellot, Jr. who passed away on Saturday, February 23, 2019 at the age of 67. Mr. Bellot was born and raised in Dixie County, Florida and has held a multitude of roles throughout his lifetime—each of them with the main purpose of serving others.

His love for education and investing in children was one of the many passions that Mr. Bellot dedicated his life to. A graduate of Dixie County High School, Mr. Bellot would return to this same school to not only teach, but also to hold the title of Assistant Principal and Dean of Students.

He protected the citizens of Dixie County through his service as a volunteer fireman, Assistant Fire Chief for the Dixie City Fire Department, and through his role with Dixie County Emergency Services. He would even go on to become the first Emergency Services Director for Dixie County in 1975. Mr. Bellot served in the capacity of Emergency Services Director for 24 years before also becoming the first County Administrator for Dixie County.

Throughout his career and community involvement, there was always one aspect of Mr. Bellot’s life that would remain constant—his love and commitment to the Lord God our Savior. Mr. Bellot was a member of the Faith Baptist Church where he dedicated his time to the church as a Deacon.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring the life of a courageous educator, protector, and leader who will be missed by many, Mr. Leon Arthur Bellot.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE KENNETH A. GIBSON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the life and legacy of a great man, a visionary leader, and a trailblazer—Kenneth A. Gibson.

In 1970, voters in Newark, New Jersey, elected Mr. Gibson as our city’s first Black mayor. He went on to serve four terms as mayor. Mayor Gibson passed away on March 19 at the age of 86. Mayor Gibson walked into Newark City Hall during a tumultuous time in the city’s history. He was steadfast in fighting to ensure that, in his words, “wherever American cities are going, Newark is going to be there first.” Mayor Gibson brought home federal funds to help improve public housing. He made improvements to public health services, which led to reductions in infant mortality and tuberculosis. And Mayor Gibson helped start a revitalization of downtown Newark that continues today.

Mayor Gibson’s words, vision, and legacy will live on through the work of those who came after him. The modern development of Newark, New Jersey, cannot be separated from the legacy of Kenneth A. Gibson. It was his life and legacy that paved the way for transforming Newark.

I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the life of Newark, New Jersey’s first Black Mayor, the Honorable Kenneth A. Gibson.

BE THE LIGHT FOOD PANTRY FOR U.S. COAST GUARD MEMBERS AND OTHERS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the generosity and public service of the organizers of the Be The Light Food Pantry.

More than 500 active duty members of the Coast Guard and their families live and work in NW Oregon, and their mission is critical to our nation’s safety. The Coast Guard protects our borders and our national security. They save lives every day, ensuring the safety of our fishing fleet and the many others who rely on the Columbia River and the ocean for their livelihood.

Because of the longest-ever government shutdown this winter, the dedicated members of the U.S. Coast Guard missed two consecutive paychecks. This was the first time in modern history that a branch of the armed forces went without pay. It is unconscionable that people who are protecting our country should be forced to work without getting their paychecks.

Over the course of the 35-day-long shutdown, I heard from many U.S. Coast Guard members and spouses who were furious, demoralized, and very stressed about their personal finances.

Michelle discovered that her 16-year-old was skipping meals because he was worried there wouldn’t be enough food for his younger siblings. Amanda had to explain to her five kids why the family needed food assistance, even though their dad was working hard every day to serve our country.

Robin, a proud Coast Guard mom with three sons and one daughter-in-law in the Coast Guard, told me that one of her sons lost an apartment because he couldn’t afford to put down a deposit.

Our national security depends on having service members who are focused on the job at hand, and the mission could be compromised if Coast Guard members are worried about how they’re going to keep food on their plates. Coast Guard and their families live and work in NW Oregon, and their mission is critical to our nation’s safety. They save lives every day, ensuring the safety of our fishing fleet and the many others who rely on the Columbia River and the ocean for their livelihood.

In the midst of this calamity, an inspiring effort came together—the Be The Light Food Pantry for Coast Guard members and all federal employees affected by the shutdown. U.S. Coast Guard spouses Stacey Benson, Michelle Somers, and Amanda Gibbs generously led the effort, giving countless hours of their time. Community members, local Boy Scout Troop 211, the Masonic Temple of Astoria, the Moms Club of Astoria, the U.S. Coast Guard Chief Petty Officer Association, and many private businesses contributed thousands of pounds of food and hundreds of
hours of volunteer time to make the pantry a success.

In its first weekend, the food pantry served 503 families. That's 503 families who could have faced hunger because of the harmful and unnecessary shutdown. It is inspiring to see how the community came together to support our Coast Guard members and their families.

EMMALEE GONZALES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emmalee Gonzales for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Emmalee Gonzales is a student at Mandelay Middle School and received this award because her dedication and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities. The dedication demonstrated by Emmalee Gonzales is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emmalee Gonzales for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OVERDOSE PREVENTION AND PATIENT SAFETY ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act. As the opioid crisis continues to devastate our communities, this legislation would help to address the opioid crisis by ensuring that medical providers have access to the full medical history of patients suffering from substance use disorders.

Currently, because of an antiquated law from 1972, substance use treatment records are kept expressly separate from a patient's medical record. This life-threatening barrier prevents medical providers who treat patients in recovery for substance use disorders from knowing their full medical history, which can lead to poor, and in some cases, tragic patient outcomes.

The Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act would align the outdated and restrictive law, known as 42 CFR Part 2 (or “Part 2”), with the patient privacy protections currently in place under HIPAA, ensuring substance use records are treated as all other medical records. The legislation also incorporates language to guard against unauthorized invasions of patient privacy, discriminatory activities, and authorizes penalties and breach notification requirements for these transgressions not currently available under Part 2.

As our health care delivery system moves towards more robust, integrated care models, every member of a patient's treatment team needs to understand a patient's full medical history, including substance use disorder history. Current Part 2 regulations stand as a hindrance to whole-person care and must be changed to ensure all patients, regardless of diagnosis, have access to safe, effective, high-quality treatment and care.

If substance use disorder treatment is not included in your medical records, then they are not complete. It makes care coordination more difficult and can lead to devastating outcomes. This bill works to remove the stigma that comes with substance use disorders and ensures necessary information is available for safe, efficient, and transparent treatment for all patients. I urge all of my colleagues to join me to pass the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act.

COMMEMORATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CASE CONSTRUCTION SKID STEER

HON. RON ESTES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the 50th anniversary of the skid steer loader.


In 1974, CASE moved its skid steer manufacturing operations to Wichita, Kansas.

In 1989, CASE and New Holland merged to form CNH Industrial, but the skid steer manufacturing operation remained in Wichita.

Today, the Wichita site employs nearly 500 people who research, design and manufacture the skid steer loaders for use all around our country and throughout the world.

From agriculture to construction, the skid steer has become an iconic fixture in many industries and is another example of how products grown and manufactured in south-central Kansas impact our world.

I am hopeful that through free and fair trade policies, companies like CNH Industrial can continue to grow and thrive in my district of Kansas and throughout the country.

On this 50th anniversary, I congratulate all of the hard-working men and women of CNH Industrial in Wichita on this milestone and wish them many more decades of success and growth.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF NATIONAL COMMANDER WILLIAM M. DETWEILER

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of William M. “Bill” Detweiler, a strong advocate for veterans who was a former national commander of the American Legion. He passed away on Wednesday, March 27, 2019 at the age of 79.

Mr. Detweiler, a native of New Orleans, grew up near the St. Roch Playground. He graduated from St. Aloysius High School and earned undergraduate and law degrees at Loyola University.

Mr. Detweiler served in the Army. After graduating from its Infantry and Intelligence schools, he was operations officer on the G-2 Staff of the U.S. Air Defense Command at Fort Bliss, Texas. After his discharge from active duty in 1965, Mr. Detweiler returned to New Orleans, where he served in the Army Reserve, rising to the rank of captain.

Upon his return to civil life, Mr. Detweiler started practicing law. In 1978, he was elected constable of New Orleans’ First City Court, a position to which he was re-elected twice and from which he stepped down at the end of 1996.

In 1973, United States President Richard Nixon appointed Mr. Detweiler to the Veterans Administration’s National Rehabilitation and Education Advisory Committee; he was named its chairman in 1975. He also served on military advisory boards for the governor, the Louisiana Senate and New Orleans’ mayor.

In 1995, United States President Bill Clinton invited Mr. Detweiler to fly with him on Air Force One to Russia to represent America’s veterans at the 50th anniversary commemoration of the Allies’ victory in World War II.

Mr. Detweiler received the Andrew J. Higgin Award for Exceptional Leadership from the Mayor’s Military Affairs Committee of Greater New Orleans in 1998.

After Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans in 2005, Mr. Detweiler was a guiding force in getting the New Orleans VA Medical Center rebuilt, serving on the advisory committee for the project’s design team. He was at both the new facility’s groundbreaking and grand opening and is credited with crafting the words now engraved in stone at the front entrance of the medical center: “THE PRICE OF FREEDOM CAN BE SEEN WITHIN THESE WALLS.”

In 2010, Mr. Detweiler was appointed to lead the American Legion’s committee assigned to investigate the existing science and procedures for treating traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder.

In 2013, Mayor Mitch Landrieu appointed Mr. Detweiler to the Board of Directors of the New Orleans Building Corp. He was elected its president in 2017, which was the year when the organization assumed the responsibilities of the Canal Street Development Corp.

Mr. Detweiler also was instrumental in bringing what is now the National World War II Museum to the city of New Orleans. He served as a member of the executive leadership team for the museum until his death.

In December 2018, Mr. Detweiler was presented the French National Order of Merit by Consul General of France Vincent Sciascia. He was honored for his devotion at the museum, including helping launch the annual World War II Conference at the museum in 2007 when it re-opened after Hurricane Katrina.

Mr. Detweiler loved the city and the people of New Orleans. His legacy will be a part of the city and his dedication to community embodies the spirit of New Orleans. We cannot match the sacrifices made by Mr. Detweiler, but surely, we can try to match his
sense of service. We cannot match his courage, but we can strive to match his devotion.

Mr. Detweiler, in addition to his wife, survivors include two sons Scott Reed Detweiler and Keith Michael Detweiler; two daughters, Bonnie Detweiler Shor and Jeannie Detweiler Miller; and six grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of National Commander William M. Detweiler.

BLAKE HAGAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Blake Hagan for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Blake Hagan is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Blake Hagan is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Blake Hagan for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN BAYLISS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of John Bayliss of Bayliss Boatworks from Wanchese, North Carolina.

John is the leader of a team who every day applies their experience and unique craftsmen touch in creating perfectly crafted vessels for their unique clientele.

Bayliss Boatworks was established in 2002. With a fishing background, self-motivated John, and his team built the company from the ground up. John and friends were able to draw up a number of contacts from the sportfishing community to begin their brand的新shop to create their exquisite boats used for fishing, travel and entertainment. John turned his passion into a profession. Since the establishment of the company, Bayliss Boatworks has risen to become one of the premier boat craftsmen in the world. I am fortunate to have known John for many years and be witness to the dedication he has for his family, colleagues, and Bayliss Boatworks.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of John Bayliss as he and Bayliss Boatworks celebrate 17 years in operation. May God bless John and the operations of the Bayliss Boatworks, and I look forward to seeing their excellence for many years into the future.

HONORING GERARDO OLIVERO

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the outstanding contributions of Gerardo Olivo to the people of the State of New Jersey. His numerous achievements through hard work and dedication inspire generations, old and young. To this day, he motivates his community to achieve their own American Dream.

Of humble beginnings, Gerardo Olivo was born in Avellino, Italy, the youngest of 11 children. The Olivo family moved to Tripoli, Libya in 1939 and worked tirelessly on the land given to them, however, this peaceful life did not last. In 1943, the Olivo family was forced to evacuate Italian Libya due to World War II. They left their new home behind, sought shelter in a refugee camp in Sicily, Italy, and returned back to their hometown of Avellino.

In 1952, Gerardo’s father, Constantino, immigrated to the United States and three years later, the rest of the family made the same journey. The seven-day voyage from Naples to Manhattan not only reunited Gerardo with his father, but also opened a world of new opportunities. Making a home in Paterson, New Jersey, Gerardo attended Central High School, where he diligently studied English.

Gerardo worked many jobs to help support himself and his family. His first and most pivotal job was in a coat factory; at the beginning of his career he learned the fundamentals of persistence and gratitude that would make him a role model for his community. While visiting Italy in 1967 for the first time since leaving, Gerardo met and later married Dina Della Salla on October 22 of that year. The two re- turned to the United States and settled down in Paterson. In 1973 Gerardo became a businessman in his own right, opening a coat factory, which stayed in business for 28 years until his retirement in 2001. This was one of Gerardo’s greatest achievements, second to that of raising his family with his loving wife.

In 1955, Gerardo began an active membership in the Roma Club, formed numerous lifelong friendships, became Vice President in 1972, and went on to serve as President from 1982 to 2014. With the Roma Club being a second family to him, Gerardo still frequents the club and keeps his Italian heritage alive as a participating member, whilst residing in his Pompton Plains home of 43 years and enjoying being a proud father and grandfather.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to working with and recognizing the efforts of dedicated individuals like Mr. Gerardo Olivo.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join my colleagues, Gerardo Olivo’s family and friends, and the residents of the State of New Jersey in recognizing his outstanding character and service to his community.
In recognition of his excellent service, Rodriguez was promoted to Lieutenant as he returned to the Investigative Services Division. Then, he was Captain for the Operations Division. Two years later, Rodriguez became the Deputy Police Chief, which he served as for the rest of his distinguished career.

His dedication and confidence as a leader has allowed him to overcome adversities, which has enabled him to become a role model for his colleagues. Despite his strong character and confident approach left an indelible mark at the Pomona Police Department. His dedication to the profession, the community, the Department and the City of Pomona is highly commendable and has earned him the esteem of the men and women of the Pomona Police Department.

For his remarkable accomplishments, it is my honor to recognize Deputy Chief Hector Rodriguez. His decades of commitment and contributions to the City of Pomona are worthy of commending and admiration.

SAMUEL HERNANDEZ
HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Samuel Hernandez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Samuel Hernandez is a student at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Samuel Hernandez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Samuel Hernandez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF COACH BOB HALLBERG

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Bob Hallberg and recognize his tremendous impact on our community, most recently as the Women’s Basketball Coach and Athletic Director at St. Xavier University in Chicago. Coach Hallberg’s dedication to his athletes and his love for the sport is nothing short of extraordinary. Despite starting his career over 50 years ago, Coach Hallberg still considers his retirement to be an early one.

His commitment to his profession and his players throughout his distinguished tenure stands as an example to all educators striving to make a positive impact on the student-athletes they mentor.

After playing basketball throughout his studies at Leo High School and later the Chicago Teachers College (Chicago State), Coach Bob Hallberg began his career coaching boys’ basketball just down the street from my childhood home at Chicago’s Kennedy High School in 1966. From there he went on to coach Men’s Basketball at St. Xavier University, Chicago State University, and the University of Illinois, Chicago. In 2000 he came back to St. Xavier to become the university’s first—and so far only—Women’s Basketball coach. In addition, Coach Hallberg spent many years as St. Xaver’s Athletic Director.

Coach Hallberg has been honored with induction into multiple Halls of Fame, including St. Xavier, Leo High School, the University of Illinois-Chicago, the Chicago Catholic League, the Illinois Basketball Coaches Association (IBCA), and Chicago State University. Meanwhile, his former players remember him for his endless encouragement and someone who would stop at nothing to mold a player into the best version of themselves.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Coach Bob Hallberg. It is not often you come across a person who so encompasses inspiration, sportsmanship, and professionalism. I congratulate Coach Hallberg on his distinguished accomplishments, thank him for his service, and wish him and his wife Linda nothing but good health and happiness.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ENDEAVORS

HON. WILL HURD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. HURD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50-year anniversary of Endeavors. Since its start in 1969 as Urban Ministries, Endeavors has provided comprehensive and effective support services for children, families, and our nation’s veterans.

As an organization, Endeavors aims to empower people to build better lives for themselves, their families, and their communities through service and career training, crisis intervention, homelessness prevention, childcare, emergency case management, and employment assistance for individuals with disabilities. The organization provides critical support to over 16,000 people each year and makes a positive difference in communities across the country.

On behalf of the Twenty-third Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Endeavors on their 50th anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. A. DONALD MCEACHIN
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. MCEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote “yea.” I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 140. On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 540. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.” I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 143, on approving the Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REVEREND SAMSON “SKIP” ALEXANDER

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Reverend Samson “Skip” Alexander, a New Orleans pastor and civil rights leader who befriended and worked alongside Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., photographed Dr. King’s life and career and was present during some of the Civil Rights Era’s pivotal moments. He passed away on Sunday, March 24, 2019 at the age of 88.

Rev. Alexander graduated from Gilbert Academy and Booker T. Washington High School in New Orleans. He earned a Master of Business Administration degree at Clinton University and a doctorate in theology at A.P. Clay Theological College. Rev. Alexander became an active minister in the 1970s and he preached at churches throughout the city. He was associate minister at Christian Unity Baptist Church. In 1957, Rev. Alexander attended the founding of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in New Orleans. At a meeting at the New Zion Baptist Church in Central City, Dr. King was elected president of the group, which would go on to become one of the most important organizations in the civil rights movement.

Rev. Alexander marched with Dr. King during many of the marches from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, seeking voting rights for African-Americans. During the marches in 1965, Rev. Alexander suffered a bump to the back of his head from a state trooper’s baton.

Rev. Alexander’s friendship with Dr. King and his interest in photography led him to capture the civil rights icon’s life and career on film. He also captured an iconic photo of King’s widow, Coretta Scott King, sitting in the front row of her husband’s 1968 memorial service, holding their daughter Bernice on her lap.

In addition to his work with civil rights causes, Rev. Alexander was also a labor organizer and led striking teetotalers in Memphis and New York. Also, he was involved in many 1960s New Orleans sit-ins and demonstrations seeking to integrate Canal Street lunch counters and department stores and efforts to desegregate the U.S. Custom House on Canal Street. As an Air Force veteran, he led the effort to desegregate an Air Force base near Denver, Colorado.

Balancing his time with the civil rights movement, Rev. Alexander continued preaching well into his 80s. He also hosted a radio show on WBOK and was involved in politics as a member of the Orleans Parish Democratic Executive Committee.

Rev. Alexander loved the city and the people of New Orleans. His legacy will forever be
a part of the city and his dedication to community embodies the spirit of New Orleans. We cannot match the sacrifices made by Rev. Alexander, but surely, we can try to match his sense of service. We cannot match his courage, but we can strive to match his devotion. Rev. Alexander’s survivors include a son, Jerome Alexander; three daughters, Gloria Irvin, Joanne and Jacqueline Alexander; six grandchildren; 14 great-grandchildren; and five great-great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Reverend Samson “Skip” Alexander.

KRISTIAN KRAMER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kristian Kramer for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kristian Kramer is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kristian Kramer is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kristian Kramer for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, April 4, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 9

Time to be announced
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider the nomination of Gordon Hartogensis, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for a term of five years, and other pending nominations.

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

TBA
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland

SR–232A APRIL 10

9:15 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of State.

SD–419

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Forest Service.

SD–366
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy
To hold hearings to examine ARIA in action, focusing on human rights, democracy, and the rule of law.

SD–419
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine migration at the United States Southern border, focusing on perspectives from the frontline.

SD–342
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

SD–226
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine recent developments in Hungary, focusing on issues related to the rule of law and corruption.

LHOB–1539

10:15 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine drug pricing in America, focusing on a prescription for change, part III.

SD–215
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the National Guard and Reserve.

SR–232A
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 and Future Years Defense Program.

SD–419

10:15 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

SD–226
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the 2019 tax filing season and the 21st century Internal Revenue Service.

SD–215

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation within the Department of the Interior.

SD–138
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Cybersecurity
To hold closed hearings to examine defense industrial base cybersecurity policy.

SVC–217

3 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland

SR–232A
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Transportation and Safety
To hold hearings to examine pipeline safety, focusing on Federal oversight and stakeholder perspectives. SD-562

Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine building out Indian country, focusing on tools for community development. SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution
To hold hearings to examine free speech, focusing on technological censorship and the public discourse. SD-226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration’s international trade programs. SR-429A

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs
To hold hearings to examine VA MISSION Act, focusing on implementing the Veterans Community Care Program. SR-418

3 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office. SD-124

APRIL 11
10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine opportunities for energy innovation and other potential solutions to help address global climate change. SD-366
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Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House and Senate met in a Joint Meeting to receive His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2209–S2244

Measures Introduced: Twenty-nine bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 997–1025, and S. Res. 140.

Measures Reported:

- S. Res. 123, supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments.
- S. 862, to repeal the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans.

Altman Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 66 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. EX. 60), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

By 48 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. EX. 61), Senate rejected the ruling of the Chair that the post-cloture time under Rule XXII for all judicial nominations other than Circuit Courts or the Supreme Court of the United States is two hours. Subsequently, Senator McConnell motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair was upheld.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the vote on confirmation of the nomination occur at 11:45 a.m., on Thursday, April 4, 2019.

Calabria Nomination—Cloture: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 11 a.m., on Thursday, April 4, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination: Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 95 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. EX. 58), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

By 48 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. EX. 59), Senate rejected the ruling of the Chair that the post-cloture time under Rule XXII for all executive branch nominations other than a position at level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5, United States Code, is two hours. Subsequently, Senator McConnell motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair was upheld.

Message from the House:

Measures Referred:

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Executive Communications:

Petitions and Memorials:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today.

(Total—61)
Adjournment: Senate convened at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 6:42 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Thursday, April 4, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2244.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Environmental Protection Agency, after receiving testimony from Andrew Wheeler, Administrator, and Holly Greaves, Chief Financial Officer, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM


APPROPRIATIONS: FEMA


APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration, after receiving testimony from Lisa E. Gordon-Hagerty, Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Administrator, Charles P. Verdon, Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, Brent K. Park, Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Admiral James F. Caldwell, Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors, all of the National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, after receiving testimony from Ben Carson, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS: SERGEANT AT ARMS AND CAPITOL POLICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the United States Capitol Police, after receiving testimony from Michael Stenger, Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate; and Matthew Verderosa, Chief of Police, United States Capitol Police.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM


BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 151, to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
The nominations of Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman and a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Joseph Ryan Gruters, of Florida, Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, and Rick A. Dearborn, of Oklahoma, each to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Heidi R. King, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, both of the Department of Transportation, Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, and a routine list in the Coast Guard.

**BUSINESS MEETING**

**Committee on Foreign Relations:** Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

- S. 494, to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants;
- S. 512, to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors;
- S. 529, to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 542, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions;
- S. 881, to improve understanding and forecasting of space weather events;
- S. 877, to prohibit the sale of shark fins;
- S. 906, to improve the management of driftnet fishing, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 908, to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data;
- S. 910, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 914, to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center;
- S. 918, to prohibit the President or a Federal agency from constructing, operating, or offering wholesale or retail services on broadband networks without authorization from Congress, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 919, to reduce regulatory burdens and streamline processes related to commercial space activities; and

The nominations of John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Stephen Akard, of Indiana, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, with the rank of Ambassador, Lynda Blanchard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, Joseph Cella, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu, R. Clarke Cooper, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs), Michael J. Fitzpatrick, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador, Kenneth S. George, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, Brett P. Giroir, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, Jeffrey Ross Gunter, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iceland, Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador, W. Patrick Murphy, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Cambodia, Daniel N. Rosenblum, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the
Republican of Uzbekistan, Robert K. Scott, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malawi, Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to Jamaica, Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq, Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment), United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years, and United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years, David Schenker, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs), David Stilwell, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs), and Kip Tom, of Indiana, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture, all of the Department of State, John Barsa, of Florida, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, Jane L. Corwin, of New York, Robert C. Sisson, of Michigan, and Lance V. Yohe, of North Dakota, all to be a Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, and Mark Rosen, of Connecticut, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

**ENHANCING TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE AND SAFETY**

*Committee on Indian Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine enhancing tribal self-governance and safety of Indian roads, after receiving testimony from Timothy Hess, Associate Administrator, Office of Federal Lands Highway, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation; Leroy Gishi, Chief of the Division of Transportation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Stephen Roe Lewis, Gila River Indian Community, Sacaton, Arizona; and Joe Garcia, Ohkay Owingeh, Owingeh, New Mexico.

**WOMEN INVENTORS**


**ACCESS TO CAPITAL PROGRAMS**

*Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration's Access to Capital programs, after receiving testimony from William M. Manger, Associate Administrator, Office of Capital Access, Small Business Administration; Julie Huston, immito, LLC, Denver, Colorado; Patricia Kibbe, Evergreen Business Capital, Seattle, Washington; Robert Villarreal, CDC Small Business Finance, San Diego, California; and Connie Evans, Association for Enterprise Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

---

**House of Representatives**

**Chamber Action**

*Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:* 36 public bills, H.R. 2043–2078; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 31–32; and H. Res. 285–289 were introduced. Pages H3066–68

*Additional Cosponsors:* Pages H3069–70

*Reports Filed:* There were no reports filed today.

*Speaker:* Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Kim to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H2989

*Recess:* The House recessed at 9:03 a.m. for the purpose of receiving His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The House reconvened at 12:26 p.m., and agreed that the proceedings had during the Joint Meeting be printed in the Record. Page H2989

*Condemning the Trump Administration’s Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans’ Health Care:* The House agreed to H. Res. 271, condemning the Trump Administration’s Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans’ Health Care, by a yea-and-nay vote of 240 yeas to 186 nays, with one answering “present”, Roll No. 146. Consideration began yesterday, April 2nd. Pages H3002–03
H. Res. 274, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) and the resolution (H. Res. 271) was agreed to yesterday, April 2nd.


Pursuant to the Rule, 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 Rules Committee Print 116–9, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–32, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill.

Agreed to:

Escobar amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that requires a report on the status of women in federal incarceration and collaboration on reentry planning and services for incarcerated women, including development of a national standard on prevention with respect to domestic and sexual violence; Pages H3030–31

Dean amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that allows for cross agency coordination and collaboration; Pages H3031–32

Torres amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that requires the Center for Disease Control and Prevention to provide a report to Congress on the activities of grant awardees funded through the Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) grant program, as well as on emerging best practices relating to rape prevention and education; Page H3032

Burgess amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that requires state and local governments that are recipients of the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program to include information on best practices regarding reducing the backlog of DNA evidence in those government’s annual reports to the Attorney General; Pages H3032–33

Young (AK) amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that changes the definition of land eligible for a tribe’s jurisdiction to include all land within any Alaska Native village, for the Alaska tribal jurisdiction pilot project; Page H3034

Johnson (TX) amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that clarifies in law the difference between internal and external transfers when applying for an emergency transfer; Page H3035

Wagner amendment (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that enhances VAWA’s transparency and accountability measures by making entities found by the Attorney General to have intentionally misused VAWA grant funds ineligible to apply for future grants for up to 5 years, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing; Page H3037

Grijalva amendment (No. 12 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that expands the definition of domestic violence in the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the bill, to include violence against or witnessed by a child under the age of 18, or an elder (as defined by tribal law); Pages H3037–38

Grijalva amendment (No. 13 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32), as modified, that alleviates the costs tribes incur due to the expansion of criminal jurisdiction; provides language allowing the Attorney General to award grants to tribes to improve law enforcement, tribal court personnel and criminal codes; Pages H3038–39

Emmer amendment (No. 14 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that authorizes the Office on Violence Against Women to improve the handling of crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by incorporating a trauma-informed approach into the initial response to and investigation of such crimes; Pages H3039–41

Quigley amendment (No. 15 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that requires the Secretary of HHS to review and submit a report on whether being a victim of domestic violence increases the likelihood of having a substance use disorder; Pages H3041–42

Meng amendment (No. 16 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that directs the Department of Justice to establish an interagency working group to study existing Federal surveys and reporting programs on sexual violence, and to make recommendations on how to harmonize such efforts for improved coordination and data collection; Pages H3042–43

Jeffries amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that requires that the materials distributed by various federal agencies as set out by the bill are made available in commonly encountered languages; such materials include information about resources for and rights of survivors (by a recorded vote of 363 ayes to 67 noes, Roll No. 147); Pages H3029, H3043–44

Scanlon amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that requires the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to Congress a report on the return on investment for legal assistance grants awarded pursuant to section 1201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (by a recorded vote of 394 ayes to 36 noes, Roll No. 148); Pages H3029–30, H3044

Waters amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that creates a new purpose area to the grants to combat violent crimes on campuses,
which allows grant funds to be used for the training of campus personnel in how to use victim-centered, trauma-informed interview techniques, informed by evidence based research on the neurobiology of trauma, when asking questions of a student or employee who reports to be a victim of sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence or stalking (by a recorded vote of 258 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No. 149);

Wagner amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that ensures that the Creating Hope through Outreach, Options, Service, and Education for Children and Youth (CHOOSE Children and Youth) Program can continue to include programs that address sex trafficking (by a recorded vote of 429 ayes with none voting “no”, Roll No. 150);

Meng amendment (No. 18 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that directs the Director of BOP to develop tools to communicate parenting program availability and eligibility criteria to each BOP employee and each pregnant inmate to ensure that each pregnant inmate understands the resources available to them;

Meng amendment (No. 19 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that ensures that cultural competency training is included in trauma screening trainings provided to correctional officers, and each BOP employee, including instructors and health care professionals;

Plaskett amendment (No. 20 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that increases the minimum amount made available to territories of the United States under the Sexual Assault Services Program and the Transitional Housing Assistance Program;

Bera amendment (No. 21 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that increases funding for grants to enhance culturally specific services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

Gallego amendment (No. 22 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that directs the GAO to submit a report on the response of law enforcement agencies to reports of missing or murdered Indians, including recommendations for legislative solutions;

Clark (MA) amendment (No. 23 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that establishes a grant program to train state and local law enforcement to prevent, enforce, and prosecute domestic violence-related crimes carried out online and establishes a national resource center to study these crimes; requires the FBI to update the Uniform Crime Reports and the National Incident-Based Reporting System to include cybercrimes committed against individuals;

Krishnamoorthi amendment (No. 24 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that specifies, but does not limit, components of economic security that Americans face when striving for economic stability including: financial empowerment, affordable housing, transportation, healthcare access, and quality education and training opportunities;

Krishnamoorthi amendment (No. 25 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that ensures the inclusion of guidelines and best practices for the creation of employee assistance programs;

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 26 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that creates a grant program for States, local governments, Indian tribes, and domestic violence victim service providers and coalitions for technical assistance and training in the operation or establishment of a lethality assessment program (LAP);

Haaland amendment (No. 27 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that provides for the inclusion of victim advocates/resources in state courts for urban American Indians/Alaskan Natives (AI/ANs) where 71 percent of the Native American population resides due to federal relocation and termination policies;

Haaland amendment (No. 28 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that clarifies that federal criminal information database sharing extends to entities designated by a tribe as maintaining public safety within a tribe’s territorial jurisdiction that have no federal or state arrest authority;

Rouda amendment (No. 29 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that adds language that recognizes the ongoing epidemic of violence against transgender and gender non-conforming people;

Rouda amendment (No. 30 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that gives college campuses the opportunity to offer primary prevention training, in addition to survivor support services;

Rouda amendment (No. 31 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that gives college campuses the opportunity to offer alternative justice response programs;

Rouda amendment (No. 32 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that gives college campuses the opportunity to include all participants involved with the resolution process in training which identifies and responds to crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; resolution
process members include the Title IX coordinator’s office as well as the office of student conduct;

Pages H3057–58

Craig amendment (No. 33 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that directs the Secretary of Education to submit a report to Congress regarding an evaluation of programs, events, and educational materials related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and an assessment of best practices and guidance; this report shall be made publicly available online to universities and college campuses to use as a resource;

Page H3058

Schrier amendment (No. 34 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that specifies that trauma and behavioral health specialists are included in the term “health care professionals”; would also increase the number of health care professionals that specialize in child exposure to violence;

Pages H3058–59

Underwood amendment (No. 35 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that requires DOJ to report to Congress the effects of the recent federal government shutdown on DOJ’s efforts to disperse funding and services to victims to domestic violence;

Page H3059

Casten (IL) amendment (No. 36 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that ensures that campus faculty is trained to recognize victims of sexual or domestic violence;

Pages H3059–60

Porter amendment (No. 37 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that integrates the term “economic abuse” throughout the legislation, wherever “domestic violence” occurs; and

Pages H3060–61

Rose (NY) amendment (No. 38 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that expands the National Domestic Violence Hotline to include texting features via telephone.

H. Res. 281, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 145, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 144.

Pages H2993–H3002

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, April 4th.

Page H3061

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H2993.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3001–02, H3002, H3002–03, H3043–44, H3044, H3045, and H3045–46. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 8:26 p.m.  

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING THE PROPOSED ABAWD RULE AND ITS IMPACT ON HUNGER AND HARDSHIP

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Nutrition, Oversight, and Department Operations held a hearing entitled “Examining the Proposed ABAWD Rule and its Impact on Hunger and Hardship”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Food and Drug Administration. Testimony was heard from Scott Gottlieb, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Testimony was heard from Benjamin S. Carson, Sr., M.D., Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL PARKS SERVICE, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Parks Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Geological Survey. Testimony was heard from the following Department of the Interior officials: Margaret Everson, Principal Deputy Director, Fish and Wildlife Service; Jim Reilly, Director, U.S. Geological Survey; and Daniel Smith, Deputy Director Exercising the Authority of the Director, National Park Service.

APPROPRIATIONS—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a budget hearing on the Federal Communications Commission. Testimony was heard from Ajit Pai, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.
APPROPRIATIONS—SCIENCE, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on Science, Energy, and Environmental Management Programs. Testimony was heard from Paul Dabbar, Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy; and Mark Menezes, Under Secretary for Energy, Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Labor. Testimony was heard from Alexander Acosta, Secretary, Department of Labor.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on Defense Health Programs. Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral Raquel Bono, Director, Defense Health Agency; Stacy Cummings, Program Executive Officer, Defense Healthcare Management Systems; Vice Admiral Forrest C. Faison III, Surgeon General, U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Dorothy A. Hogg, Surgeon General, U.S. Air Force; Thomas McCaffery, Principal Deputy, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Nadja Y. West, Surgeon General, U.S. Army.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Kilmer, Chairman Takano, and Representatives Case, Green of Tennessee, Cunningham, Thompson of Pennsylvania, Rose of New York, and San Nicholas.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 PRIORITIES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 Priorities for National Security Space Programs”. Testimony was heard from Kenneth Rapuano, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security, Department of Defense; General John W. Raymond, Commander, Air Force Space Command; and Christina Chaplain, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office.

REVIEWING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STRATEGY, POLICY, AND PROGRAMS FOR COUNTERING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled “Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2020”. Testimony was heard from D. Christian Hassell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Chemical and Biological Defense Programs; Theresa Whelan, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security; Vice Admiral Timothy G. Szymanski, Deputy Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command; and Vayl S. Oxford, Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2021, the “Investing for the People Act of 2019”. H.R. 2021 was ordered reported, without amendment.

STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION TO BETTER SERVE STUDENTS AND TAXPAYERS

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment held a hearing entitled “Strengthening Accountability in Higher Education to Better Serve Students and Taxpayers”. Testimony was heard from Melissa Emrey-Arras, Director, Education, Workforce, And Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; Noe Ortega, Deputy Secretary, Office of Postsecondary and Higher Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 1644, the “Save the Internet Act of 2019”; H.R. 1781, the “Payment Commission Data Act of 2019”; H.R. 938, the “BLOCKING Act of 2019”; H.R. 1520, the “Purple Book Continuity Act of 2019”; H.R.1503, the “Orange Book Transparency Act of 2019”; H.R. 1499, the “Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act of 2019”; H.R. 965, the “CREASES Act of 2019”; H.R. 1385, the "SAVE Act"; H.R. 1386, the “ENROLL Act of 2019”; H.R. 987, the “MORE Health Education Act”; H.R. 1010, a bill to provide that the rule entitled “Short-Term, Limited Duration
Insurance” shall have no force or effect; H.R. 986, the “Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019”; H.R. 1425, the “State Health Care Premium Reduction Act”; and H.R. 9, the “Climate Action Now Act”.

MEMBER DAY
Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day”.

PUTTING INVESTORS FIRST: REVIEWING PROPOSALS TO HOLD EXECUTIVES ACCOUNTABLE
Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets held a hearing entitled “Putting Investors First: Reviewing Proposals to Hold Executives Accountable”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING U.S. POLICY PRIORITIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “Assessing U.S. Policy Priorities in the Middle East”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ENSURING EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT OPERATIONS: A REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2020 DHS MANAGEMENT DIRECTORATE BUDGET REQUEST

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE
Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on a Resolution Authorizing Issuance of Subpoenas. A Resolution Authorizing Issuance of Subpoenas was agreed to, as amended.

SECURING THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE
Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship held a hearing entitled “Securing the Future of American Agriculture”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE SPENDING PRIORITIES AND MISSION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing entitled “Examining the Spending Priorities and Mission of the National Park Service”. Testimony was heard from Dan Smith, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES
Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing on H.R. 375, to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; H.R. 312, the “Mashpee Wampanoag 5 Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act”; and legislation on the RESPECT Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Cole and Keating; Claire Richards, Executive Counsel to the Governor, Rhode Island; and public witnesses.

THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION’S 2019 HIGH-RISK LIST
Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled “The Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction’s 2019 High-Risk List”. Testimony was heard from John F. Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2020”. Testimony was heard from Robert Wilkie, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUDGET REQUEST OVERVIEW
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 Intelligence Community Budget Request Overview”. Testimony was heard from Sue Gordon, Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence; and Joseph Kernan, Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.
COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Health and Human Services, 10 a.m., SD–124.


Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Security, to hold hearings to examine Federal maritime agencies, focusing on ensuring a safe, secure, and competitive future, 10:15 a.m., SD–562.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider the nominations of David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary, and Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of the Interior, and Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine migration at the United States Southern border, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Daniel P. Collins, and Kenneth Kiyul Lee, both of California, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, James Wesley Hendrix, and Mark T. Pittman, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Sean D. Jordan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Ronald D. Vitiello, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Virgil Madden, of Indiana, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, and Nick Edward Proffitt, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.


Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Tactical and Land Forces, hearing entitled “Navy and Marine Corps Tactical Aviation and Ground Modernization”, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled “Mismanaged Military Family Housing Programs: What is the Recovery Plan?”, 9 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 1644, the “Save the Internet Act of 2019”; H.R. 1781, the “Payment Commission Data Act of 2019”; H.R. 938, the “BLOCKING Act of 2019”; H.R. 1520, the “Purple Book Continuity Act of 2019”; H.R.1503, the “Orange Book Transparency Act of 2019”; H.R. 1499, the “Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act of 2019”; H.R. 965, the “CREASES Act of 2019”; H.R. 1385, the “SAVE Act”; H.R. 1386, the “ENROLL Act of 2019”; H.R. 987, the “MORE Health Education Act”; H.R. 1010, a bill to provide that the rule entitled “Short-Term, Limited Duration Insurance” shall have no force or effect; H.R. 986, the “Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019”; H.R. 1425, the “State Health Care Premium Reduction Act”; and H.R. 9, the “Climate Action Now Act”, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1904, the “Indian Water Rights Settlement Extension Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Generation Climate: Young Leaders Urge Climate Action Now”, 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
11 a.m., Thursday, April 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

At 11:45 a.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Following disposition of the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Thursday, April 4

House Chamber
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