



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2019

No. 58

## House of Representatives

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 forth an abundance of wisdom, knowledge, and understanding upon the Members of Congress and upon Your people so that, together, solutions for the betterment of our Nation might be forged.

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

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

### 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.

### 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.

Accordingly, (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1052

### 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 gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES);

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK);

The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL);

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2989

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 (Mrs. 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, I have the high 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 STOLTENBERG. Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, honorable Members of the United States Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am really truly 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 to stand up to the expansion of the Soviet Union 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 and allies 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 has been 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

9/11, a reminder of how all NATO allies stood with the United States in its hour of need.

One monument is a symbol of freedom, the other a symbol of solidarity. Both are symbols of NATO, who we are and what we stand for, what so many of our brave men and women have fought for and sometimes died for, but not in vain and not alone.

The men and women of our armed forces have served 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, and 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 that 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 have overcome our disagreements in the past, and we must overcome our differences now, because we will need our alliance even more in the future.

We face unprecedented challenges, challenges no one nation can face alone.

The global balance of power is shifting. The fight against terrorism is a generational fight. We have only just seen the beginning of the threats in cyberspace. Artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and big data could change the nature of conflict more fundamentally than the Industrial Revolution. And we will need to continue to deal with a more assertive Russia.

In 2014, Russia illegally annexed Crimea, the first time in Europe that one country had taken part of another by force since World War II.

And we see a pattern of Russian behavior, including a massive military buildup from the Arctic to the Mediterranean and from the Black Sea to the Baltic; the use of a military-grade nerve agent in the United Kingdom; support for Assad's murderous regime in Syria; consistent cyberattacks on NATO allies and partners, targeting everything from Parliaments to power grids; sophisticated disinformation campaigns; and attempts to interfere in democracy itself.

NATO has responded with the biggest reinforcement of our collective defense in decades. For the first time, we have combat-ready troops deployed in the east of our alliance. We have increased the readiness of our forces, tripled the size of the NATO Response Force; modernized our command structure; bolstered our cyber defenses; and we have stepped up our support for our close partners, Georgia and Ukraine, sovereign nations with the sovereign right to choose their own path.

We do all of this, not to provoke a conflict, but to prevent a conflict, and to preserve peace; not to fight, but to deter; not to attack, but to defend.

There is no contradiction between deterrence, defense, and dialogue. We do not want to isolate Russia. We strive for a better relationship with Russia. But even without a better relationship, we still need to manage a difficult one. So we need to talk, and we do talk, to reduce risks, to avoid incidents, accidents, and miscalculations.

We also need dialogue in order to work for arms control. My generation was shaped by the deployment of thousands of nuclear missiles in Europe in the 1980s, missiles capable of destroying our cities and killing millions of people in moments.

Thanks to the vision and leadership of President Reagan and Premier Gorbachev, the INF Treaty put an end to all these weapons.

But today, they are back. Russia has deployed new missiles in Europe. They are mobile, hard to detect, nuclear capable, cut the warning time to just minutes, and reduce the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons in an armed conflict.

NATO's position is united and clear. Russia is in violation of the INF Treaty. There are no new American missiles

in Europe, but there are new Russian missiles.

I continue to call on Russia to return to compliance with the INF Treaty. But so far, Russia has taken no steps to do so, and time is running out.

We do not want a new arms race. We do not want a new Cold War. But we must not be naive. An agreement that is only respected by one side will not keep us safe, so we must also prepare for a world without the INF Treaty.

We will be measured and coordinated. We will not mirror what Russia is doing. NATO has no intention of deploying land-based nuclear missiles in Europe. But NATO will always take the necessary steps to provide credible and effective deterrence.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, the fight against terrorism also demands our collective effort. The attacks on 9/11 made that clear.

NATO's response to those was swift. Within 24 hours, and for the first and only time in our history, we invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the collective defense clause, which states: "An armed attack against one . . . shall be considered an attack against them all."

So, 9/11 was not only an attack on the United States, but against all NATO allies. Within days, NATO aircraft were patrolling American skies. And in the wake of 9/11, NATO soldiers went to fight side by side in Afghanistan to prevent that country from ever again becoming a safe haven for terrorists who could attack us here at home.

Over the years, hundreds of thousands of troops from Europe and Canada have served in Afghanistan. Over a thousand have paid the ultimate price, and many more have been seriously wounded. We honor their service and their sacrifice.

NATO remains in Afghanistan today to fight terrorism and to train Afghan forces. Our goal is not to stay there forever. We should not stay any longer than is necessary. We went in together; we will decide on our future presence together; and when the time comes, we will leave together.

NATO fully supports the peace process. It must pave the way for Afghan reconciliation. There can only be peace if Afghanistan stays free from international terrorists. And for peace to be sustainable, it must build on our achievements. NATO has created the conditions for social and economic progress, bringing education and human rights to women and girls. Their rights must be preserved.

NATO is not only fighting terrorism in Afghanistan, we are also part of the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS. The Coalition has made remarkable progress.

Once, ISIS controlled an area roughly the size of Virginia, and they imposed their twisted ideology on millions. They beheaded people, burned people alive, and traded women as sex slaves.

We should never forget their brutality; and, thanks to American leadership and our collective efforts, we have

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 can never 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 Utoya, where young people 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 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 not 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.

NATO allies must 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 all allies 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 you 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 ISIS, or Russia's illegal annexation 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, because come what may, 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.

□ 1226

**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,  
Washington, DC, April 3, 2019.

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.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1839.

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(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 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. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, 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 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 are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 281, providing for consideration of H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Re-

authorization 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 to reduce instances of domestic violence and ensure that millions of survivors have access to the services they need.

VAWA was the first piece of Federal legislation to acknowledge domestic violence and sexual assault as crimes and has dramatically improved our Nation's response to helping survivors in both the short and long term.

Since its enactment in 1994, VAWA has brought together law enforcement, social service organizations, and victims' advocates to bring domestic violence to light, provide survivors with support, and hold abusers accountable for their actions.

VAWA was and still is 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 necessary 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 past week in my district.

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.

Then, just this past Sunday evening, another woman was asleep in her home in Upland with her three children when, just after midnight, her ex-boyfriend broke into her house, entered

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, because 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 physical 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 they or 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-

ing their spouses, dating partners are generally exempt from these restrictions.

This gaping hole in our gun safety laws has become even more deadly over the years. The share of homicides committed by dating partners has been increasing for three decades. Today, women are as likely to be killed by dating partners as they are by spouses.

Closing the boyfriend loophole is a fact-based, commonsense response to a very real threat.

The provisions in this reauthorization would protect women from abusive dating partners by ensuring that their abusers are prohibited from possessing guns under Federal law.

The definition of “dating partner” is already contained in the Violence Against Women Act. This simple update to policy will provide increased protections for partners in unmarried relationships.

Closing the boyfriend loophole has been a bipartisan issue since long before this bill. Last year, six Republicans cosponsored legislation that would have closed this loophole, and 23 States, in their own laws, have already acted to prevent abusers from obtaining guns, including Pennsylvania and Arizona.

It is time we update Federal law to reflect the reality, which our States have already recognized, and prevent violent dating partners from being able to access weapons.

This bill also closes the stalker loophole. Stalking has been shown to be a predictor of intimate partner violence and homicide, although current law does not prohibit misdemeanor stalking offenses.

A study of intimate partner homicides and attempted homicides involving female victims found that 76 percent of those murders and 85 percent of attempted murders were preceded by at least one incident of stalking before the attack.

Passing this bill will protect women from stalkers by ensuring those convicted of stalking offenses are prohibited from possessing guns under Federal law.

On top of limiting stalkers and abusive dating partners from legally owning weapons, this bill strengthens enforcement by alerting State and local law enforcement when an abuser fails a firearms background check. This notice gives State law enforcement an opportunity to intervene before an abuser can obtain a firearm or do any further harm.

This provision mirrors a bipartisan bill that was introduced earlier this year to notify State law enforcement each time a person who is not allowed to have guns tries to buy a firearm and fails the background check. Clearly, keeping guns out of the hands of those who should not have them is a bipartisan priority.

Mr. Speaker, one of my first experiences as a young attorney was representing women and families who had

sought shelter at the People's Emergency Center in West Philadelphia. That agency was started by former Congressman Bob Edgar.

Most of the women in that shelter had been subjected to domestic abuse. This was before VAWA was the law of the land, but even then it was clear there were significant problems with how the system cared for abused women and punished their abusers.

When VAWA was enacted in 1994, it spoke to so many of the problems my then-clients were facing, issues with housing and employment, caring for young children, and fighting for custody in court.

What makes VAWA such a critical bill is not just the legal protections it puts in place to protect women but the structures it sets up to help women who have been abused.

This reauthorization bill builds upon those critical reforms from 25 years ago and updates them to address current needs.

The bill funds and improves screening for victimization and the perpetration of intimate partner and sexual violence across federally funded healthcare programs. The healthcare system is often one of the first places women go where unseen abuse can be detected. Empowering healthcare professionals to address such sensitive situations can help to avert abuse before it escalates or prevent it from happening in the first place.

The bill ensures that survivors of domestic abuse can maintain housing in the event of a breakup with their partner and further protects their privacy through strengthened confidentiality agreements with housing authorities. Similarly, the bill extends traditional housing grant opportunities to organizations that help underserved populations.

Victims of domestic abuse are often at risk of significant financial loss if they are unable to work and provide for their family as a result of abuse. This bill protects survivors from termination from employment due to disruption caused by domestic abuse and also addresses the impact of domestic abuse on a woman's credit rating.

We should also note that transgender people are disproportionately survivors of sexual assault and violence, and they deserve to access services consistent with their gender identity.

Domestic violence providers and law enforcement agree: Transgender women being in the same space as other women does not make either less safe. Laws that prohibit discrimination based on gender identity have been in place for years, including specifically for VAWA programs.

Minneapolis, for example, has had gender identity protections since 1975, and there is no credible evidence that the existence of these laws has contributed to violence against women. Instead, they simply keep transgender people safe.

Since 1994, VAWA has provided critical tools to survivors of domestic

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 reauthorization of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. 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 debating 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.

VAWA has historically been a bipartisan bill with little controversy. However, this particular VAWA proposal moved through the Judiciary Committee without a single vote of support from any Republican.

Throughout this process, my friends across the aisle have talked a lot about bipartisanship, but I have seen little effort from my Democratic colleagues to engage in a process to pass a VAWA reauthorization bill that could garner wide-ranging bipartisan support. And believe me, I have tried.

I have reached out to my Democratic colleagues to set up meetings several times, to no avail.

□ 1245

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 accept 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 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 de-prioritizes 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 term being outright offensive, it 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 be 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 Senate. 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 for yielding me the time.

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 way 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, stalking, 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 Alaska 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mrs. LESKO. 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 women 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 a lawsuit on behalf 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. The reason? 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 doesn't. These new housing provisions not only diminish the Violence Against Women Act, but also enable more violence against women.

While there are many other concerns with the VAWA language, I will mention just one more.

A 2018 Government Accountability Office report found that Planned Parenthood received nearly \$300,000 from VAWA formula grants during 2013 through 2015. This is extremely disheartening, considering there have been several undercover investigations and news stories suggesting that a number of 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.

□ 1300

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 oppose the rule 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 order quite a few 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 version of the reauthorization 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 misdemeanor conviction.

Frankly, I hope and 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 legislation, and I 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, Congress authorized the Tribal Court's jurisdiction over non-Indian offenders that are arrested for committing domestic violence or assault against women Tribal members on Indian lands.

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 the 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 sexual 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 per-

petrators. 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 obligations, should 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 (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of what I consider, and many consider, one of the most important pieces of legislation that protects 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.

Reauthorizing and strengthening this legislation, expanding protections, increasing funding, and improving services to survivors will save lives across America and help protect women like

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 North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

The Violence Against Women Act, originally enacted in 1994, was reauthorized twice with broad bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, today's bill has followed the same path as other bills this Congress. Democrats are more interested in playing politics and falsely painting Republicans as anti-women rather than passing legislation to actually protect women.

Sadly, despite years of work through local, State, and Federal efforts, domestic and sexual violence remain serious problems. I have heard from women and those working to help them about the challenges faced by women due to violence, but as Republican leader of the House Education and Labor Committee, I can tell you they have never asked for a GAO study on student loan repayment. Such a study is included in this bill. Another study about repayment options and the challenges of student debt will not help those women who are victims of violence.

If Democrats ever had a compelling argument, Americans would never know, since this bill was marked up in only one committee instead of the seven that have jurisdiction.

This bill also requires a study by the Secretaries of Labor and Health and Human Services on workplace responses to victims of violence against women. We are concerned this study is overbroad, and that the workplace is not the best avenue to address domestic violence, especially when those resources can be directed to already existing programs like the National Domestic Abuse Hotline.

I supported the 2006 reauthorization of this bill and stand strongly against all perpetrators of violence against women.

I will always stand for the protection of women, and any reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act should do the same.

Republicans have been ready and willing to work in a bipartisan fashion to reauthorize a bill that truly addresses domestic and sexual violence, but the legislation before us today is not a product worthy of its predecessors.

This bill should go back to be thoughtfully considered by the Education and Labor Committee and all the committees of jurisdiction before we consider it on the floor today.

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

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

□ 1315

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 until 2013. 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, they indicated 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. But, as I recall, 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. GOMERT, 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 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 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 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 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 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.

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 violence 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 firearm 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 dating 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 focused 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 to receive 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, prohibiting persons 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 jurisdic-

tion 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 de-emphasized, merged, 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 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 courageous people with a story 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 endorsed by 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 policy to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Indeed, there is no reason our work on this 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 gentlewoman from Arizona has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has 6½ 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 assault the Second Amendment rights of American citizens. It is despicable that anyone would seize on this as such an oppor-

tunity 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 what 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 titled 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.

Now, the gentlewoman from Texas who just spoke, my friend from Texas, just spoke about 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 these 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 is burning and while women are being abused on our southern border.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, the NRA has spent a lot of money to create this distraction, making this about them as opposed to protecting the lives of women. Over 50 percent of women murdered in 2017 were slain by an intimate partner or family member; 82 percent of homicide victims targeted by intimate partners are women; the weapon of choice in over half of female homicides, a firearm.

This is an opportunity to support both saving the lives of women and responsible gun ownership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her outstanding work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

I want to be associated with the remarks that the gentlewoman just gave

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 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 our communities and 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 voices, and put forth a bill which strikes the unique balance of overreaching where it is unnecessary and underperforming where resources are needed the most.

I don't dispute that my Democrat colleagues are well-intentioned with their legislation, but they missed the mark. In this bill, they diluted important funds meant to help the victims, handcuffed our law enforcement, and reduced their effectiveness. Additionally, they have taken a bipartisan issue and used it to weaken the Second Amendment, 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 preserves and 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).

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. 1585, 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 Violence Against Women Act for the State of California, and, yes, it was signed by a Republican Governor.

In addition to the protections this bill has provided for 26 years, it will now expand protections for Native American women and will protect the transgender community. Every woman has the right to live free from abuse.

Although my Republican colleagues argued differently in committee, sexual orientation or gender identity should not put victims in a second-class status. This bill will now make sure that every victim of sexual violence has access to support.

VAWA is critical for the 1.3 million individuals who benefit from this program. We must continue to improve these services for victims and survivors by passing this bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, I know from personal experiences, yes, the life-and-death implications of this very important bill. So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill to ensure that all women are protected from sexual and domestic violence.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

□ 1330

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide additional consideration of H.R. 1741, authored by Representative ELISE STEFANIK.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1741 is a bill that would provide a 1-year extension of VAWA while we work on negotiating a long-term reauthorization of 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 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 will become a thing of the past 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 deprioritizes 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 ex parte orders are often entered against abusers.

But, in fact, in every instance, even if an initial order is an ex parte, the abuser has the right to request a hearing, including in Arizona, where title 12, section 1809 provides that anyone who has a protection order entered against them can file a written request for a hearing, and that is when they get their due process. So I just want to point that out.

The purpose of the Violence Against Women Act is today as it was when it was passed in 1994: to keep women safe from domestic abuse. It remains a piece of bipartisan landmark legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE detailed the number of Republican amendments and bills that have been incorporated into this version, so it is a shining example of what Congress can accomplish when we set aside our partisan differences and work together to find actual solutions.

VAWA has dramatically improved our Nation’s response to domestic violence and has provided invaluable support to victims, communities, social service providers, and law enforcement. It is working.

We won’t solve domestic violence overnight, nor will we end it with the passage of a bill, but we can continue to change the culture of violence against women and provide the support that survivors need.

The two constituents I spoke of in my opening never should have experienced the violence that was inflicted upon them; but it is not enough to condemn what was done or to charge those responsible, no. We must change the conditions to allow such acts of violence to occur.

We can look at the facts and we can look at the research so we create policies and pass laws to better protect women from abusers, and this reauthorization is a bold step in the right direction.

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:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, 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 recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Adoption of H. Res. 271.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—231

Adams Clyburn Finkenauer
Aguiar Cohen Fletcher
Allred Connolly Foster
Axne Cooper Frankel
Barragán Correa Fudge
Bass Costa Gabbard
Beatty Courtney Gallego
Bera Cox (CA) Garamendi
Beyer Craig Garcia (IL)
Bishop (GA) Crist Garcia (TX)
Blumenauer Crow Golden
Blunt Rochester Cuellar Gomez
Bonamici Cummings Gonzalez (TX)
Boyle, Brendan Cunningham Gottheimer
F. Davids (KS) Green (TX)
Brindisi Davis (CA) Grijalva
Brown (MD) Davis, Danny K. Haaland
Brownley (CA) Dean Harder (CA)
Bustos DeFazio Hastings
Butterfield DeGette Hayes
Carbajal DeLauro Heck
Cárdenas DelBene Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN) Delgado Hill (CA)
Cartwright Demings Himes
Case DeSaunier Horn, Kendra S.
Casten (IL) Deutch Horsford
Castor (FL) Dingell Houlahan
Castro (TX) Doggett Huffman
Chu, Judy Doyle, Michael Jackson Lee
Cicilline F. Jayapal
Cisneros Engel Jeffries
Clark (MA) Escobar Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY) Eshoo Johnson (TX)
Clay Espaillat Kaptur
Cleaver Evans Keating

Kelly (IL) Moulton Scott, David
Kennedy Mucarsel-Powell Serrano
Khanna Murphy Sewell (AL)
Kildee Nadler Shalala
Kilmer Napolitano Sherman
Kim Neal Sherrill
Kind Neguse Sires
Kirkpatrick Norcross Slotkin
Krishnamoorthi O’Halloran Smith (WA)
Kuster (NH) Ocasio-Cortez Soto
Lamb Omar Spanberger
Langevin Pallone Speier
Larsen (WA) Panetta Stanton
Larson (CT) Pappas Stevens
Lawrence Pascrell Suozzi
Lawson (FL) Payne Swalwell (CA)
Lee (CA) Perlmutter Takano
Lee (NV) Peters Thompson (CA)
Levin (CA) Peterson Thompson (MS)
Levin (MI) Phillips Titus
Lewis Pingree Tlaib
Lieu, Ted Pocan Tonko
Lipinski Porter Torres (CA)
Loeb sack Loeb sack Pressley Torres Small
Lofgren Price (NC) (NM)
Lowenthal Quigley Trahan
Lowe y Raskin Trone
Luján Rice (NY) Underwood
Luria Richmond Van Drew
Lynch Rose (NY) Vargas
Malinowski Rouda Veasey
Maloney, Ruiz Vela
Carolyn B. Ruiz Velázquez
Maloney, Sean Ruppertsberger Visclosky
Matsui Rush Wasserman
McAdams Sánchez Schultz
McBath Sarbanes Waters
McCollum Scanlon Watson Coleman
McGovern Schakowsky Welch
McNerney Schiff Wexton
Meeks Schneider Wild
Meng Schrader Wilson (FL)
Moore Schrier Yarmuth
Morelle Scott (VA)

NAYS—193

Abraham Fitzpatrick Latta
Aderholt Fleischmann Lesko
Allen Flores Long
Amash Fortenberry Loudermilk
Amodei Foxx (NC) Lucas
Armstrong Fulcher Luetkemeyer
Arrington Gaetz Marchant
Babin Gallagher Marshall
Bacon Gianforte Massie
Baird Gibbs Mast
Balderson Gohmert McCarthy
Banks Gonzalez (OH) McCaul
Barr Gooden McClintock
Bergman Gosar McHenry
Biggs Granger McKinley
Bilirakis Graves (GA) Meadows
Bishop (UT) Graves (LA) Meuser
Bost Graves (MO) Miller
Brady Green (TN) Mitchell
Brooks (AL) Griffith Moolenaar
Brooks (IN) Grothman Mooney (WV)
Buchanan Guest Mullin
Buck Guthrie Newhouse
Bucshon Hagedorn Norman
Budd Harris Nunes
Burchett Hartzler Olson
Burgess Hern, Kevin Palazzo
Byrne Herrera Beutler Palmer
Calvert Hice (GA) Pence
Carter (GA) Higgins (LA) Perry
Carter (TX) Hill (AR) Posey
Chabot Holding Ratcliffe
Cheney Hollingsworth Reed
Cline Hudson Reschenthaler
Cloud Huizenga Rice (SC)
Cole Hunter Rigglesman
Collins (GA) Hurd (TX) Roby
Collins (NY) Johnson (LA) Rodgers (WA)
Comer Johnson (OH) Roe, David P.
Conaway Johnson (SD) Rogers (AL)
Cook Jordan Rogers (KY)
Crawford Joyce (OH) Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw Joyce (PA) Rose, John W.
Curtis Katko Rouzer
Davidson (OH) Kelly (MS) Roy
Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA) Scalise
DesJarlais King (IA) Schweikert
Diaz-Balart King (NY) Scott, Austin
Duffy Kinzinger Sensenbrenner
Duncan Kustoff (TN) Shimkus
Dunn LaHood Simpson
Emmer LaMalfa Smith (MO)
Ferguson Lamborn Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smucker  
Spano  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton

NOT VOTING—7

Estes  
Hoyer  
McEachin

Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup

Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

□ 1401

Messrs. WOODALL, TAYLOR, and WESTERMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. VISCLOSKY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 144.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—231

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brindisi  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Cabajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig

Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
García (IL)  
García (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green (TX)  
Grijalva  
Haaland  
Loftgren  
Harder (CA)  
Hastings

Luján  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Malden  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Murphy  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters

NAYS—194

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy (NC)  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser

Peterson  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)

Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suozzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Demings  
McEachin

Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho

□ 1412

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING 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  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brindisi  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Cabajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Cunningham

Davids (KS)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
García (IL)  
García (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green (TX)  
Grijalva  
Haaland  
Harder (CA)  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill (CA)  
Himes  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Horsford  
Houlahan

Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebsack  
Loftgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Luján  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McGovern

|                 |               |                |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| McNerney        | Rice (NY)     | Stefanik       |
| Meeks           | Richmond      | Stevens        |
| Meng            | Riggleman     | Suozi          |
| Moore           | Rose (NY)     | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Morelle         | Rouda         | Takano         |
| Moulton         | Roybal-Allard | Thompson (CA)  |
| Mucarsel-Powell | Ruiz          | Thompson (MS)  |
| Murphy          | Ruppersberger | Titus          |
| Nadler          | Rush          | Tlaib          |
| Napolitano      | Sánchez       | Tonko          |
| Neal            | Sarbanes      | Torres (CA)    |
| Neguse          | Scanlon       | Torres Small   |
| Norcross        | Schakowsky    | (NM)           |
| O'Halleran      | Schiff        | Trahan         |
| Ocasio-Cortez   | Schneider     | Trone          |
| Omar            | Schrader      | Underwood      |
| Pallone         | Schrier       | Upton          |
| Panetta         | Scott (VA)    | Van Drew       |
| Pappas          | Scott, David  | Vargas         |
| Pascrell        | Serrano       | Veasey         |
| Payne           | Sewell (AL)   | Vela           |
| Pelosi          | Shalala       | Velázquez      |
| Perlmutter      | Sherman       | Visclosky      |
| Peters          | Sherrill      | Wasserman      |
| Phillips        | Sires         | Schultz        |
| Pingree         | Slotkin       | Waters         |
| Pocan           | Smith (NJ)    | Watson Coleman |
| Porter          | Smith (WA)    | Welch          |
| Pressley        | Soto          | Wexton         |
| Price (NC)      | Spanberger    | Wild           |
| Quigley         | Speier        | Wilson (FL)    |
| Raskin          | Stanton       | Yarmuth        |
| Reed            | Stauber       |                |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez (OH)

NOT VOTING—5

|             |            |         |
|-------------|------------|---------|
| McEachin    | Rutherford | Stivers |
| Rooney (FL) | Ryan       |         |

□ 1422

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT**

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge that the Speaker and the majority leader immediately schedule the born-alive bill so that we can stand up for the sanctity of human life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019**

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1585.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 281 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1585.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1425

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. AGUILAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from 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.

VAWA, which is not gender exclusive, addresses the needs of men and women, children, persons with disabilities, homeless persons, and LGBTQ people, among others. Importantly, H.R. 1585 includes new protections for transgender individuals.

The range of individuals 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 prosecute violent crimes against women and to provide services to sexual assault victims. It also strengthens various 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.

|               |                 |               |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| NAYS—186      |                 |               |
| Abraham       | Gibbs           | Mooney (WV)   |
| Aderholt      | Gohmert         | Mullin        |
| Allen         | Gooden          | Newhouse      |
| Amash         | Gosar           | Norman        |
| Amodei        | Granger         | Nunes         |
| Armstrong     | Graves (GA)     | Olson         |
| Arrington     | Graves (LA)     | Palazzo       |
| Babin         | Graves (MO)     | Palmer        |
| Bacon         | Green (TN)      | Pence         |
| Baird         | Griffith        | Perry         |
| Balderson     | Grothman        | Peterson      |
| Banks         | Guest           | Posey         |
| Barr          | Guthrie         | Ratcliffe     |
| Bergman       | Hagedorn        | Reschenthaler |
| Biggs         | Harris          | Rice (SC)     |
| Bilirakis     | Hartzler        | Roby          |
| Bishop (UT)   | Hern, Kevin     | Rodgers (WA)  |
| Bost          | Herrera Beutler | Roe, David P. |
| Brady         | Hice (GA)       | Rogers (AL)   |
| Brooks (AL)   | Higgins (LA)    | Rogers (KY)   |
| Brooks (IN)   | Hill (AR)       | Rose, John W. |
| Buchanan      | Holding         | Rouzer        |
| Buck          | Hollingsworth   | Roy           |
| Bucshon       | Hudson          | Scalise       |
| Budd          | Huizenga        | Schweikert    |
| Burchett      | Hunter          | Scott, Austin |
| Burgess       | Hurd (TX)       | Sensenbrenner |
| Byrne         | Johnson (LA)    | Shimkus       |
| Calvert       | Johnson (OH)    | Simpson       |
| Carter (GA)   | Johnson (SD)    | Smith (MO)    |
| Carter (TX)   | Jordan          | Smith (NE)    |
| Chabot        | Joyce (OH)      | Smucker       |
| Cheney        | Joyce (PA)      | Spano         |
| Cline         | Kelly (MS)      | Steil         |
| Cloud         | Kelly (PA)      | Steube        |
| Cole          | King (IA)       | Stewart       |
| Collins (GA)  | King (NY)       | Taylor        |
| Collins (NY)  | Kinzinger       | Thompson (PA) |
| Comer         | Kustoff (TN)    | Thornberry    |
| Conaway       | LaHood          | Timmons       |
| Cook          | LaMalfa         | Tipton        |
| Crawford      | Lamborn         | Turner        |
| Crenshaw      | Latta           | Wagner        |
| Curtis        | Lesko           | Walberg       |
| Davidson (OH) | Long            | Walden        |
| Davis, Rodney | Loudermilk      | Walker        |
| DesJarlais    | Lucas           | Walorski      |
| Diaz-Balart   | Luetkemeyer     | Waltz         |
| Duffy         | Marchant        | Watkins       |
| Duncan        | Marshall        | Weber (TX)    |
| Dunn          | Massie          | Weber (FL)    |
| Emmer         | Mast            | Wenstrup      |
| Estes         | McCarthy        | Westerman     |
| Ferguson      | McCaul          | Williams      |
| Fleischmann   | McClintock      | Wilson (SC)   |
| Flores        | McHenry         | Wittman       |
| Fortenberry   | McKinley        | Womack        |
| Foxx (NC)     | Meadows         | Woodall       |
| Fulcher       | Meuser          | Wright        |
| Gaetz         | Miller          | Yoho          |
| Gallagher     | Mitchell        | Young         |
| Gianforte     | Moolenaar       | Zeldin        |

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

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 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.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chair, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.*

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

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 1585, the Committee on Energy and Commerce agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter in the report on the bill and into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1585.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,  
*Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: 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 Financial Services. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1585 and agree that the inaction of your Com-

mittee 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.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2019.

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 Rule X 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 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 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.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2019.

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 mutual understanding that your Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar leg-

islation, 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.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

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 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.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, DC, March 18, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Wash-  
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 1585, Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, the Committee on Ways and Means agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

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

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. NEAL,  
*Chairman.*



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEAL: 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 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 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 THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: 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 Education and Labor. 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.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND  
LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 20, 2019.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I write concerning H.R. 1585, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019." This bill was primarily referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and secondarily to the Committee on Education and Labor. As a result of your having consulted with me concerning this bill generally, I agree to forgo consideration of the bill in 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 con-

tained in this or similar legislation, and we will be, appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issue within our 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2019.

Hon. 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 20, 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 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 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 THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: 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 Natural Resources. 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, March 18, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.

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

I will 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 subject matters contained in the bill that fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Natural Resources to any conference committee to consider such provisions. Finally, please include this letter in the report 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,  
Chair, Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

Hon. MARK TAKANO,  
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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, March 18, 2019.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I write concerning H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 1585 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1585 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee

will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Further I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Judiciary Committee, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

MARK TAKANO,  
*Chairman.*

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 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.

□ 1430

Remember, Republicans tried to add a short-term extension of VAWA to the funding bill in February when Congresswoman LESKO offered it as a previous question. Democrats blocked this attempt and refused to include a short-term extension to allow time for meaningful negotiations to take place.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I want to find a solution that helps victims, prevents domestic violence, and strengthens programs that serve vulnerable populations. We stand willing and ready to discuss ways to do that.

But I cannot and will not support a bill that undermines and jeopardizes due process; that curtails prosecutorial discretion; that makes it more difficult for victims in rural areas to find housing; that could weaken programs for female victims; that could re-victimize abused women; and that undercuts the Second Amendment rights.

This bill contains a large expansion of unemployment insurance benefits, which amounts to a new tax on employers. This bill continues to expand the focus of programs past women and children; and this bill fails to provide a faith-based exemption for grant recipients, which could jeopardize these organizations' ability to provide services for victims.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was referred to seven committees. The bill was rushed to markup at the Judiciary Committee, but at least Judiciary actually had a markup. Even though the rushed markup ended in a party-line vote, that markup is far more than the Democrats gave the other committees of jurisdiction.

The Ways and Means Committee is the committee with expertise in unemployment insurance benefits, but if you are on that committee, Democrats denied you the chance to weigh in on that issue at committee, and Americans didn't get to benefit from your expertise there.

The Financial Services Committee is the committee with expertise on housing issues. But if you are on that committee, you were shut down as well; this bill moving ahead without the benefit of your consideration.

Democrats also denied the Natural Resources, Education and Labor, Veterans' Affairs, and Energy and Commerce Committees the chance to weigh in on a bill with provisions that sit squarely within their jurisdiction.

I want to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. I want to do it in a way that meets the fundamental goals and intent of the original law, and I want to recognize changes that need to be addressed.

Simply put, I want to find a bipartisan, bicameral agreement that Democrats shunned when they rushed this bill to the floor. This bill could actually put women at greater risk in some of the programs it authorizes, and it is not a solution that I can support.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), the vice-chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Chairman, some of the hardest calls law enforcement officers take are intimate partner violence calls. These situations are heart-breaking, volatile, dangerous, and far too commonplace. Domestic violence affects every community and crosses all racial and socioeconomic lines. It is heart-breaking and even more tragic because domestic violence is often pre-

ventable. That is the purpose of the Violence Against Women Act.

One in five homicides in Florida is a result of domestic violence. In 2016, over 100,000 domestic violence incidents were reported to police in Florida. Since I began my remarks, three women have been beaten, battered, or murdered.

Mr. Chairman, these calls are extremely dangerous for everyone involved. When law enforcement responds to these calls, they too are put at great risk. In 2017, more officers were shot responding to domestic violence calls than any other type of call.

All too often, it is a first responder, family member, neighbor, or other loved one who is killed in a domestic violence incident. In fact, these deaths make up 1 of 5 domestic violence homicide victims.

We have to train, equip, and empower law enforcement, healthcare providers, and other responders to address intimate partner violence. These programs have already proven effective.

Grantees funded by VAWA have trained nearly 90,000 law enforcement officers in best practices and techniques to handle these sensitive situations. But the VAWA reauthorization is not just about continuing these successful programs. It also makes additional improvements which will save lives of victims and responders.

Nationwide, the presence of a gun in a domestic violence situation makes it five times more likely that someone will be killed.

The VAWA reauthorization will help law enforcement disarm dangerous people and convicted felons, create new notification systems for law enforcement, address the so-called "boyfriend loophole" that lets non-married but dangerous partners get weapons.

The Violence Against Women Act reauthorization is a critical step to our efforts to protect these Americans; and I urge my colleagues to support this critical and necessary legislation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I am a survivor of domestic violence from a previous marriage. I serve on the advisory council of a domestic violence shelter in my district. I am the co-chairwoman of the Working Group Against Domestic Violence in Congress.

So if you haven't figured it out, this issue is very important to me and I want to protect women.

Another role I have is, I am co-chairwoman of the Congressional Women's Caucus. And in that, I spoke with my Democratic colleague, and she knew it was an important issue to me, it was an important issue to her, and we really had talked about having a bipartisan approach that all women and all of us could vote on that we would agree on.

So once I found out that Representative BASS was going to be the sponsor of the bill, I reached out to her office.

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 shelters, under penalty of Federal law, this law, to house biological males in with women. And often these 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 gentleman has expired.

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

Mrs. LESKO. This bill, thirdly, also takes away gun rights in 2 cases: 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 we all can support, 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. Chair, 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 these victims, and one more fear that we just add to them.

In one 24-hour period in Michigan, domestic violence programs answered 408 hotline calls of people in immediate danger, and served 2,359 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 and heal.

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 the time to hold the safety of women as a bargaining chip against infringements on religious liberty or weakening 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 shames. 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 8,500 individual victims of 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 let’s be 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 provision.

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.

□ 1445

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. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. 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

testimony repeatedly, as a judge, from experts.

I have read the studies. The literature, psychiatric literature, indicates that the studies show that women who have been through sexual assault are more likely to experience post-traumatic stress disorder than even soldiers, on a percentage basis.

One of the things that can trigger the trauma coming back is a man coming into a confined space like a restroom, like a dressing room, like a battered women's shelter, and they are living it again.

Why would we do that? Why would we have a bill that forces that kind of trauma back on women who have been through enough?

This bill, in the name of equality, says women are not going to be able to have a safe place from biological men. No. We are going to force them, and under this bill, there will be lawsuits. A homeless shelter, a shelter for battered women, and it is shocking how much of this still goes on, but they will be subject to lawsuits if this bill becomes law.

You will have people, the government with all its power, forcing shelters for battered women 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 relieved 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 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Chairman, I will be short and to the point.

The number one way that women in America are being killed by their intimate partners is with a gun. We cannot address the epidemic of gender-based violence without addressing gun violence.

The NRA sees it differently. They don't want us to close the boyfriend loophole. They don't want to keep firearms out of the hands of those whose

actions show that they are a threat. Their solution to gun violence is by arming women, selling more guns, even though we know that this would make women less safe.

Nearly 1 million American women alive today have been shot or shot at by an intimate partner. They deserve better.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act for those we have lost, for those who have survived, and for the safety of all Americans.

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

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

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, as a former domestic violence prosecutor and advocate for abused women, I have seen firsthand the impact of the Violence Against Women Act's legal protections and survivor support services. Because of this law, survivors can access a national hotline, a network of shelters, and get protection orders that carry across State lines.

The bill before us today will close the boyfriend loophole by stopping abusers and stalkers from obtaining firearms.

The NRA thinks this language is too broad. They are wrong. When women are five times more likely to be murdered if there is a gun present in the household, it is clear that gun violence is a women's issue.

We have made important progress, but we can't let up, not when a woman is murdered by a male intimate partner with a gun every 16 hours.

This bill tells survivors: You are not alone. You will always have a place to go. You will always have people on your side.

Most importantly, it will save lives. 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 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. LUJÁN. 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 struck 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 strangled.

Rayen's story is representative of the violence women, especially 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ 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 demonstrate that we value the dignity of every human being.

I was proud to work with the committee to close three potentially fatal loopholes that allow abusers to possess firearms.

We closed the stalking loophole by treating stalking similarly to other domestic violence crimes. Currently, 76 percent of women who are murdered by 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. Chairman, 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 reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the chair of the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee and the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

This bipartisan measure was introduced by myself and my colleague, Mr. FITZPATRICK, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Several other Members have supported this effort and were inadvertently left off the sponsor list due to a clerical error. To remedy that, I will furnish a separate statement for the RECORD that includes those names, respectively.

H.R. 1585 will reauthorize the VAWA of 1994, a landmark piece of legislation

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, we still have much to do.

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.

The 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 everywhere, 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 goals of 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 an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman 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.

□ 1500

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, 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. In 1994, 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 cosponsor 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. 1585, 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. COLLINS and I have been working on any number of issues dealing with criminal justice reform, and certainly we have spent the last couple of years on the Judiciary Committee. He may not recall, but working with our chairman in the last session of Congress, who acknowledged that the Judiciary Committee had many opportunities to work together—and I totally agree—one of those issues was, of course, the Violence Against Women Act. We engaged with the staff quite extensively because we wanted this to be a bipartisan bill.

So, for a 3-year period, we engaged, I engaged, many women of this Congress

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, or 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, it will expand the capacity of early childhood programs to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It will put in \$291 million, so that date rape kits, DNA kits, will not be backlogged, so that law enforcement will have resources, and so that prosecutors will have resources.

Candice cannot be brought back. And we introduced that bill at a time when no one wanted to see anything having to do with protecting us from guns. Now we have a statement that respects Candice's life by indicating that if you have been convicted, you need not have a gun around your family, it should be in a lockbox.

What more can we do to be fair and balanced and draw bipartisan support, even to the extent of joining with my friend from Texas to have a bill amendment that deals with female genital mutilation.

We have worked hard. This bill deserves 100 percent support of this Congress, because while we talk lives are being lost.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my friends to support the legislation that we are debating, H.R. 1585.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019. 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 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 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 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 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 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.

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 violence 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 firearm 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 dating 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 focused 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 to receive 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, prohibiting persons 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 de-emphasized, merged, 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 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 courageous people with a story 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 endorsed by 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 policy to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Indeed, there is no reason our work on this 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.

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 gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all of those who have been involved in getting this to the floor. This bill is a critically important bill and, unfortunately, its authorization expired last year. It is timely that we bring it to the floor. I am hopeful that it passes.

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 difference.

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 gentle-

woman 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 BASS—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 to 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 preventing anybody 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 chil-

dren they care for. Let's pass this bill. Let's reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

□ 1515

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 this 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

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 BERA  
SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr.  
G.K. BUTTERFIELD  
ANDRÉ CARSON  
MATT CARTWRIGHT  
JOAQUIN CASTRO  
EMANUEL CLEAVER  
GERALD CONNOLLY  
JIM COSTA  
TJ COX  
CHARLIE CRIST  
SHARICE DAVIDS  
DANNY K. DAVIS  
ROSA DELAURO  
MARK DESAULNIER  
THEODORE E. DEUTCH  
MICHAEL F. DOYLE  
ELIOT ENGEL  
DWIGHT EVANS  
ABBY FINKENAUER  
JIMMY GOMEZ  
ALCEE 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  
TED LIEU  
NITA M. LOWEY  
BEN RAY LUJÁN  
ELAINE G. LURIA  
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  
MIKIE SHERRILL  
DARREN SOTO  
ABIGAIL DAVIS SPANBERGER  
MARK TAKANO  
BENNIE G. THOMPSON  
RASHIDA TLAIB  
NORMA J. TORRES  
XOCHITL TORRES SMALL  
MARC A. VEASEY

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 116-32. 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 support families in the justice system.*  
Sec. 105. *Outreach and services to underserved populations grants.*  
Sec. 106. *Criminal provisions.*  
Sec. 107. *Rape survivor child custody.*

#### 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 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 (CHOOSE) 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.*

- Sec. 402. *Saving Money and Reducing Tragedies (SMART) through Prevention grants.*

#### TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE

- Sec. 501. *Grants to strengthen the healthcare systems response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*

#### TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS

- Sec. 601. *Housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*  
Sec. 602. *Ensuring compliance and implementation; prohibiting retaliation against victims.*  
Sec. 603. *Protecting the right to report crime from one’s home.*  
Sec. 604. *Transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.*  
Sec. 605. *Addressing the housing needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.*  
Sec. 606. *United States Housing Act of 1937 amendments.*

#### TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS

- Sec. 701. *Findings.*  
Sec. 702. *National Resource Center on workplace responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence.*  
Sec. 703. *Entitlement to unemployment compensation for victims of sexual and other harassment and survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.*  
Sec. 704. *Study and reports on barriers to survivors’ economic security access.*  
Sec. 705. *GAO Study.*  
Sec. 706. *Education and information programs for survivors.*  
Sec. 707. *Severability.*

#### TITLE VIII—HOMICIDE REDUCTION INITIATIVES

- Sec. 801. *Prohibiting persons convicted of misdemeanor crimes against dating partners and persons subject to protection orders.*  
Sec. 802. *Prohibiting stalkers and individuals subject to court order from possessing a firearm.*

#### TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

- Sec. 901. *Findings and purposes.*  
Sec. 902. *Authorizing funding for the tribal access program.*  
Sec. 903. *Tribal jurisdiction over crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, obstruction of justice, sexual violence, sex trafficking, stalking, and assault of a law enforcement officer or corrections officer.*  
Sec. 904. *Annual reporting requirements.*

#### TITLE X—OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

- Sec. 1001. *Establishment of Office on Violence Against Women.*

#### TITLE XI—IMPROVING CONDITIONS FOR WOMEN IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

- Sec. 1101. *Improving the treatment of primary caretaker parents and other individuals in federal prisons.*  
Sec. 1102. *Public health and safety of women.*

#### TITLE XII—LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY

- Sec. 1201. *Notification to law enforcement agencies of prohibited purchase or attempted purchase of a firearm.*  
Sec. 1202. *Reporting of background check denials to state, local, and tribal authorities.*  
Sec. 1203. *Special assistant U.S. attorneys and cross-deputized attorneys.*



**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.
- Sec. 1305. Definition.

**TITLE XIV—OTHER MATTERS**

- Sec. 1401. National stalker and domestic violence reduction.
- 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 redesignating paragraphs (34) through (45) as paragraphs (42) through (53);

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

“(39) **INTERNET ENABLED DEVICE.**—The term ‘internet enabled device’ means devices that have a connection to 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. Technological abuse may include—

“(A) unwanted, repeated telephone calls, text messages, instant messages, or social media posts;

“(B) non-consensual accessing e-mail accounts, texts or instant messaging accounts, social networking accounts, or cellular telephone logs;

“(C) controlling or restricting a person’s ability to access technology with the intent to isolate them from support and social connection;

“(D) using tracking devices or location tracking software for the purpose of monitoring or stalking another person’s location;

“(E) impersonating a person (including through the use of spoofing technology in photo or video or the creation of accounts under a false name) with the intent to deceive or cause harm; or

“(F) sharing or urging or compelling the sharing of another person’s private information, photographs, or videos without their consent.

“(41) **FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.**—The terms ‘female genital mutilation’, ‘female genital cutting’, ‘FGM/C’, or ‘female circumcision’ mean the intentional removal or infibulation (or both) of either the whole or part of the external female genitalia for non-medical reasons. External female genitalia includes the pubis, labia minora, labia majora, clitoris, and urethral and vaginal openings.”;

(D) in paragraph (19)(B), by striking “and probation” and inserting “probation, and vacatur or expungement”;

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (13) through (33) as paragraphs (18) through (38);

(F) by striking paragraphs (11) and (12) and inserting the following:

“(13) **DIGITAL SERVICES.**—The term ‘digital services’ means services, resources, information, support or referrals provided through electronic communications platforms and media, whether via mobile device technology, video technology, or computer technology, including utilizing the internet, as well as any other emerging communications technologies that are appropriate for the purposes of providing services, resources, information, support, or referrals for the benefit of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(14) **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, including money, 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 default on joint or other financial obligations, exploiting powers of attorney, guardianship, or conservatorship, or failing or neglecting to act in the best interests of a person to whom one has a fiduciary duty.

“(15) **ELDER ABUSE.**—The term ‘elder abuse’ has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act. The terms ‘abuse,’ ‘elder,’ and ‘exploitation’ have the meanings given those terms in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397j).

“(16) **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.

“(17) **HOMELESS.**—The term ‘homeless’ has the meaning given such term in section 41403(6).”;

(G) by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as paragraphs (11) and (12), respectively;

(H) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

“(10) **DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.**—The term ‘domestic violence’ means a pattern of behavior involving the use or attempted use of physical, sexual, verbal, emotional, economic, or technological abuse or any other coercive behavior committed, enabled, or solicited to gain or maintain power and control over a victim, by a person who—

“(A) is a current or former spouse or dating partner of the victim, or other person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the family or domestic violence laws of the jurisdiction;

“(B) is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or dating partner, or other person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the family or domestic violence laws of the jurisdiction;

“(C) shares a child in common with the victim;

“(D) is an adult family member of, or paid or nonpaid caregiver for, a victim aged 50 or older or an adult victim with disabilities; or

“(E) commits acts against a youth or adult victim who is protected from those acts under the family or domestic violence laws of the jurisdiction.”;

(I) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively;

(J) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(7) **COURT-BASED AND COURT-RELATED PERSONNEL.**—The terms ‘court-based personnel’ and ‘court-related personnel’ mean persons working

in the court, whether paid or volunteer, including—

“(A) clerks, special masters, domestic relations officers, administrators, mediators, custody evaluators, guardians ad litem, lawyers, negotiators, probation, parole, interpreters, victim assistants, victim advocates, and judicial, administrative, or any other professionals or personnel similarly involved in the legal process;

“(B) court security personnel;

“(C) personnel working in related, supplementary offices or programs (such as child support enforcement); and

“(D) any other court-based or community-based personnel having responsibilities or authority to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the court system.”;

(K) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (4) through (6) respectively;

(L) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(3) **ALTERNATIVE JUSTICE RESPONSE.**—The term ‘alternative justice response’ means a process, whether court-ordered or community-based, that—

“(A) involves, on a voluntary basis, and to the extent possible, those who have committed a specific offense and those who have been harmed as a result of the offense;

“(B) has the goal of collectively seeking accountability from the accused, and developing a process whereby the accused will take responsibility for his or her actions, and a plan for providing relief to those harmed, through allocation, restitution, community service, or other processes upon which the victim, the accused, the community, and the court (if court-ordered) can agree;

“(C) is conducted in a framework that protects victim safety and supports victim autonomy; and

“(D) provides that information disclosed during such process may not be used for any other law enforcement purpose, including impeachment or prosecution, without the express permission of all participants.”;

(M) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2); and

(N) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as redesignated in subparagraph (M) of this paragraph) the following:

“(1) **ABUSE IN LATER LIFE.**—The term ‘abuse in later life’ means neglect, abandonment, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking of an adult over the age of 50 by any person, or economic abuse of that adult by a person in an ongoing, relationship of trust with the victim. Self-neglect is not included in this definition.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (H) and (I);

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

“(G) **DEATH OF THE PARTY WHOSE PRIVACY HAD BEEN PROTECTED.**—In the event of the death of any victim whose confidentiality and privacy is required to be protected under this subsection, such requirement shall continue to apply, and the right to authorize release of any confidential or protected information be vested in the next of kin, except that consent for release of the deceased victim’s information may not be given by a person who had perpetrated abuse against the deceased victim.”;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (E) as subparagraphs (E) through (F); and

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) **USE OF TECHNOLOGY.**—Grantees and subgrantees may use telephone, internet, and other technologies to protect the privacy, location and help-seeking activities of victims using services. Such technologies may include—

“(i) software, apps or hardware that block caller ID or conceal IP addresses, including instances in which victims use digital services; or

“(ii) 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) in paragraph (6), by adding at the end 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 available as broadly as possible to any appropriate grantees, subgrantees, potential grantees, or other entities without regard to whether the entity has received funding from the Office on Violence Against Women for a particular program or project.”;

(E) in paragraph (13)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after “the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013” the following: “(Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 54)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “section 3789d of title 42, United States Code” and inserting “section 809 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10228)”;

(F) in paragraph (14), by inserting after “are also victims of” the following: “forced marriage, or”;

(G) in paragraph (16)(C)(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.”.

### SEC. 3. REPORTING ON FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION, FEMALE GENITAL CUTTING, OR FEMALE CIRCUMCISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, pursuant to section 534 of title 28, United States Code, classify the offense of female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision as a part II crime in the Uniform Crime Reports.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the terms “female genital mutilation”, “female genital cutting”, “FGM/C”, or “female circumcision” mean the intentional removal or infibulation (or both) of either the whole or part of the external female genitalia for non-medical reasons. External female genitalia includes the pubis, labia minora, labia majora, clitoris, and urethral and vaginal openings.

### TITLE I—ENHANCING LEGAL TOOLS TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

#### SEC. 101. STOP GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10441 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2001(b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “including implementation of the non-discrimination requirements in section 40002(b)(13) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994”;

(B) in paragraph (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”;

(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 and 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 court has—

“(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 that the perpetrator possesses or has 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 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 individual 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 (d)—

(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 40002(b)(13) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994”;

(B) in subsection (i)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and the requirements under section 40002(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b))”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(C)(iv), by inserting after “ethnicity,” the following: “sexual orientation, gender identity,”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(k) REVIEWS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH NON-DISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If allegations of discrimination in violation of section 40002(b)(13)(A) of the Violence 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) ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of

2019, the Attorney General shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the House of Representatives regarding compliance with section 40002(b)(13)(A) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(13)(A)) by recipients of grants under this part.”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 2017. GRANT ELIGIBILITY REGARDING COMPELLING VICTIM TESTIMONY.

“In order to be eligible for a grant under this part, a State, Indian tribal government, territorial government, or unit of local government shall certify that, not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, their laws, policies, or practices will include a detailed protocol to discourage the use of bench warrants, material witness warrants, perjury charges, or other means of compelling victim-witness testimony in the investigation, prosecution, trial, or sentencing of a crime related to the domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence or stalking of the victim.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(18) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(18)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

#### 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 2101 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) in subsection (b)—

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

(B) in paragraph (8)—

(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 striking “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 among underserved populations (as defined in section 40002(a)(46) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994)”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(23) To develop and implement an alternative justice response (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994).

“(24) To develop and implement policies, procedures, protocols, laws, regulations, 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 court has—

“(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 that the perpetrator possesses or has 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 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)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “encourage or mandate arrests of domestic violence offenders” and inserting “encourage arrests of offenders”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), 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 laws, 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 victim-witness testimony 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”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(19) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(19)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

**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. 20121) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after “no cost to the victims.” 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 1301 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12464) 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 “improve”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and” ; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) develop and implement an alternative justice response (as such term is defined in sec-

tion 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 UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS GRANTS.**

Section 120 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20123) 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 to, 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, whether or not the protection order was issued by that State, territory, or Tribe.”; 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.**

Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511(f)(1)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

**SEC. 202. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

Section 40295 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. 20122) 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”; and

(C) in paragraph (8), by striking “providing advocacy and intervention services within” and inserting “to enhance the capacity of”;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “disabled individuals” 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.**

Section 40801 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12421)—

(1) in the heading, by striking “ENHANCED TRAINING” and inserting “TRAINING”;

(2) by striking subsection “(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—” and all that follows through paragraph (1) 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 (5) 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)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting after “elder abuse” the following: “and abuse in later life”;

(ii) in clauses (ii) and (iii), by inserting after “victims of” the following: “elder abuse and”; and

(iii) in clause (iv), by striking “advocates, victim service providers, and courts to better serve victims of abuse in later life” and inserting “leaders, 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 inserting after “victims of” the following: “elder abuse and”; and

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking “subparagraph (B)(ii)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(B)”;

(5) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “over 50 years of age” and inserting “50 years of age or over”; and

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

(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. 280b-1b) 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)” ; and

(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 “\$150,000,000 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.”.

**SEC. 302. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION (CHOOSE) 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”; and

(B) by adding at the end 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)—  
(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), 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”;

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

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “stalking, or sex trafficking” and inserting “or stalking”; and  
(II) by striking “or” at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (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

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) clarify State or local mandatory reporting policies and practices regarding peer-to-peer dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; or

“(E) develop, enlarge, or strengthen culturally specific programs and projects to provide culturally specific services regarding, responses to, and prevention of female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “stalking, or sex trafficking” and inserting “stalking, or female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision”;

(ii) by striking “stalking, or sex trafficking” each place it appears and inserting “or stalking”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “confidential” before “support services”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “stalking, and sex trafficking” and inserting “and stalking”; and

(v) in subparagraph (E), by inserting after “programming for youth” the following: “, including youth in underserved populations.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “stalking, or sex trafficking” and inserting “or stalking”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1)”;

(4) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “stalking, and sex trafficking” and inserting “and stalking, including training on working with youth in underserved populations (and, where intervention or programming will include a focus on female genital mutilation, female genital cutting, or female circumcision, or on sex trafficking, sufficient training on those topics)”;

(5) in subsection (f), 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”.

**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 “, provide, 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 training health providers on 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 “\$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. 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.”.

(b) 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.”.

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

(d) 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.

**TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES**

**SEC. 401. STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.**

Section 402 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “violence against women” and inserting “violence against adults, youth,”; and

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

**SEC. 402. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES (SMART) THROUGH PREVENTION GRANTS.**

Section 41303 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12463) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

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

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; 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 (d)(3)—

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

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) include a focus on the unmet needs of underserved populations.”;

(3) in subsection (f), 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”; and

(4) 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.”.

**TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE**

**SEC. 501. GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.**

Section 399P of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the development or enhancement and implementation of training programs to improve the capacity of early childhood programs to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking among families they serve.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by inserting “, including labor and sex trafficking” after “other forms of violence and abuse”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(i) by striking “on-site access to”; and

(ii) by striking “patients by increasing” and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting the following: “patients by—

“(I) increasing the capacity of existing health care professionals and public health staff to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

“(II) contracting with or hiring advocates for victims of domestic violence or sexual assault to provide such services; or

“(III) providing funding to State domestic and sexual violence coalitions to improve the capacity of such coalitions to coordinate and support health advocates and other health system partnerships;”;

(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: “, with priority given to programs administered through the Health Resources and Services Administration, Office of Women’s Health; and”;

(E) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end 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.”.

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(A)—  
(A) in the heading, by striking “CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE” 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 “or” 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 (iv) the following:

“(v) development of a State-level pilot program to—

“(I) improve the response of substance use disorder treatment programs and systems to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(II) improve the capacity of substance use disorder treatment programs and systems to serve survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking dealing with substance use disorder; or

“(vi) development and utilization of existing technical assistance and training resources to improve the capacity of substance use disorder treatment programs to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking among patients the programs serve.”

(8) in subsection (d)(2)(A)—  
(A) by inserting “or behavioral health” after “of health”;

(B) by inserting “behavioral” after “physical or”;

(C) by striking “mental” before “health care”;

(9) in subsection (d)(2)(B)—  
(A) by striking “or health system” and inserting “behavioral health treatment system”; and

(B) by striking “mental” and inserting “behavioral”;

(10) in subsection (f) in the heading, by striking “RESEARCH AND EVALUATION” and inserting “RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND DATA COLLECTION”;

(11) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “research and evaluation” and inserting “research, evaluation, or data collection”;

(12) in subsection (f)(1)(B), by inserting after “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)”;

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

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and  
(E) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) research on the intersection of substance use disorder and domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including the effect of coerced use and efforts by an abusive partner or other to interfere with substance use disorder treatment and recovery; and

“(F) improvement of data collection using existing Federal surveys by including questions about domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and substance use disorder, coerced use, and mental or behavioral health.”;

(14) in subsection (g), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”;

(15) in subsection (h), by striking “herein” and “provided for”.

**TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS**

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

Section 4141 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “brother, sister,” and inserting “sibling,”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “including the direct loan program under such section”;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “the program under subtitle A” and inserting “the programs under subtitles A through D”;

(iii) in subparagraph (I)—

(1) by striking “sections 514, 515, 516, 533, and 538 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, and 1490p–2)” and inserting “sections 514, 515, 516, 533, 538, and 542 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, 1490p–2, and 1490r)”;

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and  
(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(K) the provision of assistance from the Housing Trust Fund as established under section 1338 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501);

“(L) the provision of assistance for housing under the Comprehensive Service Programs for Homeless Veterans program under subchapter II of chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code (38 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

“(M) the provision of assistance for housing and facilities under the grant program for homeless veterans with special needs under section 2061 of title 38, United States Code;

“(N) the provision of assistance for permanent housing under the program for financial assistance for supportive services for very low-income veteran families in permanent housing under section 2044 of title 38, United States Code; and

“(O) any other Federal housing programs providing affordable housing to low-income persons by means of restricted rents or rental assistance as identified by the appropriate agency.”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COVERED HOUSING PROVIDER.—The term ‘covered housing provider’ refers to the individual or entity under a covered housing program that has responsibility for the administration or oversight of housing assisted under a covered housing program and includes public housing agencies, sponsors, owners, mortgagees, managers, grantee under the continuum of Care, State and local governments or agencies thereof, and nonprofit or for-profit organizations or entities.

“(5) CONTINUUM OF CARE.—The term ‘Continuum of Care’ means the Federal program au-

thorized under subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 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 (b)(3)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting after “CRIMINAL ACTIVITY” the following: “AND FAMILY BREAK-UP”;

(B) 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 criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is engaged in by a member of the household of the tenant or any guest or other person under the control of the tenant, if the tenant or an affiliated individual of the tenant is the victim or threatened victim of such domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(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 criminal activity, including drug-related criminal activity (as such term is defined section 3(b)(9) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(9))), 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 its 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) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as clauses (ii) and (iii) respectively;

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

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a family break-up results from an occurrence of domestic violence, dating

violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and the perpetrator no longer resides in the unit and was the sole tenant eligible to receive assistance under a covered housing program, the covered housing provider shall—

“(I) provide any other tenant or resident the opportunity to establish eligibility for the covered housing program; or

“(II) provide that tenant or resident with at least 180 days to remain in the unit under the same terms and conditions as the perpetrator and find new housing or establish eligibility for another covered housing program.”

(iv) in clause (ii) (as redesignated by clause (ii) of this subparagraph)—

(I) in the heading, by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “EVICTION”; and

(II) by inserting after “a public housing agency” the following: “, participating jurisdictions, grantees under the Continuum of Care, grantees,”; and

(v) by striking clause (iii) (as redesignated by clause (ii) of this subparagraph);

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) to limit any right, remedy, or procedure otherwise available under the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162, 119 Stat. 2960) prior to the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.”; and

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

“(D) EARLY TERMINATION.—A covered housing provider shall permit a tenant assisted under the covered housing program to terminate the lease at any time prior to the end date of the lease, without penalty, if the tenant has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and the tenant—

“(i) sends notice of the early lease termination to the landlord in writing prior to or within 3 days of vacating the premises unless a shorter notice period is provided for under State law;

“(ii)(I) reasonably believes that the tenant is threatened with imminent harm if the tenant remains within the same dwelling unit subject to the lease; or

“(II) is a victim of sexual assault, the sexual assault occurred on the premises during the 180-day period preceding the request for lease termination; and

“(iii) provides a form of documentation consistent with the requirements outlined in subsection (c)(3).

Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to preclude any automatic termination of a lease by operation of law.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “Any information submitted to a public housing agency or owner or manager” and inserting “Covered housing providers shall ensure any information submitted”; and

(B) by inserting after “owner or manager” the following: “of housing assisted under a covered housing program”;

(4) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) EMERGENCY TRANSFERS.—

“(I) 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 assisted under a covered housing program if—

“(A) the tenant expressly requests the transfer from the covered housing provider; and

“(B)(i) the tenant reasonably believes that the tenant is threatened with imminent harm from further violence if the tenant remains within the same dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program; or

“(ii) 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 intends to 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 victim 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 a process 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 Continuum 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 are not considered new applicants and take priority over existing waiting lists for a covered housing program;

“(G) incorporate confidentiality measures to ensure that the appropriate agency and 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, and a tenant protection voucher, then the covered housing provider must assist the victim in identifying other housing providers who may have safe and available units to which the victim can move and that the covered housing provider also assist tenants in contacting local organizations offering assistance to victims; and

“(I) mandate a uniform policy for how a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking requests an emergency internal or external transfer.

“(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 grantee under the Continuum of Care shall designate the entity within its geographic area that will coordinate and 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 process when seeking an emergency transfer placement.

“(4) REGIONAL OFFICES.—Each regional office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this section 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 a 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 paragraph (2) or (3).”;

(5) in subsection (f), by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary shall establish these policies and procedures within 60 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.”;

(6) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (k); and

(7) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) EMERGENCY TRANSFER POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—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.

“(h) EMERGENCY TRANSFER VOUCHERS.—Provision of emergency transfer vouchers to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking under subsection (e), shall be considered an eligible use of any funding for tenant protection voucher assistance available under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out emergency transfers under this section, \$20,000,000 under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

“(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, and to facilitate implementation of this section. All staff of covered housing providers shall attend the basic understanding training once annually; and all staff and managers engaged in tenant services shall attend both the basic understanding training and the implementation training once annually.

“(2) REFERRALS.—The appropriate agency with respect to each covered housing program shall supply all appropriate staff of the covered housing providers with a referral listing of public contact information for all domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking service providers offering services in its coverage area.”.

**SEC. 602. ENSURING COMPLIANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION; PROHIBITING RETALIATION AGAINST VICTIMS.**

Chapter 2 of subtitle N of title IV of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 41411 the following:

**“SEC. 41412. COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.**

“(a) ANNUAL COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.—Each appropriate agency administering a covered housing program shall establish a process by which to review compliance with the requirements of this subtitle, on an annual basis, of the covered housing providers administered by that agency. Such a review shall examine the following topics:

“(1) Covered housing provider compliance with requirements prohibiting the denial of assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights on the basis of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(2) Covered housing provider compliance with confidentiality provisions set forth in section 41411(c)(4).

“(3) Covered housing provider compliance with the notification requirements set forth in section 41411(d)(2).

“(4) Covered housing provider compliance with accepting documentation set forth in section 41411(c).

“(5) Covered housing provider compliance with emergency transfer requirements set forth in section 41411(e).

“(6) Covered housing provider compliance with the prohibition on retaliation set forth in section 41414.

“(b) REGULATIONS.—Each appropriate agency shall issue regulations to implement subsection (a) not later than one year after the effective date of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019. These regulations shall—

“(1) define standards of compliance for covered housing providers;

“(2) include detailed reporting requirements, including the number of emergency transfers requested and granted, as well as the length of time needed to process emergency transfers, disaggregated by external and internal transfers; and

“(3) include standards for corrective action plans where a covered housing provider has failed to meet compliance standards.

“(c) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Each appropriate agency shall ensure that an agency-level assessment of the information collected during the compliance review process completed pursuant to this subsection is made publicly available. This agency-level assessment shall include an evaluation of each topic identified in subsection (a).

“(d) 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, with regard to any right, remedy, or procedure otherwise available under the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162, 119 Stat. 2960), 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 subsection 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;

“(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 Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Justice concerning legislation, implementation, and other issues relating to or affecting the housing provisions under this subtitle;

“(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and support to each appropriate agency regarding advancing housing protections and 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 made 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, wherein—

“(A) such corrective action plans shall be developed in partnership with national, State, or local programs focused on child or adult victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(B) such corrective action plans shall include provisions requiring covered housing providers to review and develop appropriate notices, procedures, and staff training to improve compliance with this subtitle, in partnership with national, state, or local programs focused on child or adult victims;

“(8) establish a formal reporting process to receive individual complaints concerning non-compliance with this subtitle;

“(9) coordinate the development of inter-agency guidelines to ensure that information concerning available dwelling units is forwarded to the Director by all covered housing providers for use by the Secretary in facilitating the emergency transfer process;

“(10) coordinate with HUD regional offices and officials at each appropriate agency the development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines regarding uniform timeframes 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, with regard to any right, remedy, or procedure otherwise available under the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162, 119 Stat. 2960), 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 subsection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

**“SEC. 41414. PROHIBITION ON RETALIATION.**

“(a) NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENT.—No covered housing provider 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 COERCION.—No covered housing provider shall coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with, or retaliate against, any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of the person having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of the person having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any rights or protections under this subtitle, including—

“(1) intimidating or threatening any person because that person is assisting or encouraging an individual entitled to claim the rights or protections under this subtitle; and

“(2) retaliating against any person because that person has participated in any investigation or action to enforce this subtitle.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Office for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity to enforce this section shall be the same as the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3610 et seq.).”

**SEC. 603. PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO REPORT CRIME FROM ONE'S HOME.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of subtitle N of title IV of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 41414 the following:

**“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, regulations, 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 funding pursuant to section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306).

“(e) **SUBGRANTEES.**—For those covered governmental entities that distribute funds to subgrantees, compliance with subsection (b)(1) includes inquiring about the existence of laws and 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.”.

(b) **SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE, ALTERNATIVE CRIME REDUCTION METHODS.**—

(1) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF BYRNE-JAG FUNDS.**—Section 501(a)(1) of subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding after subparagraph (H) the following:

“(I) Programs for the development and implementation of 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, on the basis of a request by the victim for law enforcement or emergency assistance; or (ii) imposes a penalty on such a victim because of criminal activity at the property in which the victim resides.”.

(2) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF COPS FUNDS.**—Section 1701(b) of part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (22), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (23), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; 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 (as such term is defined in section 501(a)(1)(I)).”.

(3) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES.**—Section 2101(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:

“(25) 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, on the basis of a request by the victim for law enforcement or emergency assistance; or (B) imposes a penalty on such a victim because of criminal activity at the property in which the victim resides.”.

**SEC. 604. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.**

Section 40299 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12351) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “the Director of the Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women”; and

(B) by inserting after “, other nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations” the following: “, population-specific organizations”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “5 percent” and inserting “8 percent”.

**SEC. 605. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.**

(a) **MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS.**—Section 423(a) of the McKinney-Vento

Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11383(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) **Facilitating and coordinating activities to ensure compliance with section 4141(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including, in consultation with the regional office (if applicable) of the appropriate agency (as such term is defined in section 4141 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994), development of external emergency transfer memoranda of understanding between covered housing providers, participating in the local Continuum of Care, facilitation of external emergency transfers between those covered housing providers participating in the local Continuum of Care, and monitoring compliance with the confidentiality protections of section 4141(c)(4) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 for reporting to that regional office.**”.

(b) **DEFINITION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND OTHER DANGEROUS OR LIFE-THREATENING CONDITIONS AMENDED.**—Section 103(b) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302(b)) is amended to read as follows:

(b) **DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND OTHER DANGEROUS OR LIFE-THREATENING CONDITIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary shall consider to be homeless any individual or family who—

“(1) is fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and who have no other residence and lack resources to obtain other permanent housing; or

“(2) is fleeing or attempting to flee a dangerous or life-threatening condition in the individual’s or family’s current housing situation, including where the health and safety of children are jeopardized and who have no other residence and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.”.

(c) **COLLABORATIVE GRANTS TO INCREASE THE LONG-TERM STABILITY OF VICTIMS.**—Section 41404(i) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12474(i)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

(d) **GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.**—Section 41405 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12475) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “the Director of the Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(D), by inserting after “linguistically and culturally specific service providers,” the following: “population-specific organizations.”; and

(3) in subsection (g), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting the following: “2020 through 2024”.

**SEC. 606. UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 AMENDMENTS.**

Section 5A(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c-1(d)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (13) to read as follows:

“(13) **DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **COPIES.**—A copy of—

“(i) all standardized notices issued pursuant to the housing protections under subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including the notice required under section 4141(d) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994;

“(ii) the emergency transfer plan issued pursuant to section 4141 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; and

“(iii) any and all memoranda of understanding with other covered housing providers developed to facilitate emergency transfers under section 4141(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

“(B) **DESCRIPTIONS.**—A description of—

“(i) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by an agency, either directly or in partnership with other service providers, to 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, to obtain or maintain housing;

“(iii) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by a public housing agency to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, or to enhance victim safety in assisted families; and

“(iv) all training and support services offered to staff of 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 of section 4141 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.”; and

(2) in paragraph (16), by inserting “the Violence Against Women Act of 1994,” before “the Fair Housing Act”.

**TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS**

**SEC. 701. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) Over 1 in 3 women experience sexual violence, and 1 in 5 women have survived completed or attempted rape. Such violence has a devastating impact on women’s physical and emotional health, financial security, and ability to maintain their jobs, and thus impacts interstate commerce and economic security.

(2) The Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice defines domestic violence as a pattern of abusive behavior in any relationship that is used by one intimate partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner. Domestic violence can include physical, sexual, emotional, economic, or psychological actions or threats of actions that influence another person. Domestic violence includes any behaviors that intimidate, manipulate, humiliate, isolate, frighten, terrorize, coerce, threaten, blame, hurt, injure, or wound an individual.

(3) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that domestic violence or intimate partner violence is a serious public health issue for millions of individuals in the United States. Nearly 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men in the United States have suffered sexual violence, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner.

(4) Homicide is one of the leading causes of death for women on the job. Domestic partners or relatives commit 43 percent of workplace homicides against women. One study found that intimate partner violence resulted in 142 homicides among women at work in the United States from 2003 to 2008, a figure which represents 22 percent of the 648 workplace homicides among women during the period. In fact, in 2010, homicides against women at work increased by 13 percent despite continuous declines in overall workplace homicides in recent years.

(5) Women in the United States are 11 times more likely to be murdered with guns than women in other high-income countries. Female intimate partners are more likely to be murdered with a firearm than all other means combined. The presence of a gun in domestic violence situations increases the risk of homicide for women by 500 percent.

(6) Violence can have a dramatic impact on the survivor of such violence. Studies indicate that 44 percent of surveyed employed adults experienced the effect of domestic violence in the workplace, and 64 percent indicated their workplace performance was affected by such violence. Another recent survey found that 78 percent of offenders used workplace resources to express anger, check up on, pressure, or threaten a survivor. Sexual assault, whether occurring in or out of the workplace, can impair an employee’s work performance, require time away from work, and undermine the employee’s ability to maintain a job. Nearly 50 percent of sexual assault survivors lose their jobs or are forced to quit in the aftermath of the assaults.



(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 access to housing, transportation, and child care. Ninety-two percent of homeless women have experienced domestic violence, and more than 50 percent of such women cite 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) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that survivors of severe intimate partner violence lose nearly 8,000,000 days of paid work, which is the equivalent of more than 32,000 full-time jobs and almost 5,600,000 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 \$4,100,000,000 in the 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 be underestimated because the costs 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 human resources professionals consider partner violence a workplace issue. However, more than 70 percent of United States workplaces have no formal program or policy that addresses workplace violence, let alone 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 often negatively impact a survivor's ability to maintain employment.

(12) Abusers frequently seek to exert financial control over their partners by actively interfering with their ability to work, including preventing their partners from going to work, harassing their partners at work, 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, mortgages, 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 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 screening and counseling for domestic violence, at no additional cost. In addition, it prohibits insurance companies from discrimi-

nating 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, counseling, 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 and 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, which restrains basic human rights to freedom and safety in the United States.

**SEC. 702. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.**

Section 41501 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12501) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “and sexual harassment” after “domestic and sexual violence”; and

(B) by striking “employers and labor organizations” and inserting “employers, labor organizations, and victim service providers”;

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “and stalking” and inserting “stalking, and sexual harassment”;

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting before the period at the end “or sexual harassment”;

(4) in subsection (c)(2)(A), by inserting “or sexual harassment” after “sexual violence”; and

(5) 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. 703. ENTITLEMENT TO UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF SEXUAL AND OTHER HARASSMENT AND SURVIVORS OF 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:

“(19) no person may be denied compensation under such State law solely on the basis of the individual having a voluntary separation from work if such separation is attributable to such individual being a victim of sexual or other harassment or a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and”.

(2) Section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SEXUAL OR OTHER HARASSMENT; ETC.—

“(1) DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(19), 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, 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 antiviolence counselor, a member of the clergy, or another professional, and

“(B) an attestation that such voluntary separation is attributable to such harassment, violence, assault, or stalking.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(A) The terms ‘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.”.

(b) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 303(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (12) as paragraphs (5) through (13), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) Such methods of administration as will ensure that—

“(i) applicants for unemployment compensation and individuals inquiring about such compensation are notified of the provisions of section 3304(a)(19) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(ii) claims reviewers and hearing personnel are trained in—

“(I) the nature and dynamics of sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(II) methods of ascertaining and keeping confidential information about possible experiences of sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to ensure that—

“(aa) requests for unemployment compensation based on separations stemming from sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking are identified and adjudicated; and

“(bb) confidentiality is provided for the individual's claim and submitted evidence.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) the terms ‘domestic violence’, ‘sexual assault’, and ‘stalking’ have the meanings given such terms in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 ;

“(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—

“(I) a person who has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(II) a person whose family or household member has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”.

(c) TANF PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) CERTIFICATION THAT THE STATE WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION TO SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL AND OTHER HARASSMENT, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A certification by the chief executive officer of the State that the State has established and is enforcing standards and procedures to—

“(i) ensure that applicants for assistance under the State program funded under this part

and individuals inquiring about such assistance are adequately notified of—

“(I) the provisions of section 3304(a)(19) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(II) assistance made available by the State to survivors of sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(ii) ensure that case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part are adequately trained in—

“(I) the nature and dynamics of sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(II) State standards and procedures relating to the prevention of, and assistance for individuals who are survivors of sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(III) methods of ascertaining and keeping confidential information about possible experiences of sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(iii) ensure that, if a State has elected to establish and enforce standards and procedures regarding the screening for, and identification of, domestic violence pursuant to paragraph (7)—

“(I) applicants for assistance under the State program funded under this part and individuals inquiring about such assistance are adequately notified of options available under such standards and procedures; and

“(II) case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part are provided with adequate training regarding such standards and procedures and options available under such standards and procedures; and

“(iv) ensure that the training required under subparagraphs (B) and, if applicable, (C)(ii) 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;

“(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—

“(I) a person who has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(II) a person whose family or household member has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”.

(d) SEXUAL AND OTHER HARASSMENT, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Labor (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) is authorized to award—

(A) a grant to a national victim service provider in order for such organization to—

(i) develop and disseminate a model training program (and related materials) for the training required under section 303(a)(4)(B) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (b), and under subparagraph (B) and, if applicable, subparagraph (C)(ii) of section 402(a)(8) of such Act, as added by subsection (c); and

(ii) provide technical assistance with respect to such model training program, including technical assistance to the temporary assistance for needy families program and unemployment compensation personnel; and

(B) grants to State, tribal, or local agencies in order for such agencies to contract with eligible entities to provide State, tribal, or local case workers and other State, tribal, or local agency personnel responsible for administering the temporary assistance for needy families program established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act in a State or Indian reservation

with the training required under subparagraph (B) and, if applicable, subparagraph (C)(ii) of such section 402(a)(8).

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the term “eligible entity” means an entity—

(A) that is—

(i) 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 program; or

(iii) an organization with demonstrated expertise in State or county welfare laws and implementation of such laws and experience with disseminating information on such laws and implementation, but only if such organization will provide the required training in partnership with an entity described in clause (i) or (ii); and

(B) that—

(i) has demonstrated expertise in the dynamics of both domestic violence and sexual assault, such as a joint domestic 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) in order to comply with the dual domestic violence and sexual assault expertise requirement under clause (i).

(3) APPLICATION.—An entity seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form and manner, and containing such information as the Secretary specifies.

(4) REPORTS.—

(A) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than a year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually 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.

(5) 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 FUNDS.—Each recipient of 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.

(C) 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).

(e) EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS, ETC.—

(1) MORE PROTECTIVE LAWS, AGREEMENTS, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law, collective bargaining agreement, or employment benefits program or plan that provides greater unemployment insurance benefits for survivors of sexual and other harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking than the rights established under this title.

(2) LESS PROTECTIVE LAWS, AGREEMENTS, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS.—Any law, collective bargaining agreement, or employment benefits program or plan of a State or unit of local government is preempted to the extent that such law, agreement, or program or plan would impair the exercise of any right established under this title or the amendments made by this title.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) UNEMPLOYMENT AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply in the case of compensation paid for weeks beginning on or after the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR STATE LAW AMENDMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in a case in which the Secretary of Labor identifies a State as requiring a change to its statutes, regulations, or policies in order to comply with the amendments made by this section, such amendments shall apply in the case of compensation paid for weeks beginning after the earlier of—

(I) the date the State changes its statutes, regulations, or policies in order to comply with such amendments; or

(II) the end of the first session of the State legislature which begins after the date of enactment of this Act or which began prior to such date and remained in session for at least 25 calendar days after such date, except that in no case shall such amendments apply before the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) SESSION DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term “session” means a regular, special, budget, or other session of a State legislature.

(2) TANF 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 for the plan 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. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a two-year legislative session, each year of the session is considered to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(g) 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 3304(g) 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) 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—

(A) any rights under this Act without compromising personal safety or the safety of others, including family members and excluding the abuser; and

(B) other components of economic security;

(2) identification of geographic areas with shortages in resources for such survivors, with an accompanying analysis of the extent and impact of such shortage;

(3) analysis of factors related to industries, workplace settings, employer practices, trends, and other elements that impact the ability of such survivors to exercise any rights under this Act without compromising personal safety or the safety of others, including family members;

(4) the recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor with respect to resources, oversight, and enforcement tools to ensure successful implementation of the provisions of this Act in order to support the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(5) best practices for States, employers, health carriers, insurers, and other private entities in addressing issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

**SEC. 705. GAO STUDY.**

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that examines, with respect to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are, or were, enrolled at institutions of higher education and borrowed a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) for which the survivors have not repaid the total interest and principal due, each of the following:

(1) The implications of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking on a borrower's ability to repay their Federal student loans.

(2) The adequacy of policies and procedures regarding Federal student loan deferment, forbearance, and grace periods when a survivor has to suspend or terminate the survivor's enrollment at an institution of higher education due to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(3) The adequacy of institutional policies and practices regarding retention or transfer of credits when a survivor has to suspend or terminate the survivor's enrollment at an institution of higher education due to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(4) The availability or any options for a survivor of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who attended an institution of higher education that committed unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts or practices, or otherwise substantially misrepresented information to students, to be able to seek a defense to repayment of the survivor's Federal student loan.

(5) The limitations faced by a survivor of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to obtain any relief or restitution on the survivor's Federal student loan debt due to the use of forced arbitration, gag orders, or bans on class actions.

**SEC. 706. EDUCATION AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS FOR SURVIVORS.**

(a) PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the grant recipient under section 41501 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 that establishes the national resource center on workplace

responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence) and the Attorney General (through the Principal Deputy Director of the Office on Violence Against Women), shall coordinate and provide for a national public outreach and education campaign to raise public awareness of the workplace impact of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including outreach and education for employers, service providers, teachers, and other key partners. This campaign shall pay special attention to ensure that survivors are made aware of the existence of the following types of workplace laws (federal and/or State): anti-discrimination laws that bar treating survivors differently; leave laws, both paid and unpaid that are available for use by survivors; unemployment insurance laws and policies that address survivor eligibility.

(2) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, as described in paragraph (1), may disseminate information through the public outreach and education campaign on the resources and rights referred to in this subsection directly or through arrangements with health agencies, professional and nonprofit organizations, consumer groups, labor organizations, institutions of higher education, clinics, the media, and Federal, State, and local agencies.

(3) INFORMATION.—The information disseminated under paragraph (2) shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(A) the resources and rights that are—

(i) available to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(ii) established in this Act and the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C.12291 et seq.);

(B) guidelines and best practices on prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault;

(C) resources that promote healthy relationships and communication skills;

(D) resources that encourage bystander intervention in a situation involving domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault;

(E) resources that promote workplace policies that support and help maintain the economic security of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(F) resources and rights that the heads of Federal agencies described in paragraph (2) determine are appropriate to include.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMPLOYEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “employee” means any individual employed by an employer. In the case of an individual employed by a public agency, such term means an individual employed 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, for a fixed time period, on a temporary basis, pursuant to a detail, or as a participant in a work assignment as a condition of receipt of Federal or State income-based public assistance.

(2) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer”—

(A) means any person engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce who employs 15 or more individuals; and

(B) includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, and includes a public agency that employs individuals as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, but does not include any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer) or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(3) FLSA TERMS.—The terms “employ” and “State” have the meanings given the terms in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

(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 employees who experience 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.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

**SEC. 707. SEVERABILITY.**

If any provision of this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provisions or amendments to any person or circumstance shall not be affected.

**TITLE VIII—HOMICIDE REDUCTION INITIATIVES**

**SEC. 801. PROHIBITING PERSONS CONVICTED OF MISDEMEANOR CRIMES AGAINST DATING PARTNERS AND PERSONS SUBJECT TO PROTECTION ORDERS.**

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (32), by striking all that follows after “The term ‘intimate partner’” and inserting the following: “—

“(A) means, with respect to a person, the spouse of the person, a former spouse of the person, an individual who is a parent of a child of the person, and an individual who cohabitates or has cohabited with the person; and

“(B) includes—

“(i) a dating partner or former dating partner (as defined in section 2266); and

“(ii) any other person similarly situated to a spouse who is protected by the domestic or family violence laws of the State or tribal jurisdiction in which the injury occurred or where the victim resides.”;

(2) in paragraph (33)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting after “Federal, State,” the following: “municipal,”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “intimate partner,” after “spouse,” each place it appears;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (34) and (35) as paragraphs (35) and (36) respectively; and

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

“(34)(A) The term ‘misdemeanor crime of stalking’ means an offense that—

“(i) is a misdemeanor crime of stalking under Federal, State, Tribal, or municipal law; and

“(ii) is a course of harassment, intimidation, or surveillance of another person that—

“(I) places that person in reasonable fear of material harm to the health or safety of—

“(aa) that person;

“(bb) an immediate family member (as defined in section 115) of that person;

“(cc) a household member of that person; or

“(dd) a spouse or intimate partner of that person; or

“(II) causes, attempts to cause, or would reasonably be expected to cause emotional distress to a person described in item (aa), (bb), (cc), or (dd) of subclause (I).

“(B) A person shall not be considered to have been convicted of such an offense for purposes of this chapter, unless—

“(i) the person was represented by counsel in the case, or knowingly and intelligently waived the right to counsel in the case; and

“(ii) in the case of a prosecution for an offense described in this paragraph for which a person was entitled to a jury trial in the jurisdiction in which the case was tried, either—

“(I) the case was tried by a jury; or

“(II) the person knowingly and intelligently waived the right to have the case tried by a jury, by guilty plea or otherwise.

“(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. 802. PROHIBITING STALKERS AND INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO COURT ORDER FROM POSSESSING 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)(8);”;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(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) in any event within a reasonable time after the order is issued, sufficient to protect the due process rights of the person;

“(B) that restrains such person from—

“(i) harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner of such person or child of such intimate partner or person, or engaging in other conduct that would place an intimate partner in reasonable fear of bodily injury to the partner or child; 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 “; or”; 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 84.3 percent, have experienced violence in their lifetime.

(3) The vast majority of Native victims—96% of women and 89% of male victims—report being victimized by a non-Indian.

(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 Native stalking victims are nearly 4 times as likely to be stalked by someone of a different race.

(5) While tribes exercising jurisdiction over non-Indians have reported significant successes, the inability to prosecute crimes related to the Special Domestic Violence Criminal Jurisdiction crimes continues to leave Tribes unable to fully hold domestic violence offenders accountable.

(6) Tribal prosecutors report that the majority of domestic violence cases involve children either as witnesses or victims, and Department of Justice reports that American Indian and Alaska Native children suffer exposure to violence at rates higher than any other race in the United States.

(7) Childhood exposure to violence has immediate and long-term effects, including: increased rates of altered neurological development, poor physical and mental health, poor school performance, substance abuse, and overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system.

(8) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, homicide is the third leading cause of death among American Indian and Alaska Native women between 10 and 24 years of age and the fifth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age.

(9) On some reservations, Indian women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average.

(10) According to a 2010 Government Accountability Office report, United States Attorneys declined to prosecute nearly 52 percent of violent crimes that occur in Indian country.

(11) Investigation into cases of missing and murdered Indian women is made difficult for tribal law enforcement agencies due to a lack of resources, such as—

(A) necessary training, equipment, or funding;

(B) a lack of interagency cooperation; and

(C) a lack of appropriate laws in place.

(12) Domestic violence calls are among the most dangerous calls that law enforcement receives.

(13) The complicated jurisdictional scheme that exists in Indian country—

(A) has a significant negative impact on the ability to provide public safety to Indian communities;

(B) has been increasingly exploited by criminals; and

(C) requires a high degree of commitment and cooperation among tribal, Federal, and State law enforcement officials.

(14) Restoring and enhancing local, tribal capacity to address violence against women provides for greater local control, safety, accountability, and transparency.

(15) In States with restrictive land settlement acts such as Alaska, “Indian country” is limited, resources for local tribal responses either nonexistent or insufficient to meet the needs, jurisdiction unnecessarily complicated and increases the already high levels of victimization of American Indian and Alaska Native women. According to the Tribal Law and Order Act Commission Report, Alaska Native women are over-represented in the domestic violence victim population by 250 percent; they comprise 19 percent of the State population, but are 47 percent of reported rape victims. And among other Indian Tribes, Alaska Native women suffer the highest rates of domestic and sexual violence in the country.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to clarify the responsibilities of Federal, State, tribal, and local governments with respect to responding to cases of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, trafficking, sexual violence, crimes against children, and assault against tribal law enforcement officers and murdered Indians;

(2) to increase coordination and communication among Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(3) to empower tribal governments with the resources and information necessary to effectively respond to cases of domestic violence, dating vi-

olence, stalking, sex trafficking, sexual violence, and missing and murdered Indians; and

(4) to increase the collection of data related to missing and murdered Indians and the sharing of information among Federal, State, and tribal officials responsible for responding to and investigating cases of missing and murdered Indians.

**SEC. 902. AUTHORIZING FUNDING FOR THE TRIBAL ACCESS PROGRAM.**

Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024, to remain available until expended, for the purposes of enhancing the ability of tribal government entities to access, enter information into, and obtain information from, Federal criminal information databases, as authorized by this section.”.

**SEC. 903. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL VIOLENCE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER.**

Section 204 of Public Law 90–284 (25 U.S.C. 1304) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE” and inserting “CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL VIOLENCE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER”;

(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 redesignating 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 a person; or

“(II) benefitting, financially or by receiving anything of value, from participation in a venture that has engaged in an act described in subclause (I); and

“(ii) carried out with the knowledge, or, except where 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

“(II) the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph, the terms ‘coercion’ and ‘commercial sex act’ have the meanings given the terms in section 1591(e) of title 18, United States Code.

“(9) SEXUAL VIOLENCE.—The term ‘sexual violence’ means any nonconsensual sexual act or

contact proscribed by the criminal law of the Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs, including in any case in which the victim lacks the capacity to consent to the act.”;

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (6) and (7);

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4);

(F) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated), to read as follows:

“(3) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term ‘domestic violence’ means violence—

“(A) committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or intimate partner, or by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic- or family- violence laws of an Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violence occurs; or

“(B) committed against a victim who is a child under the age of 18, or an elder (as such term is defined by tribal law) who resides or has resided in the same household as the defendant.”;

(G) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as redesignated), the following:

“(1) ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OR CORRECTIONAL OFFICER.—The term ‘assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer’ means any criminal violation of the law of the Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs that involves the threatened, attempted, or actual harmful or offensive touching of a law enforcement or correctional officer.”;

(H) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as redesignated), the following:

“(5) OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.—The term ‘obstruction of justice’ means any violation of the criminal law of the Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs, and the violation involves interfering with the administration or due process of the tribe’s laws including any tribal criminal proceeding or investigation of a crime.”;

(5) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting after “the powers of self-government of a participating tribe” the following: “, including any participating tribes in the State of Maine,”

(6) in subsection (b)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting after “over an alleged offense” the following: “, other than obstruction of justice or an act of assault of a law enforcement or corrections officer,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “;”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) is being prosecuted for a crime of sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, obstructing justice, or assaulting a police or corrections officer under the laws of the prosecuting tribe.”;

(7) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “domestic violence” and inserting “tribal”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AND DATING VIOLENCE” and inserting “, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL VIOLENCE, STALKING, SEX TRAFFICKING, OR ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER”; and

(ii) by striking “or dating violence” and inserting “, dating violence, obstruction of justice, sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, or assault of a law enforcement or corrections officer”;

(8) in subsection (d), by striking “domestic violence” each place it appears and inserting “tribal”;

(9) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “special domestic violence” each place it appears and inserting “special tribal”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “prosecutes” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: “prosecutes—

“(A) a crime of domestic violence;

“(B) a crime of dating violence;

“(C) a criminal violation of a protection order;

“(D) a crime of sexual violence;

“(E) a crime of stalking;

“(F) a crime of sex trafficking;

“(G) a crime of obstruction of justice; or

“(H) a crime of assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer.”;

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting “sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, obstruction of justice, assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer,” after “dating violence,”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) to create a pilot project to allow up to five Indian tribes in Alaska to implement special tribal criminal jurisdiction.”;

(10) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively;

(11) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) INDIAN COUNTRY DEFINED.—For purposes of the pilot project described in subsection (f)(5), the definition of ‘Indian country’ shall include 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.”.

(12) in subsection (i) (as redesignated) by striking “fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “fiscal years 2020 through 2024”.

**SEC. 904. ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**

Beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this title, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly prepare and submit a report, to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, that—

(1) includes known statistics on missing and murdered Indian women in the United States, including statistics relating to incidents of sexual abuse or sexual assault suffered by the victims; and

(2) provides recommendations regarding how to improve data collection on missing and murdered Indian women.

**TITLE X—OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**SEC. 1001. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2002 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10442) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “a Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “an Office on Violence Against Women”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting after “within the Department of Justice” the following: “, not subsumed by any other office”;

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title VI of Public Law 103–322) and the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Division B of Public Law 106–386)” and inserting “Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title VII 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), and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

(b) DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2003 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10443) is amended to read as follows:

**“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 a 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, for 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, agency, or institution 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) VACANCY.—In the case of a vacancy, the President may designate an officer or employee who shall act as Director during the vacancy.

“(d) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at a rate of pay not to exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.”.

(c) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2004 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10444) is amended to read as follows:

**“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, committees, or commissions 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.

“(5) Carrying out the functions of the Department of Justice 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), and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, including with respect to those functions—

“(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, 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 policy, 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.

“(7) Exercising such other powers and functions as may be vested in the Director pursuant to this subchapter or by delegation of the Attorney General.

“(8) Establishing such rules, regulations, guidelines, and procedures as are necessary to carry out any function of the Office.”

(d) **STAFF OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.**—Section 2005 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10445) is amended in the heading, by striking “**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OFFICE**” and inserting “**OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**”.

(e) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—Section 121(a)(1) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20124(a)(1)) is amended by striking “the Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “the Office on Violence Against Women”.

#### **TITLE XI—IMPROVING CONDITIONS FOR WOMEN IN FEDERAL CUSTODY**

##### **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) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### **“§4051. Treatment of primary caretaker parents and other individuals**

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—  
“(1) the term ‘correctional officer’ means a correctional officer of the Bureau of Prisons;

“(2) the term ‘covered institution’ means a Federal penal or correctional institution;

“(3) the term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Bureau of Prisons;

“(4) the term ‘post-partum recovery’ means the first 8-week period of post-partum recovery after giving birth;

“(5) the term ‘primary caretaker parent’ has the meaning given the term in section 31903 of the Family Unity Demonstration Project Act (34 U.S.C. 12242);

“(6) the term ‘prisoner’ means an individual who is incarcerated in a Federal penal or correctional institution, including a vulnerable person; and

“(7) the term ‘vulnerable person’ means an individual who—

“(A) is under 21 years of age or over 60 years of age;

“(B) is pregnant;

“(C) identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex;

“(D) is victim or witness of a crime;

“(E) has filed a nonfrivolous civil rights claim in Federal or State court;

“(F) has a serious mental or physical illness or disability; or

“(G) during the period of incarceration, has been determined to have experienced or to be experiencing severe trauma or to be the victim of gender-based violence—

“(i) by any court or administrative judicial proceeding;

“(ii) by any corrections official;

“(iii) by the individual’s attorney or legal service provider; or

“(iv) by the individual.

“(b) **GEOGRAPHIC PLACEMENT.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.**—The Director shall establish within the Bureau of Prisons an

office that determines the placement of prisoners.

“(2) **PLACEMENT OF PRISONERS.**—In determining the placement of a prisoner, the office established under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) if the prisoner has children, place the prisoner as close to the children as possible;

“(B) in deciding whether to assign a transgender or intersex prisoner to a facility for male or female prisoners, and in making other housing and programming assignments, consider on a case-by-case basis whether a placement would ensure the prisoner’s health and safety, including serious consideration of the prisoner’s own views with respect to their safety, and whether the placement would present management or security problems; and

“(C) consider any other factor that the office determines to be appropriate.

“(c) **PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT OF PREGNANT PRISONERS OR PRISONERS IN POST-PARTUM RECOVERY IN SEGREGATED HOUSING UNITS.**—

“(1) **PLACEMENT IN SEGREGATED HOUSING UNITS.**—A covered institution may not place a prisoner who is pregnant or in post-partum recovery in a segregated housing unit unless the prisoner presents an immediate risk of harm to the prisoner or others.

“(2) **RESTRICTIONS.**—Any placement of a prisoner described in subparagraph (A) in a segregated housing unit shall be limited and temporary.

“(d) **PARENTING CLASSES.**—The Director shall provide parenting classes to each prisoner who is a primary caretaker parent.

“(e) **TRAUMA SCREENING.**—The Director shall provide training to each correctional officer and each employee of the Bureau of Prisons who regularly interacts with prisoners, including each instructor and health care professional, to enable those correctional officers and employees to—

“(1) identify a prisoner who has a mental or physical health need relating to trauma the prisoner has experienced; and

“(2) refer a prisoner described in paragraph (1) to the proper healthcare professional for treatment.

“(f) **INMATE HEALTH.**—

“(1) **HEALTH CARE ACCESS.**—The Director shall ensure that all prisoners receive adequate health care.

“(2) **HYGIENIC PRODUCTS.**—The Director shall make essential hygienic products, including shampoo, toothpaste, toothbrushes, and any other hygienic product that the Director determines appropriate, available without charge to prisoners.

“(3) **GYNECOLOGIST ACCESS.**—The Director shall ensure that all prisoners have access to a gynecologist as appropriate.

“(g) **USE OF SEX-APPROPRIATE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS.**—

“(1) **REGULATIONS.**—The Director shall make rules under which—

“(A) a correctional officer may not conduct a strip search of a prisoner of the opposite sex unless—

“(i) the prisoner presents a risk of immediate harm to the prisoner or others, and no other correctional officer of the same sex as the prisoner, or medical staff is available to assist; or

“(ii) the prisoner has previously requested that an officer of a different sex conduct searches;

“(B) a correctional officer may not enter a restroom reserved for prisoners of the opposite sex unless—

“(i) a prisoner in the restroom presents a risk of immediate harm to themselves or others; or

“(ii) there is a medical emergency in the restroom and no other correctional officer of the appropriate sex is available to assist;

“(C) a transgender prisoner’s sex is determined according to the sex with which they identify; and

“(D) a correctional officer may not search or physically examine a prisoner for the sole pur-

pose of determining the prisoner’s genital status or sex.

“(2) **RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to affect the requirements under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15601 et seq.).”

(c) **SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.**—Section 3621(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) **ELIGIBILITY OF PRIMARY CARETAKER PARENTS AND PREGNANT WOMEN.**—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may not prohibit an eligible prisoner who is a primary caretaker parent (as defined in section 4051) or pregnant from participating in a program of residential substance abuse treatment provided under paragraph (1) on the basis of a failure by the eligible prisoner, before being committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, to disclose to any official of the Bureau of Prisons that the prisoner had a substance abuse problem on or before the date on which the eligible prisoner was committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.”

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years 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.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year 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.

(e) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“4051. Treatment of primary caretaker parents and other individuals.”

##### **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 the 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”) in accordance with this section to permit women incarcerated in Federal prisons and the children born to such women during incarceration to reside together while the inmate serves a term of imprisonment in a separate housing wing of the prison.

(c) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are to—

(1) prevent infant mortality among infants born to incarcerated mothers and greatly reduce the trauma and stress experienced by the unborn fetuses of pregnant inmates;

(2) reduce the recidivism rates of federally incarcerated women and mothers, and enhance public safety by improving the effectiveness of the Federal prison system for women as a population with special needs;

(3) establish female offender risk and needs assessment as the cornerstones of a more effective and efficient Federal prison system;

(4) implement a validated post-sentencing risk and needs assessment system that relies on dynamic risk factors to provide Federal prison officials with a roadmap to address the pre- and post-natal needs of Federal pregnant offenders, manage limited resources, and enhance public safety;

(5) perform regular outcome evaluations of the effectiveness of programs and interventions for federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers to assure that such programs and interventions are evidence-based and to suggest changes, deletions, and expansions based on the results of such evaluations; and

(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.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out this section in consultation with—

(A) 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 (3)—

(A) develop an offender risk and needs assessment system particularly 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 subsection (c);

(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;

(ii) the best available 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 dynamic 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;

(iii) the most effective and efficient uses of such tools in conjunction with recidivism reduction programs, productive activities, incentives, and rewards; and

(iv) 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) on a biennial basis, review the system developed under subparagraph (A) and the recommendations developed under subparagraph (B), using the research conducted under subparagraph (C), to determine whether any revisions or updates should be made, and if so, make such revisions or updates;

(E) hold periodic meetings with the individuals listed in paragraph (1) at intervals to be determined by the Director; and

(F) report to Congress in accordance with subsection (i).

(3) METHODS.—In carrying out the duties under paragraph (2), the Director shall—

(A) consult relevant stakeholders; and

(B) make decisions using data that is based on the best available statistical and empirical evidence.

(e) ELIGIBILITY.—An inmate may apply to participate in the Program if the inmate—

(1) is pregnant at the beginning of or during the term of imprisonment; and

(2) is in the custody or control of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

(f) PROGRAM TERMS.—

(1) TERM OF PARTICIPATION.—To correspond with the purposes and goals of the Program to promote bonding during the critical stages of child development, an eligible inmate selected for the Program may participate in the Program, subject to subsection (g), until the earliest of—

(A) the date that the inmate's term of imprisonment terminates;

(B) 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

(C) 30 months.

(2) INMATE REQUIREMENTS.—For the duration of an inmate's participation in the Program, the inmate shall agree to—

(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, as appropriate;

(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 actions to prevent detachment or disruption of either an inmate's or infant's health and bonding-based well-being due to termination of the Program.

(h) REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the 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) FINAL 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 A FIREARM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 108. NOTIFICATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF PROHIBITED PURCHASE OF A FIREARM.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a background check conducted by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System pursuant to the request of a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer of firearms (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 from which the licensee contacted the system and the law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction over the location of the resi-

dence 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.”.

(b) 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 925A 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 would violate subsection (g)(8), (g)(9), or (g)(10) of section 922 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) of the specific provision of law that would have been violated;

“(C) of the date and time the notice was provided;

“(D) of the location where the firearm was sought to be acquired; and

“(E) of the identity of the person; and

“(2) report the incident to local or tribal law enforcement authorities and, where practicable, State, tribal, or 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 report is 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 543 of title 28, qualified State, tribal, territorial and local prosecutors and qualified attorneys working for the United States government to serve as special assistant United States attorneys for the

purpose of prosecuting violations of such paragraphs;

“(2) deputize State, tribal, territorial 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) establish, in order to receive and expedite requests for assistance from State, tribal, territorial and local law enforcement agencies responding to intimate partner violence cases where such 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(g) 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 an attorney, that the attorney is a licensed attorney in good standing with any relevant licensing authority.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925B the following:

“925C. Special assistant U.S. attorneys and cross-deputized attorneys.”.

### 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) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following: “**or by any person acting under color of law**”;

(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 Federal law enforcement officer, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘sexual act’ has the meaning given the term in section 2246.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In a prosecution under subsection (c), it is not a defense that the other individual consented to the sexual act.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 2246 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given the term in section 115.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by amending the item related to section 2243 to read as follows:

“2243. Sexual abuse of a minor or ward or by any person acting under color of law.”.

#### SEC. 1303. INCENTIVES FOR STATES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Attorney General is authorized to make grants to States that have in effect a law that—

(1) makes it a criminal offense for any person acting under color of law of the State to engage 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 shall submit to 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 while acting under color of law during the previous year; and

(2) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported during the previous year.

(c) APPLICATION.—A State seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, including information about the law described in subsection (a).

(d) GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant to a State under this section shall be in an amount that is not greater than 10 percent of the average of the total amount of funding of the 3 most recent awards that the State received under the following grant programs:

(1) Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10411 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the “STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program”);

(2) Section 41601 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511) (commonly referred to as the “Sexual Assault Services Program”);

(e) GRANT TERM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide an increase in the amount provided to a State under the grant programs described in subsection (d) for a 2-year period.

(2) RENEWAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section may submit an application for a renewal of such grant at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(3) LIMIT.—A State may not receive a grant under this section for more than 4 years.

(f) USES OF FUNDS.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall use—

(1) 25 percent of such funds for any of the permissible uses of funds under the grant program described in paragraph (1) of subsection (d); and

(2) 75 percent of such funds for any of the permissible uses of funds under the grant program described in paragraph (2) of subsection (d).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

(h) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “State” means each of the several States and the District of Columbia, Indian Tribes, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

#### SEC. 1304. 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 while acting 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 2243(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 2, committed during the 1-year period covered by the report.

#### SEC. 1305. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term “sexual act” has the meaning given the term in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code.

### TITLE XIV—OTHER MATTERS

#### SEC. 1401. NATIONAL STALKER AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REDUCTION.

Section 40603 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12402) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

#### SEC. 1402. FEDERAL VICTIM ASSISTANTS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 40114 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 40114. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL VICTIM’S COUNSELORS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Attorneys for the purpose of appointing victim/witness counselors for the prosecution of sex crimes and domestic violence crimes where applicable (such as the District of Columbia), \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

#### SEC. 1403. CHILD ABUSE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR JUDICIAL PERSONNEL AND PRACTITIONERS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 224(a) of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20334(a)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

#### SEC. 1404. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT.

Section 40152(c) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12311(c)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

#### SEC. 1405. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM.

Section 219(a) of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20324(a)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

#### SEC. 1406. RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

Section 2(j) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

#### SEC. 1407. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM PROGRAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(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



report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES

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 114, 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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 House Judiciary 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.

There was no objection.

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 now 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.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 25, line 15, insert “(a) IN GENERAL—” before “Section 1201”.

Page 26, after line 12, insert the following:

(b) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall 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 (34 U.S.C. 20121), including an accounting of the amount saved, if any, on housing, medical, or employment social welfare programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to study the return on investment of legal services for survivors of domestic violence.

As a former legal services board member and director of a pro bono program, I know the importance of legal representation for the most vulnerable members of our community.

Access to justice is especially critical when it comes to survivors of domestic violence and human trafficking. Too often, survivors are left to navigate the overwhelming fallout of abuse alone, whether that means seeking custody, housing, medical care, employment protections, or other legal assistance.

In the aftermath of abuse, legal remedies are often complicated and hard to manage, and legal representation in these critical moments can make a life-changing difference. Sometimes that means a lawyer who can remove the abuser from the home so the survivor doesn't lose their housing; other times, it is an attorney helping a survivor access the medical resources to heal from physical and mental injuries.

Access to justice remains a crucial issue in our legal system, and one of the key contributions of VAWA is that it recognizes the importance of legal services for the survivors of abuse. So not only does VAWA provide critical medical and housing services, but it provides legal representation that often saves public dollars.

As with many social services, upfront investment in legal services can result in long-term benefits and savings. That is why my amendment would ask the GAO to conduct a study about the economic benefits of investments in legal services provided under the jurisdiction of VAWA.

It is important that we have a full grasp of the importance of these investments so that my colleagues and I can continue pushing for robust investment in these critical legal resources. I 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 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 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 gentlewoman 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 whenever victims receive assistance by legal professionals. This amendment would provide a vehicle to help us assess the effectiveness 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.

□ 1530

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-

ing on the topic to be addressed, and the facility, data shall be collected from Bureau of Prisons personnel and a sample that is representative of the population of incarcerated women. The report shall include:

(1) With regard to federal facilities wherein women are incarcerated—

(A) responses by such women to questions from the Adverse Childhood Experience (ACES) questionnaire;

(B) demographic data of such women, including sexual orientation and gender identity;

(C) responses by such women to questions about the extent of exposure to sexual victimization, sexual violence and domestic violence (both inside and outside of incarceration);

(D) the number of such women were pregnant at the time that they entered incarceration;

(E) the number of such women who have children age 18 or under, and if so, how many; and

(F) the crimes for which such women are incarcerated and the length of their sentence.

(2) With regard to all federal facilities where persons are incarcerated—

(A) a list of best practices with respect to women's incarceration and transition, including staff led programs, services and management practices (including making sanitary products readily available and easily accessible, and access to and provision of healthcare);

(B) the availability of trauma treatment at each facility (including number of beds, and number of trained staff);

(C) rates of serious mental illness broken down by gender and security level and a list of residential programs available by site; and

(D) the availability of vocational education and a list of vocational programs provided by each facility.

**SEC. 1104. REENTRY PLANNING AND SERVICES FOR INCARCERATED WOMEN.**

The Attorney General, in coordination with the Chief of U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services and the Director of the Bureau of Prisons (including Women and Special Population Branch), shall collaborate 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. In developing the model, the Chief and the Director shall consult with such experts within the federal government (including the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice) and in the victim service provider community (including sexual and domestic violence and homelessness, job training and job placement service providers) as are necessary to the completion of a comprehensive plan. Issues addressed should include—

(1) the development by the Bureau of Prisons of a contract for gender collaborative services; and

(2) identification by re-entry affairs coordinators and responsive planning for the needs of re-entering women with respect to—

(A) housing, including risk of homelessness;

(B) previous exposure to and risk for domestic and sexual violence; and

(C) the need for parenting classes, assistance securing childcare, or assistance in seeking or securing jobs that afford flexibility (as might be necessary in the re-entry, parenting or other contexts).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I thank Representatives BASS and FITZPATRICK and Chairman NADLER for their work on this bill, which will provide critical support to women.

My amendment has two components to help ensure our work reaches women in every corner of society.

The first requires an annual report on the status of women in Federal incarceration. According to the Federal Bureau of Prisons, women account for approximately 7 percent of the Federal inmate population. As of March 28, the U.S. had 180,181 Federal inmates. This means that the number of female prisoners in America is about 12,613.

Women in prison face unique challenges. For example, they are more likely to have their children taken away from them while they are incarcerated, more likely to have trouble accessing basic hygiene products, and more likely to suffer from mental health problems.

A report done by the Center for American Progress found that 75 percent of incarcerated women suffer from substance abuse problems, while 68 percent experienced physical or sexual abuse at some point in their lives.

This commonsense amendment would compile more comprehensive, badly needed data to help us better understand the needs of incarcerated women and help us deliver the services they need.

The report on women would include data points such as sexual orientation and gender identity, exposure to sexual and domestic violence, whether the woman was pregnant at the time of her incarceration, and length of sentence. The report would also collect data on all Federal facilities where women are incarcerated to determine best practices and the availability of trauma treatment.

This information can then be used by Congress to develop policies that would better serve women and their families.

The second component of my amendment directs the Attorney General, in coordination with the Chief of U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services and the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, to collaborate on reentry planning and services for incarcerated women, including the development of a national standard on domestic and sexual violence prevention.

Reentry and planning services are vital because reentering society is a difficult process for many and represents a critical point of transition that may help solidify rehabilitation or may, if poorly managed, pose new risk to success.

This is especially the case for women because of the unique circumstances I mentioned previously. Many are caretakers for their children, victims of abuse, and have addiction issues.

For example, finding a place to live is especially difficult. Formerly incarcerated individuals are nearly 10 times

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 women with children.

When developing reentry plans and services, the Department of Justice officials are required to address gender-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.

There was no objection.

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 direct the 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 vitally important data, for oversight purposes.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. ESCOBAR. 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. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Ms. DEAN. 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 16, after line 2, insert the following:

**SEC. 4. AGENCY AND DEPARTMENT COORDINATION.**

The heads of Executive Departments responsible for carrying out this Act are authorized to coordinate and collaborate on the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including sharing best practices and efficient use of resources and technology for victims and those seeking assistance from the Government.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer this amendment to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

My amendment allows for cross-agency coordination to collaborate on the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and for the agencies to share best practices for victims.

This will allow for greater efficiency and transparency, and most importantly, it will allow for the sharing of best practices and information that could help survivors of domestic violence.

With every reauthorization of VAWA since 1994, we have enhanced its protections, preserved its accomplishments, and removed its shortcomings, including adding protections for the elderly and the disabled, expanding sexual assault and stalking provisions, and fighting housing discrimination.

These reauthorizations of VAWA have allowed us to come together to work collaboratively to combat domestic violence. Similarly, my amendment asks the agencies to work cohesively together and coordinate to accomplish a common goal: to protect survivors and their families, and to end violence against women.

As we know, domestic violence plagues all communities across this country and all the districts that we represent. In my home State of Pennsylvania, the problem is no different. In the last 10 years, more than 1,600 people have died as a result of domestic

violence, including people of all demographics. Domestic violence has affected the lives of thousands of Pennsylvanians. Sadly, just in 2017, two of my constituents in Montgomery County lost their lives to domestic violence.

That is why it is so imperative that we reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, because we know, since its inception, the rate of violence has decreased by a remarkable 63 percent.

We have the opportunity to come together once again and pass this bipartisan VAWA reauthorization with new and better provisions, including expanding protections for young victims, survivors without shelters, and LGBTQ people; preventing intimate partner homicides by prohibiting those convicted of dating violence from possessing firearms; and protecting the Office on Violence Against Women to ensure survivors of domestic violence have access to the much-needed resources they deserve.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Violence Against Women Act, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up against domestic violence, support this amendment, and vote to reauthorize this vital piece of legislation.

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, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment, which is being sponsored by my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, VAWA, responds to our Nation's crisis of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. VAWA expired in September of last year, and it is long past time for Congress to reauthorize this legislation.

Representative DEAN's amendment will increase interagency cooperation efforts to prevent violence and provide critical services to survivors. No one solution can stop every act of violence, but this amendment recognizes that more coordination among agencies over best practices, resources, and technology will lead to better results for those in need of urgent assistance.

As survivors transition out of crisis, they need access to housing, healthcare, and other vital resources to rebuild their lives. In my home district, organizations like Turning Point of Lehigh Valley assist survivors of abuse and their families. This amendment and VAWA overall will enable

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:

(4) by adding at the end 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.

□ 1545

Maybe she or he is 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 in jail. This 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 and 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 not opposed to 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. JACKSON LEE), 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(j)” 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 reauthorizes 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.

This 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 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 reporting requirements 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 criminal cases, the demand for DNA testing continues to grow nationwide. Crime laboratories now process more DNA than ever before. In recognition of this, H.R. 1585 reauthorizes the Debbie Smith Act, which I helped to originate.

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 good one, 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 at 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 use a victim-centered, trauma-informed interview technique, which means asking questions of a student or a campus employee who is reported to be a victim of sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking, in a manner that is focused on the experience of the reported victim, that does not judge or blame the reported victim for the alleged crime, and that is informed by evidence-based re-

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. 1585, the Violence Against Women 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 access safe housing. 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 came forward are still too often disregarded, disgraced, 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. 1585 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. The employee would be 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 reports of 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 discredit those who 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 Chairman, I do claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I understand the gentlewoman's concern here, and I appreciate that concern.

A bigger concern I have here is concerning the trend of handling responsibilities on campus and giving those—in a criminal matter and putting them into campus personnel rather than law enforcement. My concern is that these are crimes and they need to be treated as crimes.

We need to do everything we possibly can to treat those victims and give them as much support and help as we possibly can, but I don't want to give in to the implication that this should be treated as anything other than a crime, and law enforcement personnel should be involved in all stages.

I have seen a concerning trend across the country in trying to treat these differently or even adding in a layer of investigation. This needs to be treated as a crime.

I understand the gentlewoman's concern here, and expanding this grant program could result from others in reducing resources that are available for prosecution. So I understand the gentlewoman's concern. I just would oppose this for those reasons and no more than that.

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 they 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.

□ 1600

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 mistreats 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 that.

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:

“(g) 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 village 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 committed.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JOHNSON OF TEXAS

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 Clerk 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, and the covered housing provider shall grant such application if—

Page 60, line 24, strike “internal emergency transfer” and insert “internal transfer”.

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 transfer”.

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 15, strike “emergency”.

Page 63, line 18, strike “emergency”.

Page 69, 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”.

Page 80, line 21, strike “external emergency transfer” and insert “external transfer”.

Page 80, line 24, strike “external emergency transfer” and insert “external transfer”.

Page 84, line 6, strike “paraph” and insert “paragraph”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, 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 home 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 safety, security, 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 engrossing, 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 the housing 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 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. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

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; and

Page 35, lines 22 through 23, strike “and stalking” and insert “stalking, and sex trafficking”.

Page 36, line 8, insert “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 Congresswoman WAGNER 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 Congresswoman 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 social services or foster care when they ran.

From 2007 to 2017, the National Human Trafficking Hotline has received 34,700 sex trafficking cases inside the United States; and, in 2017, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children indicated that children continue in 2017, again, to be sex trafficked. The International Labor Organization, again, estimates that there are 4.8 million people trapped in forced sexual exploitation.

□ 1615

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 answers the concerns of so many.

I am glad that this amendment will ensure that the Creating Hope through Outreach, Options, Service, and Education for Children and Youth program, the CHOOSE Children and Youth program, can 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 services and which draws attention to groups like CHOOSE Children and Youth (Creating Hope through Outreach, Options, Service and Education for Children and Youth) for educating and preventing sex trafficking.

Madam Chair, while we live in the richest, most powerful country in the history of the world, in our nation we still see the prevalence of sex trafficking.

It is important that as we do this work before us today, we emphasize that sex trafficking is also a form of violence against women and children.

The Congress—this body—must work to ensure that services for sex trafficking victims are available.

The Wagner/Jackson Lee/Maloney Amendment addresses the gap in services in our state for young women who are risk and who are struggling to restart their lives.

Crime, and especially crimes falling within the umbrella of offenses addressed in VAWA are unconscionable and intolerable in a civilized society.

We must ensure that once these individuals have been victimized, we do all we can to help them heal and recover.

This Jackson Lee/Wagner/Maloney Amendment works towards that end.

I ask all members to support the Wagner/Jackson Lee/Maloney Amendment and I ask thank the gentlelady from Missouri for her work.

#### NOTES ON SEX TRAFFICKING

#### SEX TRAFFICKING IS AN EXTENSION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The International Labor Organization estimates that there are 40.3 million victims of human trafficking globally.

81 percent of them are trapped in forced labor.

25 percent of them are children.

75 percent are women and girls.

The International Labor Organization estimates that forced labor and human trafficking is a \$150 billion industry worldwide.

The U.S. Department of Labor has identified 148 goods from 75 countries made by forced and child labor.

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 social services or foster care when they ran.

There is no official estimate of the total number of human trafficking victims in the U.S. Estimates indicate that the total number of victims nationally reaches into the hundreds of thousands when estimates of both adults and minors and sex trafficking and labor trafficking are aggregated.

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.

Mrs. 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 chairing 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, dating violence, sexual assault, 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 will be heard. More 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.

Human 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 we do.

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 Acting CHAIR. 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 (C)(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: “(E) 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 eligible 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. 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 meant to empower.

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.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for his leadership and for his support of this amendment, and I encourage all 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:

“(B)(i) committed against a victim who is a child under the age of 18, or an elder (as such term is defined by tribal law), including when an offender recklessly engages in conduct that creates a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury to the victim, or committed as described in subparagraph (A) while the child or elder is present; and

“(ii) the child or elder—

“(I) resides or has resided in the same household as the offender;

“(II) is related to the offender by blood or marriage;

“(III) is related to another victim of the offender by blood or marriage;

“(IV) is under the care of a victim of the offender who is an intimate partner or former spouse; or

“(V) is under the care of a victim of the offender who is similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic- or family-violence laws of an Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violence occurs.”.

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 or witnessed by a

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 child 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 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. 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 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 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 134, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 135, line 18, and insert the following:

(9) by striking subsections (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following:

“(f) GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENT TO TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—

“(1) REIMBURSEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General is authorized to reimburse tribal government authorities for expenses incurred in exercising special tribal criminal jurisdiction.

“(B) ELIGIBLE EXPENSES.—Eligible expenses for reimbursement shall include—

“(i) expenses incurred to arrest or prosecute offenders and to detain inmates (including costs associated with providing health care);

“(ii) expenses related to indigent defense services; and

“(iii) costs associated with probation and rehabilitation services.

“(C) PROCEDURE.—Reimbursements authorized pursuant to this section shall be in accordance with rules promulgated by the Attorney General after consultation with Indian tribes and within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. The rules promulgated by the Department shall set a maximum allowable reimbursement to any tribal government in a one year period.

“(2) GRANTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to the governments of Indian tribes (or to authorized designees of those governments)—

“(A) to strengthen tribal criminal justice systems to assist Indian tribes in exercising special tribal criminal jurisdiction, including—

“(i) law enforcement (including the capacity of law enforcement, court personnel, or other non-law enforcement entities that have no Federal or State arrest authority agencies but have been designated by a tribe as responsible for maintaining public safety within its territorial jurisdiction, to enter information into and obtain information from national crime information databases);

“(ii) prosecution;

“(iii) trial and appellate courts (including facilities construction);

“(iv) probation systems;

“(v) detention and correctional facilities (including facilities construction);

“(vi) alternative rehabilitation centers;

“(vii) culturally appropriate services and assistance for victims and their families; and

“(viii) criminal codes and rules of criminal procedure, appellate procedure, and evidence;

“(B) to provide indigent criminal defendants with the effective assistance of licensed defense counsel, at no cost to the defendant, in criminal proceedings in which a participating tribe prosecutes—

“(i) a crime of domestic violence;

“(ii) a crime of dating violence;

“(iii) a criminal violation of a protection order;

“(iv) a crime of sexual violence;

“(v) a crime of stalking;

“(vi) a crime of sex trafficking;

“(vii) a crime of obstruction of justice; or

“(viii) a crime of assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer;

“(C) to ensure that, in criminal proceedings in which a participating tribe exercises special tribal criminal jurisdiction, jurors are summoned, selected, and instructed in a manner consistent with all applicable requirements;

“(D) to accord victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, obstruction of justice, assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer, and violations of protection orders rights that are similar to the rights of a crime victim described in section 3771(a) of title 18, consistent with tribal law and custom; and

“(E) to create a pilot project to allow up to five Indian tribes in Alaska to implement special tribal criminal jurisdiction.

“(g) INDIAN COUNTRY DEFINED.—For purposes of the pilot project described in subsection (f)(2)(E), the definition of ‘Indian country’ shall include 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.

“(h) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement and not supplant any other Federal, State, tribal, or local government amounts made available to carry out activities described in this section.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024 to carry out subsection (f) and to provide training, technical assistance, data collection, and evaluation of the criminal justice systems of participating tribes.

“(j) USE OF FUNDS.—Not less than 25 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under this section in a given year shall be used for each of the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (f), with remaining funds available to be distributed for either of the purposes described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (f), or any combination of such purposes, depending on need and in consultation with Indian tribes.”.

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.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified in the form that I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to Amendment No. 13 Offered by Mr. GRIJALVA:

The amendment is modified to read as follows:

Page 134, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 135, line 18, and insert the following:

(9) by striking subsections (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following:

“(f) GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENT TO TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—

“(1) REIMBURSEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General is authorized to reimburse tribal government authorities for expenses incurred in exercising special tribal criminal jurisdiction.

“(B) ELIGIBLE EXPENSES.—Eligible expenses for reimbursement shall include—

“(i) expenses incurred to arrest or prosecute offenders and to detain inmates (including costs associated with providing health care);

“(ii) expenses related to indigent defense services; and

“(iii) costs associated with probation and rehabilitation services.

“(C) PROCEDURE.—Reimbursements authorized pursuant to this section shall be in accordance with rules promulgated by the Attorney General after consultation with Indian tribes and within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. The rules promulgated by the Department shall set a

maximum allowable reimbursement to any tribal government in a one year period.

“(2) GRANTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to the governments of Indian tribes (or to authorized designees of those governments)—

“(A) to strengthen tribal criminal justice systems to assist Indian tribes in exercising special tribal criminal jurisdiction, including—

“(i) law enforcement (including the capacity of law enforcement, court personnel, or other non-law enforcement entities that have no Federal or State arrest authority agencies but have been designated by a tribe as responsible for maintaining public safety within its territorial jurisdiction, to enter information into and obtain information from national crime information databases);

“(ii) prosecution;

“(iii) trial and appellate courts (including facilities construction);

“(iv) probation systems;

“(v) detention and correctional facilities (including facilities construction);

“(vi) alternative rehabilitation centers;

“(vii) culturally appropriate services and assistance for victims and their families; and

“(viii) criminal codes and rules of criminal procedure, appellate procedure, and evidence;

“(B) to provide indigent criminal defendants with the effective assistance of licensed defense counsel, at no cost to the defendant, in criminal proceedings in which a participating tribe prosecutes—

“(i) a crime of domestic violence;

“(ii) a crime of dating violence;

“(iii) a criminal violation of a protection order;

“(iv) a crime of sexual violence;

“(v) a crime of stalking;

“(vi) a crime of sex trafficking;

“(vii) a crime of obstruction of justice; or

“(viii) a crime of assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer;

“(C) to ensure that, in criminal proceedings in which a participating tribe exercises special tribal criminal jurisdiction, jurors are summoned, selected, and instructed in a manner consistent with all applicable requirements;

“(D) to accord victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, obstruction of justice, assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer, and violations of protection orders rights that are similar to the rights of a crime victim described in section 3771(a) of title 18, consistent with tribal law and custom; and

“(E) to create a pilot project to allow up to five Indian tribes in Alaska to implement special tribal criminal jurisdiction.

“(g) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement and not supplant any other Federal, State, tribal, or local government amounts made available to carry out activities described in this section.

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024 to carry out subsection (f) and to provide training, technical assistance, data collection, and evaluation of the criminal justice systems of participating tribes.

“(i) USE OF FUNDS.—Not less than 25 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under this section in a given year shall be used for each of the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (f), with remaining funds available to be distributed for either of the purposes described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (f), or any combination of such purposes, depending on need and in consultation with Indian tribes.”.

Mr. GRIJALVA (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the modification be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, the underlying bill will provide a historic extension of Tribal jurisdiction and ensure that more Native people receive the proper legal protections against people who commit violence toward them.

Unfortunately, during the historic passage of the 2013 Violence Against Women reauthorization, the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe quickly realized the cost of implementing this important provision was pricey. Cost concerns about implementing Tribal jurisdiction are generally related to incarceration, healthcare, and jury selection.

Further, a National Congress of American Indians report found that there are multiple implementation costs related to incarceration, healthcare, code development, law enforcement, and prosecutors. This hinders some Tribes from implementing the most important provisions related to the Violence Against Women Act.

Unlike States, Tribes do not have the ability to tax for the costs related to implementing these important provisions that protect its people.

With the support of Representative KILDEE, who represents the area of the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, the amendment I am offering will help alleviate the costs Tribes will incur due to the expanded criminal jurisdiction provision.

This amendment would authorize the Department of Justice to reimburse Tribes that incur costs related to arrest, indigent defense services, and rehabilitation services.

Further, this amendment provides language allowing DOJ to award grants to improve their law enforcement, detention and correctional facilities, culturally appropriate services, and criminal code development.

I urge my colleagues to protect Indian Country from violence and support this amendment that will ease the costs incurred by Tribes for implementing this historic bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although at this point 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. 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.

□ 1630

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I do think it is interesting, for a sovereign government, the expansion should come out of the funds here is the only concern I would have on this, but other than that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mr. EMMER. 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 32, after line 24, insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SECTION 205. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON TRAUMA-INFORMED TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.**

Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“Subtitle Q—Trauma-informed Training for Law Enforcement**

**“SEC. 41701. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON TRAUMA-INFORMED TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘Attorney General’ means the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women;

“(2) the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual who interfaces with victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including—

“(A) an individual working for or on behalf of an eligible entity;

“(B) a school or university administrator; and

“(C) an emergency services or medical employee;

“(3) the term ‘demonstration site’, with respect to an eligible entity that receives a grant under this section, means—

“(A) if the eligible entity is a law enforcement agency described in paragraph (4)(A), the area over which the eligible entity has jurisdiction; and

“(B) if the eligible entity is an organization or agency described in paragraph (4)(B), the area over which a law enforcement agency described in paragraph (4)(A) that is working in collaboration with the eligible entity has jurisdiction; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State, local, territorial, or Tribal law enforcement agency; or

“(B) a national, regional, or local victim services organization or agency working in collaboration with a law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall award grants on a competitive basis to

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 designed to—

“(A) prevent re-traumatization of the victim;

“(B) ensure that covered individuals use evidence-based 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) investigative 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) the community being served; and

“(F) developing an understanding of how to define, identify, and correctly classify a re-

port 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, print materials, 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 employed by a training 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 and focus groups on 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 require each eligible entity that receives a grant under this section to identify a research partner, preferably a local research partner, to—

“(1) design a system for generating and collecting the appropriate data to facilitate an independent process or impact evaluation of the use of the grant funds;

“(2) periodically conduct an evaluation described in paragraph (1); and

“(3) periodically make publicly available, during the grant period—

“(A) preliminary results of the evaluations conducted under paragraph (2); and

“(B) recommendations for improving the use of the grant funds.

“(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 Violence Against Women 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 crimes, 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 of rape, but I know her as 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 sensitive 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 victims of sexual violence in trauma-informed techniques focused on preventing retraumatization of the victim, improving communication and rapport between victims and law enforcement, as well as collaboration between the different entities that assist a victim of sexual violence.

Sexual assault is a crime, and it is vital for law enforcement to have accurate and complete information to prosecute it. For Abby and for the thousands of victims who experience trauma, 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 Committee 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 enforcement community on this important legislation.

A good first step to holding those accountable 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 amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, I am very proud 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 violence and sexual assault.

Unfortunately, as you well know, despite 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 techniques 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 survivor, but it is also to make sure that law enforcement can hold perpetrators accountable.

I am particularly moved by the courage and the determination of Abby Honold, the namesake of this amendment, and many, 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 courageous. 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 justice, and today, her work has resulted in this amendment to ensure that others 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 colleagues will support this amendment to the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, traditionally a bipartisan act in this Chamber.

When Congress passed VAWA 25 years ago, it was a landmark achievement that sent a very clear message to people living in abusive or violent situations that we saw them, that we would stand with them. With each reauthorization, we continue to expand critical protections and make improvements 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 assault, 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 colleagues support this amendment on behalf 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 continue to operate in a bipartisan fashion in this Chamber to pass not only this amendment, but the full reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

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 follows:

Page 171, insert after line 2, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 1408. REVIEW ON LINK BETWEEN SUBSTANCE USE AND VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.**

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 assault, 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 Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today to offer this straightforward, commonsense amendment that does not affect direct spending or revenues.

My amendment requires the Secretary of HHS to complete a review of the relationship between survival of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and the likelihood of developing a substance use disorder.

This information is vital because we know traumatic experiences such as domestic violence are associated with behavioral health conditions; we know that behavioral health conditions are associated with substance use disorders; 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 exists, we have yet to conduct a comprehensive review of the data to make the connection.

It is important to understand the nature and impact of trauma to effectively 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 survivors 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 use disorders, we can begin the 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.

□ 1645

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 traf-

ficking, 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. I urge my colleagues, both 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 gentlewoman from Oklahoma (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 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. 16 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), 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 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.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish an interagency working group (in this section referred to as the "Working Group") to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts.

(b) COMPOSITION.—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.

(c) DUTIES.—The Working Group shall consider the following:

(1) What activity constitutes different acts of sexual violence.

(2) Whether reports that use the same terms for acts of sexual violence are collecting the same data on these acts.

(3) Whether the context which led to an act of sexual violence should impact how that act is accounted for in reports.

(4) 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.

(5) Steps that agencies that compile reports relating to sexual violence can take to avoid double counting incidents of sexual violence.

(d) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Working Group shall publish and submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The activities of the Working Group.  
 (2) Recommendations to harmonize Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence.

(3) Actions Federal agencies can take to implement the recommendations described in paragraph (2).

(4) Recommendations for congressional action to implement the recommendations described in paragraph (2).

(e) TERMINATION.—The Working Group shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the report is submitted pursuant to subsection (d).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HARMONIZE.—The term “harmonize” includes efforts to coordinate sexual violence data collection to produce complementary information, as appropriate, without compromising programmatic needs.

(2) SEXUAL VIOLENCE.—The term “sexual violence” includes an unwanted sexual act (including both contact and non-contact) about which the Federal Government collects information.

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. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of Congresswoman KUSTER’s bipartisan amendment that calls on key Federal agencies to harmonize their sexual violence surveys and reporting systems.

This amendment was inspired by a Government Accountability Office study that found Federal agencies engaged in collecting data on sexual violence are using different terminology for the same types of sex crimes, and these crimes are being categorized in dissimilar ways.

As one example, an act some Federal surveys identified as rape is considered “nonconsensual sex acts” or “sexual coercion” in others.

For another survey, attempted non-consensual sex acts are not specifically included in the definition of “non-consensual sex acts” in the survey, even though they are counted in overarching measurement of this behavior.

These surveys and reporting systems are important, but their ambiguities and inconsistencies are very problematic and need to be corrected.

Ms. KUSTER’s amendment requires four Federal agencies that conduct eight critical sexual violence surveys to form a working group to help improve coordination and develop clearer sexual violence terminology and categorization. This working group will then complete a report identifying the internal steps and congressional action that can be taken to address this issue.

I know Ms. KUSTER is proud that this amendment is bipartisan, and she has asked me to extend her thanks to our colleagues, Representatives TURNER, SPEIER, MORELLE, and RASKIN, for joining her to introduce it for consideration within this landmark legislation

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 categorization, 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, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Ms. MENG. 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. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–32 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. JEFFRIES of New York.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. SCANLON 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 will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 363, noes 67, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

AYES—363

|                 |                 |                 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Adams           | DeGette         | Kaptur          |
| Aderholt        | DeLauro         | Katko           |
| Aguilar         | DelBene         | Keating         |
| Allred          | Delgado         | Kelly (IL)      |
| Amodei          | Demings         | Kennedy         |
| Armstrong       | DeSaulnier      | Khanna          |
| Arrington       | Deutch          | Kildee          |
| Axne            | Diaz-Balart     | Kilmer          |
| Bacon           | Dingell         | Kim             |
| Balderson       | Doggett         | Kind            |
| Barragan        | Doyle, Michael  | King (NY)       |
| Bass            | F.              | Kinzinger       |
| Beatty          | Duffy           | Kirkpatrick     |
| Bera            | Dunn            | Krishnamoorthi  |
| Bergman         | Emmer           | Kuster (NH)     |
| Beyer           | Engel           | Kustoff (TN)    |
| Billirakis      | Escobar         | LaHood          |
| Bishop (GA)     | Eshoo           | LaMalfa         |
| Blumenauer      | Espallat        | Lamb            |
| Blunt Rochester | Evans           | Lamborn         |
| Bonamici        | Finkenauer      | Langevin        |
| Bost            | Fitzpatrick     | Larsen (WA)     |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Fleischmann     | Larson (CT)     |
| F.              | Fletcher        | Latta           |
| Brady           | Flores          | Lawrence        |
| Brindisi        | Fortenberry     | Lawson (FL)     |
| Brooks (IN)     | Foster          | Lee (CA)        |
| Brown (MD)      | Foxx (NC)       | Lee (NV)        |
| Brownley (CA)   | Frankel         | Levin (CA)      |
| Buchanan        | Fudge           | Levin (MI)      |
| Buck            | Fulcher         | Lewis           |
| Bucshon         | Gabbard         | Lieu, Ted       |
| Bustos          | Gallagher       | Lipinski        |
| Butterfield     | Gallego         | Loeb sack       |
| Byrne           | Garamendi       | Lofgren         |
| Calvert         | Garcia (IL)     | Long            |
| Carbajal        | Garcia (TX)     | Lowenthal       |
| Cárdenas        | Gianforte       | Lowe y          |
| Carson (IN)     | Gibbs           | Lucas           |
| Carter (GA)     | Golden          | Luetkemeyer     |
| Cartwright      | Gomez           | Luján           |
| Case            | Gonzalez (OH)   | Luria           |
| Casten (IL)     | Gonzalez (TX)   | Lynch           |
| Castor (FL)     | González-Colón  | Malinowski      |
| Castro (TX)     | (PR)            | Maloney         |
| Chu, Judy       | Gottheimer      | Carolyn B.      |
| Cicilline       | Graves (MO)     | Maloney, Sean   |
| Cisneros        | Green (TX)      | Marchant        |
| Clark (MA)      | Griffith        | Marshall        |
| Clarke (NY)     | Grijalva        | Mast            |
| Clay            | Guest           | Matsui          |
| Cleaver         | Guthrie         | McAdams         |
| Clyburn         | Haaland         | McBath          |
| Cohen           | Hagedorn        | McCarthy        |
| Cole            | Harder (CA)     | McCaul          |
| Collins (GA)    | Hartzler        | McCollum        |
| Collins (NY)    | Hastings        | McGovern        |
| Comer           | Hayes           | McHenry         |
| Conaway         | Heck            | McNerney        |
| Connolly        | Herrera Beutler | Meeks           |
| Cook            | Higgins (LA)    | Meng            |
| Cooper          | Higgins (NY)    | Mitchell        |
| Correa          | Hill (AR)       | Moolenaar       |
| Costa           | Hill (CA)       | Moore           |
| Courtney        | Himes           | Morelle         |
| Cox (CA)        | Hollingsworth   | Moulton         |
| Craig           | Horn, Kendra S. | Mucarsel-Powell |
| Crawford        | Horsford        | Mullin          |
| Crenshaw        | Houlahan        | Murphy          |
| Crist           | Hoyer           | Nadler          |
| Crow            | Hudson          | Napolitano      |
| Cuellar         | Huffman         | Neal            |
| Cummings        | Huizenga        | Neguse          |
| Cunningham      | Hurd (TX)       | Newhouse        |
| Curtis          | Jackson Lee     | Norcross        |
| Dauids (KS)     | Jayapal         | Norton          |
| Davidson (OH)   | Jeffries        | Nunes           |
| Davis (CA)      | Johnson (GA)    | O’Halleran      |
| Davis, Danny K. | Johnson (LA)    | Ocasio-Cortez   |
| Davis, Rodney   | Johnson (OH)    | Olson           |
| Dean            | Johnson (TX)    | Omar            |
| DeFazio         | Joyce (OH)      | Pallone         |

Palmer  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Plaskett  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Riggelman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Sablan  
San Nicolas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff

Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Spano  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Stevens  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Young

Tipton  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Turner  
Underwood  
Upton  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Young

## NOES—67

Abraham  
Allen  
Amash  
Babin  
Baird  
Banks  
Barr  
Biggs  
Bishop (UT)  
Brooks (AL)  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
DesJarlais  
Duncan  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Gaetz

Gohmert  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Green (TN)  
Grothman  
Harris  
Hern, Kevin  
Hice (GA)  
Hunter  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
Lesko  
Loudermilk  
Massie  
McClintock  
McKinley

Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mooney (WV)  
Norman  
Palazzo  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Rose, John W.  
Roy  
Scalise  
Scott, Austin  
Steube  
Walker  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wright  
Yoho  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—7

Holding  
McEachin  
Payne

Radewagen  
Rooney (FL)  
Rutherford

Ryan

□ 1723

Mr. GOODEN, Mrs. MILLER, Messrs. GAETZ, JOHNSON of South Dakota, CLINE, BUDD, JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, GROTHMAN, ABRAHAM, and LOUDERMILK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PALMER, REED, TIPTON, HIGGINS of Louisiana, MAST, and MCHENRY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Chair, I was inadvertently detained during roll call No. 147. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 147.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) 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

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 394, noes 36, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

## AYES—394

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Craig  
Crawford  
Allred  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Axne  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Barr  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady  
Brindisi  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cloud  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa

Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Curtis  
Davids (KS)  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Davis, Rodney  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duffy  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Estes  
Evans  
Ferguson  
Finkenauer  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fletcher  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox (NC)  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Fulcher  
Gabbard  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Gianforte  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gonzalez (TX)  
González-Colón  
(PR)  
Gooden  
Gottheimer  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TX)  
Griffith  
Grijalva

Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Haaland  
Hagedorn  
Harder (CA)  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Heck  
Hern, Kevin  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill (AR)  
Hill (CA)  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hurd (TX)  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson (TX)  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamb  
Lamborn  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Long

Loudermilk  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney.  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meeks  
Meng  
Meuser  
Miller  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Mullin  
Murphy  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newhouse  
Norcross  
Norman  
Norton  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Olson  
Omar  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Phillips

Pingree  
Plaskett  
Pocan  
Porter  
Posey  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Riggelman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose (NY)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouda  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Sablan  
San Nicolas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Spano

Speier  
Stanton  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Stevens  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons

Stanton  
Turner  
Underwood  
Upton  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Young

## NOES—36

Amash  
Babin  
Banks  
Biggs  
Brooks (AL)  
Buck  
Cline  
Duncan  
Gaetz  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goldin

Gosar  
Graves (GA)  
Green (TN)  
Harris  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hunter  
Jordan  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Lesko  
Massie

Mast  
McClintock  
Mitchell  
Palazzo  
Ratcliffe  
Roy  
Steube  
Weber (TX)  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—7

Bishop (UT)  
McEachin  
Payne

Radewagen  
Rooney (FL)  
Rutherford

Ryan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1729

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) 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

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 258, noes 173, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

AYES—258

- Adams Fortenberry McAdams
Aguilar Foster McBath
Allred Frankel McCollum
Axne Fudge McGovern
Bacon Gabbard McNeerney
Barragan Gallego Meeks
Bass Garamendi Meng
Beatty Garcia (IL) Moore
Bera Garcia (TX) Morelle
Beyer Gianforte Moulton
Bishop (GA) Golden Mucarsel-Powell
Blumenauer Gomez Mullin
Blunt Rochester Gonzalez (OH) Murphy
Bonamici Gonzalez (TX) Nadler
Boyle, Brendan Gottheimer Napolitano
F. Green (TX) Neal
Brindisi Grijalva Neguse
Brown (MD) Haaland Norcross
Brownley (CA) Harder (CA) Norton
Bustos Hastings O'Halleran
Butterfield Hayes Ocasio-Cortez
Carbajal Heck Omar
Cardenas Higgins (NY) Pallone
Carson (IN) Hill (CA) Panetta
Cartwright Himes Pappas
Case Horn, Kendra S. Pascrell
Casten (IL) Horsford Perlmutter
Castor (FL) Houlihan Peters
Castro (TX) Hoyer Peterson
Chu, Judy Huffman Phillips
Cicilline Hurd (TX) Pingree
Cisneros Jackson Lee Plaskett
Clark (MA) Jayapal Pocan
Clarke (NY) Jeffries Porter
Clay Johnson (GA) Pressley
Cleaver Johnson (TX) Price (NC)
Clyburn Joyce (OH) Quigley
Cohen Kaptur Baskin
Collins (NY) Katko Reed
Connolly Keating Rice (NY)
Cooper Kelly (IL) Richmond
Correa Kennedy Rose (NY)
Costa Khanna Rouda
Courtney Kildee Roybal-Allard
Cox (CA) Kilmer Ruiz
Craig Kim Ruppertsberger
Crist Kind Rush
Crow King (NY) Sablan
Cuellar Kirkpatrick San Nicolas
Cummings Krishnamoorthi Sanchez
Cunningham Kuster (NH) Sarbanes
Davids (KS) Lamb Scanlon
Davis (CA) Langevin Schakowsky
Davis, Danny K. Larsen (WA) Schiff
Davis, Rodney Larson (CT) Schneider
Dean Lawrence Schrader
DeFazio Lawson (FL) Schrier
DeGette Lee (CA) Scott (VA)
DeLauro Lee (NV) Scott, David
DelBene Levin (CA) Serrano
Delgado Levin (MI) Sewell (AL)
Demings Lewis Shalala
DeSaulnier Lieu, Ted Sherman
Deutch Lipinski Sherrill
Dingell Loeb sack Simpson
Doggett Lofgren Sires
Doyle, Michael Lowenthal Slotkin
F. Lowey Smith (MO)
Engel Lujan Smith (WA)
Escobar Luria Soto
Eshoo Lynch Spanberger
Espallat Malinowski Speier
Evans Maloney, Stanton
Finkenauer Carolyn B. Stauber
Fitzpatrick Maloney, Sean Stefanik
Fletcher Matsui Steil

- Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

NOES—173

- Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderston
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Burgess
Hunter
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gibbs

NOT VOTING—6

- McEachin
Payne
Radewagen
Rooney (FL)
Rutherford
Ryan

- Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

- Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggelman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Witman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 429, noes 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

AYES—429

- Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderston
Banks
Barr
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Cooper
Correa
Crijalva
Cox (CA)
Guest
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1735

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.

|                 |               |                |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Lipinski        | Perry         | Spano          |
| Loebsock        | Peters        | Speier         |
| Lofgren         | Peterson      | Stanton        |
| Long            | Phillips      | Stauber        |
| Loudermilk      | Pingree       | Stefanik       |
| Lowenthal       | Plaskett      | Steil          |
| Lowey           | Pocan         | Steube         |
| Lucas           | Porter        | Stevens        |
| Luetkemeyer     | Posey         | Stewart        |
| Luján           | Pressley      | Stivers        |
| Luria           | Price (NY)    | Suozi          |
| Lynch           | Price (NC)    | Swalwell (CA)  |
| Malinowski      | Quigley       | Takano         |
| Maloney         | Raskin        | Taylor         |
| Carolyn B.      | Ratchliffe    | Thompson (CA)  |
| Maloney, Sean   | Reed          | Thompson (MS)  |
| Marchant        | Reschenthaler | Thompson (PA)  |
| Marshall        | Rice (NY)     | Thornberry     |
| Massie          | Rice (SC)     | Timmons        |
| Mast            | Richmond      | Tipton         |
| Matsui          | Riggleman     | Titus          |
| McAdams         | Roby          | Tlaib          |
| McBath          | Rodgers (WA)  | Tonko          |
| McCarthy        | Roe, David P. | Torres (CA)    |
| McCaul          | Rogers (AL)   | Torres Small   |
| McClintock      | Rogers (KY)   | (NM)           |
| McCollum        | Rose (NY)     | Trahan         |
| McGovern        | Rose, John W. | Trone          |
| McHenry         | Rouda         | Turner         |
| McKinley        | Rouzer        | Underwood      |
| McNerney        | Roy           | Upton          |
| Meadows         | Roybal-Allard | Van Drew       |
| Meeks           | Ruiz          | Vargas         |
| Meng            | Ruppersberger | Veasey         |
| Meuser          | Rush          | Vela           |
| Miller          | Sablan        | Velázquez      |
| Mitchell        | San Nicolas   | Visclosky      |
| Moolenaar       | Sánchez       | Wagner         |
| Mooney (WV)     | Sarbanes      | Walberg        |
| Moore           | Scalise       | Walden         |
| Morelle         | Scanlon       | Walker         |
| Moulton         | Schakowsky    | Walorski       |
| Mucarsel-Powell | Schiff        | Waltz          |
| Mullin          | Schneider     | Wasserman      |
| Murphy          | Schrader      | Schultz        |
| Nadler          | Schrier       | Waters         |
| Napolitano      | Schweikert    | Watkins        |
| Neal            | Scott (VA)    | Watson Coleman |
| Neguse          | Scott, Austin | Weber (TX)     |
| Newhouse        | Scott, David  | Webster (FL)   |
| Norcross        | Sensenbrenner | Welch          |
| Norman          | Serrano       | Wenstrup       |
| Norton          | Sewell (AL)   | Westerman      |
| Nunes           | Shalala       | Wexton         |
| O'Halleran      | Sherman       | Wild           |
| Ocasio-Cortez   | Sherrill      | Williams       |
| Olson           | Shimkus       | Wilson (FL)    |
| Omar            | Simpson       | Wilson (SC)    |
| Palazzo         | Sires         | Wittman        |
| Pallone         | Slotkin       | Womack         |
| Palmer          | Smith (MO)    | Woodall        |
| Panetta         | Smith (NE)    | Wright         |
| Pappas          | Smith (NJ)    | Yarmuth        |
| Pascrell        | Smith (WA)    | Yoho           |
| Pence           | Smucker       | Young          |
| Perlmutter      | Soto          | Zeldin         |
|                 | Spanberger    |                |

## NOT VOTING—8

|             |             |            |
|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Courtney    | Payne       | Rutherford |
| Larson (CT) | Radewagen   | Ryan       |
| McEachin    | Rooney (FL) |            |

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1743

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MALINOWSKI).  
It is now in order to consider amend-  
ment No. 17 printed in part B of House  
Report 116-32.

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 fol-  
lows:

Page 145, line 19, insert after “parent” the  
following: “, and such classes shall be made  
available to prisoners with limited English

proficiency in compliance with Title VI of  
the Civil Rights Act of 1964”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to  
House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman  
from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Mem-  
ber opposed each will control 5 min-  
utes.

The Chair recognizes the gentle-  
woman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, my amend-  
ment would ensure that incarcerated,  
pregnant prisoners who are primary  
caretaker parents and who have lim-  
ited English proficiency will have ac-  
cess 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 popu-  
lation of incarcerated individuals in  
our country.

Our Nation has 4 percent of the  
world’s female population, but 30 per-  
cent of its female incarcerated popu-  
lation.

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 pub-  
lished 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  
points, my amendment ensures that  
parenting classes be accessible to those  
incarcerated women with limited  
English proficiency.

The Bureau of Prisons already pro-  
vides certain parenting classes for  
pregnant incarcerated individuals.  
They include the Mother and Infants  
Nursing Together, MINT, program; and  
the Residential Parenting Program.

The MINT program teaches parenting  
skills to facilitate mother-child bond-  
ing and provides the tools to help build  
a stable home environment upon re-  
lease.

The Residential Parenting Program  
at the Washington State Department  
of Corrections allows Bureau of Prison  
incarcerated women and their infants to  
participate in the program.

Studies show that these programs are  
significant for incarcerated females  
and their families, as they can play im-  
portant roles in successful reentry into  
society.

Under my amendment, all pregnant  
incarcerated women or incarcerated  
moms will be able to better provide for  
their children no matter what language  
they speak.

The BOP’s incarcerated female popu-  
lation is incredibly diverse, with many  
ethnicities and many foreign countries  
represented, but no one should be de-  
nied the chance to be the best parent  
they can be simply because they are  
non-English speaking.

Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend  
Congresswoman KAREN BASS as well as

Congressman FITZPATRICK for their  
leadership in shepherding this land-  
mark legislation.

The 2019 reauthorization of the Vi-  
olence Against Women Act responds to  
our Nation’s crisis of domestic vio-  
lence, dating violence, sexual assault,  
and stalking.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for my  
amendment, and I reserve the balance  
of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair-  
man, I rise in opposition to the amend-  
ment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is  
recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I  
am not necessarily opposed to the goal  
of the amendment. In fact, I under-  
stand the amendment. I appreciate the  
gentlewoman bringing it.

I have supported similar programs in  
the FIRST STEP Act. The thing here is  
that this amendment is not necessary  
because, in the underlying bill, it al-  
ready provides for parenting classes  
and resources.

I appreciate the gentlewoman bring-  
ing it. I don’t necessarily have a prob-  
lem with it, except it is already there.  
So, offering this amendment is fine,  
but I just, at this point, would just say  
it is already there.

I have supported similar programs  
before. I appreciate the gentlewoman’s  
concern in this, and we would agree on  
that.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, we just  
want to make sure that no one is de-  
nied the chance to bond with their  
newborn or child simply because they  
don’t speak the language.

This amendment ensures compliance  
with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of  
1964, which prohibits discrimination on  
the basis of race, color, and national  
origin in programs and activities re-  
ceiving Federal financial assistance.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair-  
man, again, understanding the con-  
cerns, all this is already, frankly, cov-  
ered. It is covered in the underlying  
bill, but it is also covered in other pro-  
grams.

In going through some of these—and  
I know we have got a couple more—in  
some of these amendments, anything  
that takes funding away that would go  
from regular programs would be of con-  
cern, but I am happy to work with my  
colleagues to address these issues in  
other areas. I just don’t think VAWA,  
probably, is the best way, but I appre-  
ciate the gentlewoman’s concern.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is  
on the amendment offered by the gen-  
tlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).  
The amendment was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order  
to consider amendment No. 18 printed  
in part B of House Report 116-32.

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 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 U.S., but they account for 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. Participating mothers can enroll in pre- and postnatal classes on childbirth, parenting, and coping skills. This program offers the chance for mothers to acquire parenting skills and bond with their infant after birth.

The Residential Parenting Program offered by the Washington State Department of Corrections’ Residential Parenting Program gives its participants and their infants the opportunity to reside in the minimum security unit for up to 30 months after birth.

Mr. Chair, these programs are important resources to pregnant mothers and parents who are incarcerated. In fact, participants of the MINT program

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 in institutions designed to house 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 number-of-years period, not a single-year period.

When we were doing the FIRST STEP Act and doing some of the incar-

ceration 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.

There are other places we could work on this, and I think criminal justice reform is a great place to put this. I do commend the gentlewoman for bringing it.

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, and 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, and 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 correction staff in women's facilities still often fail to receive trauma-informed and gender-responsive training, let 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. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. 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 (Ms. MENG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed 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 41601 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 "; and".

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, while holding thousands of 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 needs to adequately assist and protect women and children of the Virgin Islands and other 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 Council 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

from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment presented by my friends STACEY PLASKETT and AMATA RADEWAGEN.

As my friend just mentioned, the smaller territories are facing a challenge in the limited funds they receive to address such a large and horrific issue. Federal funds to fight violence against women and support survivors cannot be based on the ZIP Code or where you live. I do believe that any kind of violence must be addressed, regardless of the State or the territory the people are living in, giving the survivors the same access to services, intervention, and assistance.

In the fiscal years 2017 and 2018, these four territories—we are talking about the Northern Marianas, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam—received less than \$60,000 to aid victims of domestic violence; and, simply put, this was not enough.

I am speaking also on behalf of my friend, AMATA RADEWAGEN, for American Samoa. And I do say that, as more women step out of the shadows to seek the assistance they need, it is our job in the Federal Government to be able to provide the tools and resources to the organizations and, more importantly, to the victims themselves.

Congress must rework the formula grant to allow these four territories access to additional funds. I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I am supporting the amendment as well.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, I just want to thank my colleague and my good friend—indeed, my sister—from the neighboring island of Puerto Rico for her support of this legislation and, as a member of the larger island, speaking on behalf of the smaller islands and territories.

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 the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BERA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mr. BERA. 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:

**SEC. 108. ENHANCING CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.**

Section 121(a) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20124(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the amounts made

available under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

My amendment is simple. It would increase the authorized funding level for grants that support the development of culturally specific services for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and abuse.

Domestic violence is a devastating reality for many women, and this is particularly the case in our AAPI communities. A survey done in 2015 estimated that 40 to 60 percent of AAPI women experience physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime.

However, the unfortunate stigma of these events within the AAPI community means that a lot of these survivors do not seek help afterwards or even report these incidents in the first place.

□ 1815

Yet when I think about my own community, the South Asian community and Native American community, we have had some devastating cases.

You have generational divides here where there is an older generation that doesn't allow folks to talk about this. You have arranged marriages where a bride may travel thousands of miles and have no family resources, have no ability to talk about it.

We have got to address this issue. We have got to make it okay for folks to come out of the shadows.

That is why, while it is important to expand access to these services, it is just as critical that the person can feel comfortable seeking out these services. Often, that means they are able to get help from someone who looks like them and understands their cultural background.

Providing these resources in a culturally appropriate context can help survivors feel supported and heard.

My amendment would increase the funding for grants that support organizations that provide critical services and resources to communities of color.

Lastly, I want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, for her work on this reauthorization. I am pleased that we have the opportunity to strengthen these programs.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and support the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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. GALLEGU

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mr. GALLEGU. 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 (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**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.

(2) 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. 5304).

(3) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term “Indian country” has the meaning given the term in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term “law enforcement agency” means a Federal, State, local, or Tribal law enforcement agency.

(5) MISSING OR MURDERED INDIAN.—The term “missing or murdered Indian” means any Indian who is—

(A) reported missing in Indian country or any other location; or

(B) murdered in Indian country or any other location.

(6) NOTIFICATION SYSTEM.—The term “notification system” means—

(A) the Criminal Justice Information Network;

(B) the AMBER Alert communications network established under subtitle A of title III of the PROTECT Act (34 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.); and

(C) any other system or public notification system that relates to a report of a missing or murdered Indian, including any State, local, or Tribal notification system.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report that includes—

(1) a review of—

(A) each law enforcement agency that has jurisdiction over missing or murdered Indians and the basis for that jurisdiction;

(B) the response procedures, with respect to a report of a missing or murdered Indian, of—

(i) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(ii) the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

(iii) any other Federal law enforcement agency responsible for responding to or investigating a report of a missing or murdered Indian;

(C) each covered database and notification system;

(D) Federal interagency cooperation and notification policies and procedures related to missing or murdered Indians;

(E) the requirements of each Federal law enforcement agency relating to notifying State, local, or Tribal law enforcement agencies after the Federal law enforcement agency receives a report of a missing or murdered Indian; and

(F) the public notification requirements of law enforcement agencies relating to missing or murdered Indians;

(2) recommendations and best practices relating to improving cooperation between and response policies of law enforcement agencies relating to missing and murdered Indians; and

(3) recommendations relating to—

(A) improving how—

(i) covered databases address instances of missing or murdered Indians, including by improving access to, integrating, and improving the sharing of information between covered databases; and

(ii) notification systems address instances of missing or murdered Indians, including by improving access to, integrating, and improving the sharing of information between notification systems;

(B) social, educational, economic, and any other factor that may contribute to an Indian becoming a missing or murdered Indian; and

(C) legislation to reduce the likelihood that an Indian may become a missing or murdered Indian.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chair, my amendment to the Violence Against

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 than this, 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 the 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.

According to a study on children abductions by the Washington State Attorney General's Office, 76 percent of kidnapped children are killed within the first 3 hours.

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 ever 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. GALLEG0).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 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 (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

**TITLE XV—CYBERCRIME ENFORCEMENT**  
**SEC. 1501. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CYBERCRIMES.**

(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. 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 applicant (or by another officer of the applicant, if qualified under regulations promulgated by the Attorney General), that—

(i) 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;

(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 in effect criminal laws which prohibit cybercrimes against individuals.

(G) A certification that any equipment described in subsection (c)(7) purchased using grant funds awarded 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, 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; and

(D) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the prosecution or adjudication of acts of cybercrimes against individuals, including the use of technology to protect victims of such crimes;

(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 viola-

tions 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 and forensic analysis of evidence in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in the training, maintenance, or acquisition of technical updates necessary for the use of such equipment for the duration of a reasonable period of use of such equipment;

(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 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).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 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, monitoring, 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, threaten, 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 cause harm to a commercial entity, government agency, 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, prepare, analyze, and disseminate information and statistics related to—

(A) the incidence of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) the enforcement, and prosecution of laws relating to cybercrimes against individuals; and

(C) the provision of supportive services and resources for victims of 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 described 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 establish 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.

(i) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CYBERCRIMES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.**—The term “cybercrimes against individuals” has the meaning given such term in section 1501(g).

(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a nonprofit private organization that focuses on cybercrimes against individuals and that—

(A) provides documentation to the Attorney General demonstrating experience working directly on issues of cybercrimes against individuals; and

(B) includes on the entity’s advisory board representatives who have a documented history of working directly on issues of cybercrimes against individuals and who are geographically and culturally diverse.

**SEC. 1503. NATIONAL STRATEGY, CLASSIFICATION, AND REPORTING ON CYBERCRIME.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMPUTER.**—The term “computer” includes a computer network and any interactive electronic device.

(2) **CYBERCRIME AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.**—The term “cybercrime against individuals” means a Federal, State, or local criminal 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, 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 the offense; and

(B) the term does not include the use of a computer to cause harm to a commercial entity, government agency, or non-natural person.

(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 and create within the Uniform Crime Reports a category 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 the category established under paragraph (1) as a Part I crime in the Uniform Crime Reports; and

(4) classify each type of cybercrime against individuals that is an offense under Federal or State law as a Group 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 their jobs.

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 destroy lives.

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 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 or offline.

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 to 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 and 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. 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 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 281, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH. 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 strengthen 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.

□ 1830

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH. 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 114, line 10, insert after “or stalking” the following: “, including guidelines and best practices to promote the creation of effective employee assistance programs”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, 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 that address domestic violence in the workplace.

Moving forward, we must find ways to help employers offer lifesaving re-

sources 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 research 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. Chairman, 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. KRISHNAMOORTH).

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. 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 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 States, units of 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;

(2) helps first responders and others in the justice system, including courts, law enforcement agencies, and prosecutors of tribal government and units of local government, identify and respond to possibly lethal circumstances; and

(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 applicant shall demonstrate experience in developing, implementing, evaluating, and disseminating a lethality assessment program.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF 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 40002 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—the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER; my colleague from California, Congresswoman KAREN BASS; as well as all the members of the Judiciary Committee—the underlying bill.

My amendment would create a grant program for States, localities, and nonprofits to establish and operate a lethality assessment program.

The lethality assessment program was developed in my home State of Maryland in 2005 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 lethality 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 make 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 schoolchildren.

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 question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Ms. HAALAND. 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, prosecutors’ offices, and courts and providing supportive services and advocacy to urban 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. HAALAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment addresses the needs of Native Americans living in urban areas by making victim advocates available in State courts 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 \$154 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 underfunded, 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 State victim advocates. This is especially true in light of the crisis of missing and murdered indigenous women, to break the cycle of generational trauma and violence.

Due to devastating Federal policies, like forced relocation and removal, 71 percent of the Native American population lives in urban areas. Urban cities with high populations of Native Americans include places like Phoenix; Seattle; Los Angeles; and in my district, Albuquerque.

Recent reports by the Urban Indian Health Institute identified 506 cases of missing and murdered indigenous women across 71 urban cities. My State of New Mexico ranked number one for the highest number of missing and murdered indigenous women cases, which was 78.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the bipartisan cosponsors of this amendment, Representatives GRIJALVA, COLE, GALLEGO, MOORE, YOUNG, CASE, SOTO, DAVIDS, and TORRES, for their support. I ask my colleagues to help these Native American women who are the victims of violence.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Ms. HAALAND. 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 127, strike line 3, and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is

Page 127, insert after line 11 the following:  
(b) INDIAN TRIBE AND INDIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is further amended by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) INDIAN TRIBE AND INDIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION SHARING.—The Attorney General shall permit tribal law enforcement entities (including entities designated by a tribe as maintaining public safety within a tribe’s territorial jurisdiction that has no federal or state arrest authority) and Bureau of Indian Affairs law enforcement agencies—

“(1) to access and enter information into Federal criminal information databases; and

“(2) to obtain information from the databases.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment to improve public safety in Indian Country through the Tribal Access Program, or TAP, which is an existing information-sharing system for Tribes in Indian Country.

The Tribal Access Program administered through the Department of Justice is an effective method of sharing criminal conviction information between Tribal, local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies.

□ 1845

TAP allows law enforcement officers in neighboring jurisdictions to see each other’s restraining orders, warrants, and exclusion orders across jurisdictional boundaries to improve public safety.

Having this information is critical to keeping victims of domestic violence safe from harm, but, unfortunately, the Department of Justice has told many Tribes they don’t qualify to participate. Although the statute says that any Tribal government can access this data, the DOJ rejects applications from Tribes that don’t specifically have arrest authority.

Under my amendment, a Tribal government with a designated public safety agency, regardless of their ability to detain and arrest perpetrators, will have access and the ability to enter information into the TAP program.

I want to be clear that my amendment does not allow these designated public safety departments or agencies to determine criminal convictions. That is a determination made by courts through due process. This amendment only allows information sharing and access to TAP to better communicate between public safety de-

partments on reservations that are frequently limited in resources.

The stakes are too high to continue to deny Tribes that are already struggling from resources to keep people safe in Indian Country access to this important information.

For example, I heard from a Tribe that one of their members had a pre-existing restraining order against her abuser; however, when the perpetrator entered the reservation, the Reservation Patrol—a Tribal public safety agency without arrest authority—unknowingly allowed the abuser to enter the reservation because they did not have access to information about the existing restraining order.

The violation of the restraining order against the unsuspecting victim could have been prevented if the Reservation Patrol had the ability to access the criminal history of the abuser through TAP.

Denying Tribal public safety departments access to information that can prevent crimes, particularly violence against women, is unconscionable.

The chronic lack of public safety resources in Indian Country, including inadequately staffed law enforcement agencies and lack of cell phone and internet service for communication, already puts Tribes behind in protecting their members.

If this were about any other community located off the reservation, it is likely this amendment wouldn’t be at issue today.

I thank the bipartisan cosponsors of this amendment—Representatives YOUNG, COOK, GRIJALVA, COLE, GALLEGO, RUIZ, CASE, SOTO, DAVIDS, and TORRES—for their support and ask my colleagues to help give Tribal public safety departments the information they need to protect Native American women from violence.

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 Mexico (Ms. HAALAND).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mr. ROUDA. 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 85, after line 13, insert the following (and redesignate other provisions accordingly):

(4) Transgender and gender non-conforming people face extraordinary levels of physical and sexual violence.

(5) More than 1 in 4 transgender people have faced bias-driven assault, and this rate is higher for trans women and trans people of color.

(6) The American Foundation for Suicide Prevention has found that transgender and gender non-conforming people had an elevated prevalence of suicide attempts, espe-

cially when they have suffered physical or sexual violence.

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 lifetime, 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 personal 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 it, 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 comes 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, 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. 30 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mr. ROUDA. 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 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 to muddy up, really, 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.

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 Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 39, line 6, insert after “efforts.” the following:

“(12) To develop and implement an alternative justice response (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994).”.

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 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 is an incredibly traumatic process 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 an opportunity for 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. Chairman, 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 justice 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

opposed. And, in fact, the National District Attorneys Association points out in a letter today:

While this approach may work successfully in other types of situations, we lack sufficient information on potential downsides of bringing a batterer into the same room with a victim in order to conflict-resolve what is considered a crime of violence.

□ 1900

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 actual reports.

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 who do not come forward, there are also many other reasons besides the fact of the law enforcement process that we go through here.

So what I don't want to have 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 system is too hard.

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.

So 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 or anything else and have that ability for law enforcement to do what should be done, and that is, to put these people in jail.

I think that is the big difference I have here, and I don't think this is the proper place for it. There may be other ways we can find common ground in this, but not here, especially with what VAWA has the ability to do already inside it.

So that is my opposition to this. We want the same thing. The people who perpetrate 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 and report this. It is a sad 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 this is not reported, 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 lots of times 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.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mr. ROUDA. 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, strike lines 1 through 2 and insert the following:

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) To develop, strengthen, and implement campus policies, protocols, and services that more effectively identify and respond to the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, including the use of technology to commit these crimes, and to train campus administrators, campus security personnel, and all participants in the resolution process, including the Title IX coordinator's office and student conduct office on campus disciplinary or judicial boards on such policies, protocols, and services.”.

Page 39, line 12, strike “and”.

Page 39, insert after line 12, the following:

(B) by amending paragraph (3)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) The grantee shall train all participants in the resolution process, including the Title IX coordinator's office and student conduct office, to respond effectively to situations involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”; and

Page 39, line 13, strike “(B) in paragraph” and insert “(C) in paragraph”.

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. Chairman, my final amendment addresses training for all participants involved in the complaint resolution process.

Campus disciplinary processes, governed by Title IX, vary by school, and involve many participants before the complaint even reaches the hearing phase where a campus disciplinary or judicial board would be involved. Many survivors never even reach the hearing phase.

At the same time, throughout the disclosure process, survivors are required to relive and discuss their sexual assaults with administrators, faculty, and staff. As previously mentioned, only 10 percent of college student survivors officially report their assault.

When and if they decide to report, survivors deserve to be met with trauma-informed care, and campus faculty and staff deserve training on the best practices to meet this critical need.

My amendment would give colleges and universities the opportunity to use

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.

Resolution process 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. 33 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 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 39, 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 to Congress a report, which includes—

(1) an evaluation of programs, events, and educational materials related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) an assessment of best practices and guidance from the evaluation described in paragraph (1), which shall be made publicly available online to universities and college campuses to use as a resource.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. CRAIG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Every student deserves to learn in an environment that is safe and free from harassment and violence. Yet, we all know that domestic violence and sexual assault remain prevalent threats to women, and especially young women, on college campuses across our country.

College-aged students are at greater risk than any other age groups for domestic and sexual violence. These instances of violence are vastly underreported. A study of college students by the U.S. Department of Justice found that around one in five women are targets of attempted or completed sexual assault.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019 increases funding for grants to combat violent crimes on campuses and allocates funding to train campus health centers to recognize and to respond to these crimes.

My amendment directs the Secretary of Education to study and 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. 34 OFFERED BY MS. 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 14, insert after "professionals" the following: ", including specialists in trauma and in behavioral health care,".

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. Chair, 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 healthcare 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. Chair, 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.

□ 1915

Our amendment ensures that trauma and behavioral health specialists are included as healthcare professionals in the section of this 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 victims of domestic violence, sexual 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 post-partum 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 yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It 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 142, 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 disperse 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 abuse.

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 shelters 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 know grantees were warned 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 is not 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 counselors. 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 are 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 yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 36 to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

My 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 all 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 of undergraduate 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 was mentioning. 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 feel safe to go to class?

I was honored at the time to speak with Bernadette Muloski, 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, it 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 know what 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 know as opposed 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 the 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 "; and".

Page 15, insert after line 12 the following: (3) by adding at the end 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(f)(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 offered under VAWA.

Over one-quarter of women and 11 percent of men have experienced sexual violence, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetimes. I am one of them.

I suffered domestic violence, and every year, millions suffer in silence for many reasons, but one of the most prominent among those reasons is economic necessity. According to a study conducted in 2012, 74 percent of survivors stayed with their abuser for financial reasons.

Financial abuse through consumer credit still has not been appropriately recognized under the law. Using debt to

exercise coercive control is one of the most prevalent and nefarious forms of domestic violence. In a Michigan State study, 99 percent of domestic violence victims reported some form of economic abuse.

Economic abuse takes many forms, ranging from employment sabotage to malicious attempts to restrict survivor's access to funds.

Threats of violence cause women to take time off from school or work and interfere with their abilities to maintain employment or complete their educations.

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.

□ 1930

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 extensive evidence of fraud, is an intractable 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 my three 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 for so long as domestic violence is 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 found help to let my family rebuild our lives. A police officer who had been trained in DV because of 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 rise today in support of my amendment to expand national domestic violence hotlines.

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. NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOTLINE.**

Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a national domestic violence hotline for which a grant is provided under section 313 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act shall include the voluntary feature of texting via telephone to ensure all methods of communication are available for victims and those seeking assistance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chairman, when you consider hotlines today, we have to think about the fact that text messages are absolutely important, and they are also, all too often, ignored.

We need to evolve. We need to fix the new problems of today as well as the problems of the future.

As a subcommittee chairman of the Homeland Security Committee and as one of the younger Members of this body, I understand that the advent of social networks and technology has, in

many ways, helped us track and identify bad actors. But as we have heard from survivors of domestic violence, it also allows abuse, coercion, stalking, and intimidation in more ways than ever before.

Survivors need the necessary tools to keep themselves safe. When a woman is being constantly monitored by her abuser, is unable to hide, and finds herself trapped, a phone call could put her life in even more danger.

This is why I implore 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 they need in the 21st century, no matter what age they are.

It breaks my heart to know that those hiding from their abusers could be a young college student or even a teenager in high school. A recent study on intimate partner violence found that 1 in 10 high school students have experienced physical violence from dating a partner in a given year. Nearly one in three women in college have said they have been in an abusive dating relationship.

If these statistics do not highlight the need for Congress to provide as much relief as we possibly can, I don't know what does.

Making sure women in crisis can quickly and easily get help by texting the crisis hotline should be a no-brainer. The technology exists, and it has been proven to be effective by other organizations helping those in need. This isn't rocket science.

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. MALINOWSKI) 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.

**HOURLY 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.

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

There was no objection.

**IN SUPPORT OF VAWA**

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

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.

My 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, holistic 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 one person in retirement.

Understand what this means: If we don't have substantial economic growth, substantial incentives to stay in the workplace, and also a really disruptive cost curve in parts of healthcare, I defy you to make the math work.

□ 1945

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 economic 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 on 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, as a 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 geeking 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 wonderful.

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, look, those 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 often 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, 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, and interest.

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, and the borrowing within those drives a tremendous amount of the percentage of the debt.

So how do you build a robust enough economy and then enough optionality in that growth with technology to also bend the cost on healthcare?

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 legal barriers, where almost 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 order 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 healthcare 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 this. That is this.

It is substantially our demographics and then the procedures that come along with that aging in society.

We will actually, 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 grow in that fashion.

Additionally, and 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 the miracles that this body in previous years, when we did the CURES Act, when we actually did the specialty, the financing, the research resources for orphan diseases—it is starting to pay off. Many of the policies, actually, the Republican Members here did in previous years with the previous President are starting to pay off.

So think about this—and I may have my date wrong; I am desperately hoping it is by the end of this year—a single-shot cure for hemophilia A. So our brothers and sisters, and there are only about 8,000 in the United States who have hemophilia, but it is a population that is very expensive for the blood

clotting factor, for the other medical maintenance for that population, for our brothers and sisters.

How about a single shot that cures? What would we, as a society, be willing to pay for that curative?

How do we finance it? What if it is a \$1.5 million a shot? Let's just sort of theorize here.

But in about a 5-, 6-year period of time, it has actually more than paid for itself. Just, you know, the tyranny of basic accounting: How do we say today we want a system where we can finance these disruptive pharmaceuticals so we can start to change parts of these chronic populations so we do something that is curative?

One of the discussions we have been working on in our office for almost 2 or 3 years now is the concept of, we will call it a healthcare bond that says we are going to reach out, do a census of the populations of, hey, these many individuals with this particular disease that this pharmaceutical would cure or dramatically improve their lives—some are on Medicare; some are on Medicaid; some are on private insurance; some are at the VA. We need to do that census and then do sort of an assessment over time to have what would have been their normal cost pay back that bond.

The trickier policy set here—let's go back to our hemophilia example: 8,000 population, a single shot cures the disease. How do you price it?

This is going to be an intellectually robust discussion we are going to have to have. We have other things in our society we price. A baseball player who is phenomenal, you would do certain types of arbitration.

We could actually take a look at everything from the research costs, to the future benefits, to the incentives to continue this type of research, to the health benefits of having that population cured.

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?

□ 2000

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.

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 those pharmaceuticals and how we also get a 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.

So 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 make them so they don't crash, so 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 the box of how we finance these disruptions?

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 it on in such a way—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 last year, 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 you 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 have 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 carved up from when they have had to go in and remove the fungi that is growing in his bones.

Leader MCCARTHY, KEVIN MCCARTHY, because of the community he represents, 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 move 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 after that, maybe just a handful 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 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, it is probably going to be a couple shots a year, but it will freeze. 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 can 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 of 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 exciting 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 brilliant 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 way we regulate, 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.

□ 2015

## NATIONAL DONATE LIFE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, 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, to 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.

Meanwhile, 400 miles away in Auburn, Alabama, the Boswell family faced a similarly heartbreaking situation. Their son Davis, who was born in June 2015, had been diagnosed with enterovirus, an infection that attacked his heart. His only chance at survival was an improbable heart transplant.

On a Sunday night in November, Davis' parents, Amanda and Tucker, received a call saying that a match had been found and that Davis would receive a heart. On November 29, 2015, Davis underwent a successful heart transplant.

A few days later, Amanda and Holley were connected by a mutual friend on Facebook and realized that Davis had probably received John Clarke's heart, a fact confirmed by the hospital.

In April 2016, the Boswells and the Perrys met at an event raising awareness for organ donation. The two families have continued to meet over the years at the annual Auburn-LSU football game, turning the rivalry game into an opportunity to raise awareness and funds for organ donation across the country.

While this sequence of events could have only been handcrafted by God, organ donations save lives across the country on a daily basis.

In 2018, 36,528 organ transplants were performed, a record high for the sixth consecutive year. On average, one organ donor 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 wider every time the LSU Tigers and New Orleans Saints were on TV.

Like so many donors, John Clarke is no longer with us, but his legacy lives

on in the bodies of those who received his organs. Throughout the month of April, I will be thinking of John Clarke, the entire Perry family, and all those who have given the gift of organ donation as a final act of compassion.

## HONORING MASON ANDREWS

Mr. ABRAHAM. 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 varying 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 during his flight. 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 September.

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. ABRAHAM. 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 wince in pain, and I have seen them comforted by their mother's voice. That baby is 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 life begins 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 that 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 commonsense 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; and a living, breathing baby deserves a chance to live.

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 was 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:

592. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph Anderson, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

593. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on an increase in the Average Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) for the Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare Increment 1 (Long Range Anti-Ship Missile) (OASuW Inc. 1 (LRASM)) program that exceeds the current baseline estimate by 23.5 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(d)(3); Public Law 97-252, Sec. 1107(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 110-417, Sec. 811(c)); (122 Stat. 4522); to the Committee on Armed Services.

594. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's Office of Minority and Women Inclusion Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5452(e); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 342(e); (124 Stat. 1543); to the Committee on Financial Services.

595. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's Consumer Response Annual Report for CY 2018, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5493(b)(3)(C); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1013(b)(3)(C); (124 Stat. 1969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

596. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2018 Annual Report of the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5452(e); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 342(e); (124 Stat. 1543); to the Committee on Financial Services.

597. 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 — Cost Sharing: Energy Policy Act of 2005 (RIN: 1991-AC13) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

598. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Zoxamide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0665; FRL-9987-27] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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 Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Delegation of Authority of the Federal Plan for Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0065; FRL-9991-56-Region 3] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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 — Metrafenone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0616; FRL-9987-14] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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 — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations; Consistency Update for Delaware [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0238; FRL-9990-18-Region 3] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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: Arizona; Approval and Conditional Approval of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Maricopa County Air Quality Department; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0481; FRL-9991-53-Region 9] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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 Plan Approval; NC: Readoption of Air Quality Rules and Removal of Oxygenated Gasoline Rules [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0301; FRL-9991-63-Region 4] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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 Plan Approval; ID, Kraft Pulp Mill Rule Revisions [EPA-R10-OAR-2018-0769; FRL-9991-71-Region 10] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

605. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

606. A letter from the Staff Director, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

607. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

608. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

#### 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. 2043. 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. KINZINGER):

H.R. 2044. 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. LEVIN of California, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BILLIRAKIS):

H.R. 2045. 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. WRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 2046. 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. 2047. 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. CICILLINE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MENG,

Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL, and Mr. REED):

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 by reason of their immigration status; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

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. MOOLENAAR):

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 and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 2053. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received from State-based earthquake loss mitigation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2054. A bill to provide a temporary safe harbor for the publishers of online con-

tent to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which their content may be distributed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

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, Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, Science, Space, and Technology, 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. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. GHANFORTE, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2056. A bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed 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. MCNERNEY:

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. AGUILAR (for himself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 2058. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to remove certain restrictions on advertising and public relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself and Ms. FINKENAUER):

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. CHE-NEY, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 2060. A bill 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 serving on active duty 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. BERA (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Miss RICE 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 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, 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. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. VELA, and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 2063. A bill to prohibit the President or a Federal agency from constructing, operating, or offering wholesale or retail services on 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 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 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.

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 2068. A bill to modify the authorization to provide assistance to certain foreign

police and law enforcement forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2069. 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, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 2070. A bill to provide grants to State, local, territorial, and tribal law enforcement agencies to purchase chemical screening devices and train 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. STAUBER):

H.R. 2072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the charitable mileage rate with the business travel rate; 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. SARBANES (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 Ms. SCHRIER (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 2076. A bill to establish a demonstration program to explore effective practices to improve early detection and management of injuries indicative of 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 Labor.

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 poppy seeds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. DEUTCH, 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. MENG):

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. 285. 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 Mr. TURNER):

H. Res. 286. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States remains committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VELA, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 287. A resolution condemning the President's threat to shut down the United States-Mexico border to the detriment of the United States economy; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and 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. GAETZ (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H. Res. 288. 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. 289. A resolution condemning the Nation of Brunei's criminalization of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals and imposition of cruel and disproportionate 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.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By 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. WELCH:

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. WENSTRUP:

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

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 2047.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2048.

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. 2049.

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

Article I, 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 I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States: 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 I, 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 I, 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 I, 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 I

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. 2056.

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. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2057.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2058.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the 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 any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 2059.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 2060.

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. 2061.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2062.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2063.

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. 2064.

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. 2065.

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. 2066.

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. GUEST:

H.R. 2067.

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. GUEST:

H.R. 2068.

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. 2069.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 2070.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 2071.

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

Article 1, 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 1, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 2073.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2074.

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

Article 1, Section 8: "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. SARBANES:

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2077.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 2078.

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

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

H.R. 6: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 9: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. STANTON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. TRONE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. BASS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HOULAHAN, 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, Ms. SHERILL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KIM, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 35: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 55: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 99: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 141: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 149: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 205: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 303: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 375: Mr. GALLEGRO and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 389: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 420: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 462: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 500: Ms. STEVENS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 510: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 530: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 553: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 582: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 585: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 587: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 594: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 597: Mr. DEUTCH.

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. MOULTON.

H.R. 728: Mr. KIND and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 788: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 826: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 847: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 849: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 864: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 873: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 943: Mr. BUDD, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 946: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 978: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 989: Ms. TITUS, Mr. HECK, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1019: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1034: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1035: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1058: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1066: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1096: 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. COHEN.

H.R. 1142: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1191: Ms. PINGREE.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 1221: Ms. SLOTKIN.  
H.R. 1223: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 1225: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. TITUS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 1226: Mr. LATTA, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. CLAY.  
H.R. 1227: Mr. SPANO.  
H.R. 1241: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 1255: Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 1265: Mr. GOODEN.  
H.R. 1269: Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 1321: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 1327: Mr. BUDD, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. BARR, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 1372: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. COMER, and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 1373: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1380: Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 1398: Mr. SMUCKER and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.  
H.R. 1434: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
H.R. 1444: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. YOHO.  
H.R. 1450: Mrs. CRAIG.  
H.R. 1499: Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 1507: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1521: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.  
H.R. 1545: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. KATKO.  
H.R. 1581: Mr. PANETTA and Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1591: Ms. HILL of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1595: Mr. TRONE and Mr. MASSIE.  
H.R. 1605: Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 1622: Ms. WILD, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. PASCARELL.  
H.R. 1629: Mr. CLINE.  
H.R. 1636: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1643: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 1644: Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. TLAIB.  
H.R. 1647: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CORREA.  
H.R. 1652: Mr. LAMB, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CARBAJAL.  
H.R. 1674: Mr. WALTZ.  
H.R. 1741: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. MEUSER.  
H.R. 1753: Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
H.R. 1766: Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 1802: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 1830: Ms. TITUS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. TRONE.  
H.R. 1840: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
H.R. 1841: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 1858: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. GAETZ.  
H.R. 1873: Mr. COMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H.R. 1882: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 1896: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GALLEG0, and Ms. GABBARD.  
H.R. 1903: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WRIGHT, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WILD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H.R. 1914: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
H.R. 1915: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 1934: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H.R. 1941: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 1943: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H.R. 1945: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 1948: Mr. MAST and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 1956: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 1957: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 1961: Ms. TITUS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mrs. MURPHY.  
H.R. 1986: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
H.R. 2000: Ms. SPANBERGER.  
H.R. 2002: Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. RESCIENTHALER.  
H.R. 2014: Mr. TIMMONS.  
H.R. 2030: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BUCK, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.  
H.R. 2037: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.J. Res. 54: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. OMAR.  
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H. Res. 23: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. NADLER.  
H. Res. 33: Ms. HILL of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H. Res. 54: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H. Res. 114: Mr. CISNEROS.  
H. Res. 141: Mr. PERRY.  
H. Res. 189: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H. Res. 191: Mr. BUDD, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.  
H. Res. 214: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H. Res. 230: Mr. RASKIN and Ms. PINGREE.  
H. Res. 246: Mr. SIRES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DEAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.  
H. Res. 250: Mr. CASE, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TRONE, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. CLAY.



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2019

No. 58

## Senate

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 intemperance, 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 roiled 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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2209

proud of what his presence in this Capitol Building represents about our Nation's vital role in NATO and NATO's vital role in the world.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, the comprehensive campaign by Senate Democrats to delay Senate consideration of Presidential nominations is now more than 2 years old. As I have explained in recent days, it is time for this sorry chapter to end. It is time to return this body to a more normal and reasonable process for fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities, no matter which party controls the White House.

The Senate had to hold 128 cloture votes on nominations during President Trump's first 2 years. That is 128, more than 5 times as many as the equivalent period for the previous 6 Presidents combined.

Now, 42 of those 128 were for positions that had never, in the past, required cloture votes, like the Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, the General Counsel at the Department of Agriculture, or the Ambassador to Luxembourg. It is not a thoughtful investigation of a few highly controversial nominees and not a principled opposition in some rare circumstances. These are part and parcel of Senate tradition.

But grinding, across-the-board systematic obstruction, under threat of filibuster, sparing not even individuals whom literally zero Senators opposed in the end—this is new. This is new, and it needs to stop.

Well-qualified civil servants, academic and business experts, and exemplary jurists with broad bipartisan support are all subjected to weeks, if not months and months, of pointless delays, and then pointless cloture votes tying up floor time, not because a real debate was happening, not because there is real due diligence requiring months of delay but just because our colleagues across the aisle have chosen to endlessly relitigate the 2016 election rather than actually participate in governing, just because they wish our President were not our President.

The Department of the Interior has waited 631 days since President Trump first nominated an Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget. That is 631 days. Her nomination was voice-voted out of committee. After months of inaction, it had to be sent back at the end of Congress last year.

The Millennium Challenge Corporation has waited 450 days since its CEO was nominated, and it has been 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 positions the President has been trying to fill. In each case and in hundreds of others, Democrats have made sure those chairs stayed emptied for far too long.

This systematic obstruction is unfair to our duly elected President, and, more importantly, it is disrespectful—disrespectful to the American people who deserve the government they elected. The American people deserve the government they elected.

This problem goes deeper than today. We are talking about the future of this very institution and the future functioning of our constitutional government. This practice is laying the foundation for a dangerous new norm. We cannot set this new precedent that the Senate minorities will systematically keep an administration understaffed, down to the least controversial nominees, anytime they wish somebody else had won the election.

We need to act. We need to act. We need to act so that in its third year, the current administration can finally get more of its team in place. We need to act to repair the institutional legacy we are leaving and restore a functional nominations process for future administrations of both parties.

For most of the storied history of this institution, the traditions that govern the Senate have combined two distinct things—on legislation, an iron-clad commitment to robust minority rights, including extensive debate and the filibuster, and on nominations, a reasonable process for considering the individuals the President sends us.

So let me be absolutely clear. The legislative filibuster is central to the nature of the Senate. It always has been and must always be the distinctive quality of this institution. In the U.S. Senate, dissenting voices retain considerable power to shape the debate on legislation. Pivotal moments have hinged on the strong convictions of a minority that has urged caution or insisted on an amendment.

I know many of our colleagues on both sides share my view that this part of the Senate's DNA must never be put in jeopardy or sacrificed to serve either side's momentary partisan whims. In fact, during the last Congress, 61 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle signed an open letter making their commitment to the legislative filibuster abundantly clear.

I know many of us were disturbed to read this week in the Washington Post that far-left activists are pushing “an abolish-the-filibuster litmus test on the presidential campaign trail, and quite a few of the 2020 aspirants have at least signaled a willingness to consider it.” I am glad that many of my Democratic colleagues are on the record opposing such a shortsighted disaster championed by the far left. The commitment of both sides to preserving the legislative filibuster is not just a historical matter. It is also very practical. Neither party is particularly keen to see the other side enact its entire, full-bore legislative wish list the next time they obtain 51 votes.

Republicans don't want Democrats to enact an entire leftwing agenda with 51 votes, and Democrats certainly don't

want Republicans to enact every last part of our conservative agenda with a mere 51 votes. What they are not thinking about is when the shoe is on the other foot. When the shoe is on the other foot, and Republicans have a simple majority of 51, and there is no legislative filibuster, what would happen? They are only thinking about how it might enable them, but not thinking ahead to the next time the shoe is on the other foot. In fact, I remember that in 2013 I said, when our colleagues on the other side insisted on going to a simple 51 votes on the executive calendar: You might not like what happens when the shoe is on the other fellow's foot.

I would keep in mind—I would say to my friends on the far left: Think about what might happen the next time the people who are not for it have 51 votes. We all know that both parties will possess future 51-vote majorities somewhere down the line. It will happen.

The Senate's long traditions on legislation therefore need to remain in place. But what we are discussing this week is restoring the different traditions concerning nominations. The tradition here is entirely different. There is no long tradition—none—of what amount to mass filibusters of personnel for administrations. There is no tradition of systematic, grinding delays under threats of filibuster that extend even to nominees whom nobody opposes. All of this is new. Until my Democratic colleagues started us down this road in 2003—this began in the first administration of George W. Bush—routine systematic filibusters of nominations were a foreign thing. It just wasn't done.

So we need to recover Senate tradition. The effort we will make later today is about getting us back to what the tradition in the Senate was for a couple of hundred years, down to the Bush 43 first term.

Yesterday, we had a chance to do just that, working across the aisle and through the same process that we overwhelmingly agreed to with President Obama. But—stop me if you have heard this one before—Senate Democrats chose obstruction instead.

Never mind that in 2013, a bipartisan majority, including many Republicans, passed a similar measure that immediately benefited the Obama administration. In other words, to help President Obama, a significant number of Republicans joined with all of the Democrats in 2013 to do something almost exactly like what we will be proposing later today. He had just gotten reelected. Do you think we were happy about that? We weren't. But we thought the Executive Calendar should be expedited for these kinds of nominations that we are discussing today.

Never mind that the same Democrats who opposed this measure yesterday have whispered in the ear to many of us, including the occupant of the Chair, that they would be more than happy to support this, provided it didn't take effect until 2021. They are more than

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 is 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 a 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 that this was a partisan decision on Democrats' part and not a principled 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 Member of the Democratic caucus—voted 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 were 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 for one party to try 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 assistant secretaries. We voted for this 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 yesterday 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 here in the U.S. 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 to speed through the confirmation of more far-right nominees. He says Democrats are guilty of extreme, unprecedented obstruction, and he claims that his hand has been forced and that is why he is required to change the Senate rules. In the real world, I want to make clear that I believe the facts tell a different story, and I am going to lay out briefly why I think this is the wrong way to go.

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 Republicans blocked nominees 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 2015 and 2016, the 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 when a Democrat was President and they were in the minority. Under this President, they threw the blue-slip tradition out the window.

Republicans are also moving nominees in huge batches and at paces that 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 Democrats delayed every nomination for as long as possible. That just doesn't remotely resemble the truth.

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 Finance Committee. Our committee has zero nominees ready for a committee vote. It is not because anybody 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 the Democrats have broken 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 story when they prefer to tout their record on nominations.

Let's hear from Republicans, from the President on down.

Here is the President tweeting in late 2017: "Judges at a record clip. 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 . . . 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 confirmed 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 done 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 Democratic obstructionism 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 hateful 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's, was here. We always worked in a bipartisan way to address these issues. This was a nominee who concealed hateful writings from the 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 she had done as a 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 ruthlessly 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 doomsday 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. It is a quaint idea—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 rush 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 hold.

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 owed to the appearance that he had been working on behalf of former clients while he had served as a public official. I am also very concerned about the real possibility that Mr. Bernhardt made false statements under oath in his nomination hearing last week. 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 needs 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, Ryan Zinke, who, when he came for his confirmation hearing, promised nine times he would be like Teddy Roosevelt and left under an enormous set of ethical clouds—it is clear this Republican-controlled Senate has decided that it is going to confirm first, ask questions later, and maybe duck all of the hard questions altogether.

I believe that needs to change right now. It is time to restore public trust in this process. I do not believe the Senate 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 quorum call be rescinded.

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 frustration and surprise over the election of 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 have been 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 board positions 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 afford to put their lives on hold and wait 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, the TVA 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 the 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 to introduce her before her committee hearing. Less than a month after she was nominated, Susan was unanimously approved by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Again, I was hopeful that her nomination would sail through since it, clearly, was not a controversial nomination. Unfortunately, that was not the case.

Here we are, 631 days later, and Susan Combs has still not been confirmed. Again, it is not because she is not qualified for the job or that she is a controversial nominee. Just the opposite is true. This is simply the way our Democratic colleagues have sought

to deal with nominees from this President.

If Senate Democrats were delaying well-qualified nominees like Susan to make sure they had adequate opportunity to debate their nominations, we wouldn't have any disagreement with that, but we know, by their actions, that they will stop at nothing to bring the work of this body to a screeching halt, particularly during the time of the Trump administration.

Over the last 2 years, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have forced votes on nominees who in previous years would have sailed through the Senate. During President Trump's first 2 years, we held more than five times the number of cloture votes on nominees as we did during the same time for the last six Presidents combined. So to call this unprecedented is not an exaggeration, and the long list of vacancies is growing.

Our government is suffering, and the services that we provide to the American people are being obstructed as well. The Senate's duty of advice and consent is important, but it is not our only job. We have a lot of other things we are supposed to do here, and they are falling by the wayside while we try to work through these, largely, non-controversial judicial and executive branch nominees.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues' delay tactics have brought us to the point at which we really don't have many other options. We have tried negotiations. We have been told they will be happy to limit postcloture debate time but that, oh, by the way, they will not agree to that unless it starts in the year 2021. This is hardly a principled position. This is simply about resisting President Trump, his administration, and this administration's ability to do the job the President was elected to do.

What we have proposed is something that will not make nominations easier to be confirmed. The process will be largely the same, and the vote threshold will remain the same. It will simply keep us from wasting valuable time that we should be spending on debating and voting on other important policies, not widely supported nominees.

This certainly isn't as radical a change as many of our Democratic colleagues are presenting it to be. In January of 2013, current Majority Leader SCHUMER and then Majority Leader Harry Reid led the charge to make similar changes in order to process President Obama's nominees.

At that time, Republicans were in the minority. What did we do then? Well, we weren't exactly fans of President Obama's, but he had just been elected to his second term, and suffice it to say that while we were hoping for a different outcome, we weren't about to obstruct his ability to populate and staff the various Departments in the Federal Government. We didn't obstruct nominees. We didn't sulk. We didn't try to prevent the President

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—their 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 to advise and consent.

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 exercise.

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 as well.

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 num-

ber. 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.

He led the most famous 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 lameduck 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. And it wasn't true that it was consistent with our 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 electing 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 a Supreme Court seat. It 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 they used to be.

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 apologize for 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 for 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 hopefully 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 President of the United States.

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 and you were a qualified 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 to 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," a 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 ABA, this nominee 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 with 50 votes. He barely made it, 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 or that are filled with corrupt 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.

Through this decade-long—it is more than that—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 extraconstitutional destruction of the rule of law when he claimed an emergency to fund his wall or to fund \$5 billion for his wall, which, by the way, he said 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 put 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' and say one thing, and they have spent the last 20 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 at an end, what 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.

With 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 and with 78 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 simplified 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, no matter who 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 2021. I am glad you Republicans joined with Democrats, they would say, to help President Obama get nominees, but we will not help President Trump and will block him all the way through. Now, if you want to open this up for 2021, we will be glad to be able to help.

I want to reiterate that Republicans believe whoever the President is, when the American people select a President, they should be able to hire their staff. I wish my Democratic colleagues believed the same thing. Because of that, we are making a change today. I have worked for months, meeting with Democratic colleagues, trying to find some way we could come to an agreement as was done in 2013, where Republicans and Democrats came together to resolve this. I have been rebuffed for 2 years. Not a single Democrat has been willing to join us in this, not a single one. That is unfortunate.

At the end of the day, we will try to restore this body back to how it used to function for two centuries, when every President was allowed to get a hearing for their nominees and get a vote in the Senate. For two centuries, we functioned that way. I think it is not unreasonable to function that way again in this body.

I look forward to this dialogue, and I look forward to the day we can get this issue resolved so we can get back to the work of legislation because we can't even get to legislation right now because we are blocked on nominations. So let's get the nomination issue resolved, as we have for two centuries, and then let's get on to legislation and finish the task.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). 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 this point because 16 years ago 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.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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 debate on the nomination of Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, John Thune, John Cornyn, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Ex.]

#### YEAS—95

|              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Alexander    | Fischer   | Peters     |
| Baldwin      | Gardner   | Portman    |
| Barrasso     | Graham    | Reed       |
| Bennet       | Grassley  | Risch      |
| Blackburn    | Hassan    | Roberts    |
| Blumenthal   | Hawley    | Romney     |
| Blunt        | Heinrich  | Rosen      |
| Booker       | Hirono    | Rounds     |
| Boozman      | Hoeven    | Rubio      |
| Braun        | Inhofe    | Sasse      |
| Brown        | Isakson   | Schatz     |
| Burr         | Johnson   | Schumer    |
| Cantwell     | Jones     | Scott (FL) |
| Capito       | Kaine     | Scott (SC) |
| Cardin       | Kennedy   | Shaheen    |
| Carper       | King      | Shelby     |
| Casey        | Klobuchar | Sinema     |
| Cassidy      | Lankford  | Smith      |
| Collins      | Leahy     | Stabenow   |
| Coons        | Lee       | Sullivan   |
| Cornyn       | Manchin   | Tester     |
| Cortez Masto | Markey    | Thune      |
| Cotton       | McConnell | Tillis     |
| Cramer       | McSally   | Toomey     |
| Crapo        | Menendez  | Udall      |
| Cruz         | Merkley   | Van Hollen |
| Daines       | Moran     | Warner     |
| Duckworth    | Murkowski | Whitehouse |
| Durbin       | Murphy    | Wicker     |
| Enzi         | Murray    | Wyden      |
| Ernst        | Paul      | Young      |
| Feinstein    | Perdue    |            |

#### NAYS—3

|            |         |        |
|------------|---------|--------|
| Gillibrand | Sanders | Warren |
|------------|---------|--------|

#### NOT VOTING—2

|        |            |
|--------|------------|
| Harris | Hyde-Smith |
|--------|------------|

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 95, the nays are 3.

The motion is agreed to.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is a very sad day for the Senate. At a time when Leader MCCONNELL brags about confirming more judges than anyone has done in a very long time, he feels the need to invoke the terribly destructive and disproportionate procedure of the nuclear option in order to fast-track even more of President Trump's ultraconservative nominees to the Federal bench.

Before I discuss that in greater detail, I want to note for the record that Democrats were prepared to confirm the nomination of Mr. Kessler by unanimous consent, so the cloture vote we had was unnecessary.

If you have been listening to Senators debate this issue in recent days, you have heard a lot of claims and

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 all about. I want to issue 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 the far-right agenda that Republicans 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 Republicans 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 healthcare, 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, one 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 conservative groups like the Federalist Society.

Nominees like these started to appear during the George W. Bush administration. Take Miguel Estrada, a Bush nominee with no judicial experience, who held membership 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 constitutional law" and who argued that States should have the right to criminalize homosexuality.

Or take Charles Pickering, who advocated a reduced sentence for a man convicted of burning a cross in the front yard of an interracial couple.

Before the Republicans launched their campaign to remake the courts, neither party would have dared put forward such radical nominees.

Starting with his campaign and into his Presidency, President Donald Trump has been captive—totally captive—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 judicial philosophy, so conservatives didn't trust him. He and his advisers 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 Federalist Society is and continues to be a huge influence on nominees to the circuit courts.

No other Presidential candidate had so willingly and openly outsourced judicial nominations this way, but it mollified the hard right, and the President has dutifully nominated people from the list to the Supreme 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 Senators' bipartisan judicial selection committee about his controversial writings in the past, writings in which he dismissed efforts to increase diversity as mere "race-think," criticized Stanford University's suggested punishment for students who defaced an LGBT pride statue, criticized a student group for protesting against a hotel company that had fired workers trying to unionize, and disregarded the value of university disciplinary actions against students accused of sexual violence. Five of the seven members of Oregon's in-State screening committee, including the committee's chair, 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 nomination was withdrawn.

Consider the nomination of Thomas Farr, who has an extensive record defending discriminatory voting laws and racial gerrymandering in North Carolina. 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 several conditions involving place and length of residence." Amazingly, after something as despicable as that, President Trump and Leader MCCONNELL pushed hard for his nomination, but it could not withstand scrutiny by the Senate and was ultimately withdrawn due to the united Democratic opposition and a few conscientious Republican Senators.

I would note that in the cases of both Mr. Farr and Mr. Bounds, the Republican concerns emerged only at the end of postcloture debate time, which Republicans now propose to limit. Had we had only 2 hours, horrible nominees—way beyond the bounds of normal nomination and discourse, even from conservatives—like Farr, like Bounds would be sitting on the courts today.

I agree with what my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR has said:

Two hours for a lifetime appointment . . . is unacceptable.

She said:

Two hours for a lifetime appointment, with huge influence on people's lives, is unacceptable. It's ridiculous. It's a mockery of how this institution should work.

It is not just the courts. There are many examples in the executive branch as well. Ann Marie Buerkle, nominated to chair the CPSC—just today the Post reported that this nominee blocked action at the Commission to recall hundreds of thousands of potentially defective baby strollers, even in the face of reports that they caused "potentially life-threatening injuries." She even kept Democratic Commissioners in the dark about the investigation.

Of course, there is Chad Readler, who led the charge to end preexisting condition protections. President Trump and Senate Republicans, the self-declared "party of healthcare," rewarded him by overwhelmingly confirming him to a lifetime position as a circuit court judge. Despite Mr. Readler's conspicuous role in trying to curtail Americans' healthcare, no Republicans were willing to stand up to President Trump and vote against his confirmation.

At this point, people listening to these proceedings might be asking themselves: What happened when a Democratic President occupied the White House?

The answer is that Republicans, led by Senator MCCONNELL, remained undeterred. In such times, they chose to employ the extraordinary tactic of denying confirmation to a Democratic President's nominees in order to hold vacancies open until a Republican could regain the Presidency. It was an audacious and insidious gambit, a way to nullify a Democratic President's power to fill judicial vacancies.

We saw this tactic during the Clinton administration, when Republicans on the Judiciary Committee killed a number of President Clinton's quite moderate judicial nominees, even without the basic courtesy of a hearing.

We saw it again during the Obama administration, when Republicans used the filibuster and other forms of delay to more than double the number of circuit and district court vacancies. During Obama's last 2 years in office, the Republican Senate confirmed fewer circuit court nominees than any Congress in 70 years.

Then, in March of 2016, Senator MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans took this maneuver to a new Machiavellian low. They refused to even consider President Obama's nomination to the Supreme Court of the United States, Circuit Judge Merrick Garland, one of the most respected jurists in the Nation, a man known not only for his judicial excellence and perfect judicial temperament but his moderation. In fact, Senator Orrin Hatch, a conservative's conservative and the former chairman of Judiciary Committee, had previously endorsed Judge Garland for the Supreme Court.

But the merits didn't concern Senator MCCONNELL. His cynical strategy required Republicans to block the Garland 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 Constitution. Yet, as the New York Times reported, Senator MCCONNELL said it was one of his "proudest achievements."

After President Trump took office, Republicans sensed an opportunity to grease the conveyor belt even more. Senator MCCONNELL ordered the Judiciary 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 judicial nominees reflected the ideology and values of the State to which they were nominated. It provided some healthy counterbalance against nominees who were outside the mainstream from either party or were lacking in proper qualifications. Thanks to Senate Republicans, led by Senator MCCONNELL, that protection is now history.

So when Republicans complain about Democratic handling of nominees, there is no other word for it but hypocrisy. 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 administration.

The majority leader himself has celebrated the pace of confirmations. He bragged about it to the Heritage Foundation. 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 history.

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 disgrace. That is not the Senate we want. For Leader MCCONNELL to brag about confirming more judges than ever before and then to complain about Democratic obstruction and say that the process is broken so you have to change the rules is the height of hypocrisy.

Leader MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans also complain about the pace of confirmation for President Trump's executive branch and independent Agency choices. They conveniently omit Republicans' sorry record of obstruction 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 subject of executive nominees now, given the appalling history of incompetence, 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 Constitution. They both deserve better than the Senate Republicans' cynical, partisan efforts to turn the Senate into a conveyor belt for ideological conservatives.

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 so they can automate and expedite the nomination process without 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 impartial jurists. It is outrageous.

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 we hold nominees to three simple standards: excellence, moderation, and diversity. These are not ideological litmus tests. They are the pillars of a healthy system of justice. 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 impartially.

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 consideration they deserve. For generations, the Senate has done the work of the American people through consensus, through compromise, and through cooperation. 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 large part thanks to the rules that govern how this Chamber works. It is crucial that those rules not be twisted or abused for partisan advantage.

The majority, by taking 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 minority party, and where longstanding rules have little or no meaning.

I am so sorry my Republican colleagues have gone along with Senator

MCCONNELL's debasement of the Senate. To do this for such blatantly political ends is simply unworthy of this institution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. One of the advantages of having been around the "advice 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 calendar to slow down, obstruct, and prevent Republican Presidents from having nominations confirmed.

I can remember during the Clinton years the urging of both Senator Daschle and Senator Lott—when 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.

The clearest example of why it was never done before is the Clarence Thomas nomination—the most controversial nomination for the Supreme Court in history, with the possible exception of Brett Kavanaugh. He came out of committee with a dead-even 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 Senators—said you have to get 60 votes. Clarence Thomas was confirmed 52 to 48 and has been on the Supreme Court for 30 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 tradition that you don't filibuster the executive 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 got elected in 2000. The alarms go off. They are going to appoint a bunch of crazy rightwingers to the circuit courts.

So my good friend the Democratic leader, at a seminar or a meeting, invited a couple of people named Laurence 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 toolbox, 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 there was a gang of 14 that developed and worked out an agreement, and some of the nominees were confirmed and some weren't. Yet what had been clearly established was that now the norm in the Senate was that you filibuster anybody that you want to on the executive calendar. That had then been established as a matter of practice, and that continued through the Bush years. There was actually an effort to keep Justice Alito from being on the Supreme Court by requiring a filibuster for the purpose of defeating Justice Alito, but it was not successful. A number of circuit judges were stopped.

When we fast-forward to the Obama years, our side used the filibuster twice to defeat two circuit judges over a period of 5½ years. Majority Leader Harry Reid decided, in his zeal, to pack the DC Circuit—that this had gone on long enough. So, in November 2013, I believe it was, the nuclear option was employed. The threshold was lowered to 51 for everybody on the Executive Calendar except for the Supreme Court. The DC Circuit court judges were confirmed. At the time, I said I didn't like the way it was done. I thought maybe those on the other side would rue the day they did it.

Amazingly enough, about a year and a half later, I was the majority leader. Funny how these things change, isn't it?

A number of my Members came up and said: Why don't we change it back.

I said: Look, I don't think we like the way they did it, but this is the way the Executive Calendar was handled for 200 years until Senator SCHUMER and his allies Laurence Tribe and a cast unseen said: Well, why don't we use any tool in the toolbox to stop judicial appointments?

I discouraged our going back to 60 because I had actually seen that both sides had respected their using a simple majority on the Executive Calendar down to 2003, so we didn't.

Now, look, with regard to these continued complaints about Merrick Garland, that is not what this proposal is about. This proposal is about sub-Cabinet appointments and district judges. For those of you who were not here in 2013, it is almost identical to what almost every one of you voted for in 2013—a standing order that lasted 2 years and a good number of us giving President Obama the opportunity to advance these sub-Cabinet appointments and district judges more quickly.

Let's talk about district judges for a minute. Chairman GRASSLEY and Chairman GRAHAM honored the blue slip for district judges. There are 47 of you guys. There is not a single district

judge who comes out here on the calendar who doesn't have two blue slips returned from whomever the Senators are from the home State. What that means is that you guys are not irrelevant on district judge appointments. You are not irrelevant. For example, I tried to get my good friend the Democratic leader to approve a list of 30 district judges last fall, and 14 of them were from blue States. Oh, no. He was not going to do any district judges on a voice vote even if he were for them.

So, look, all this proposal does that we are talking about today is reduce the postcloture time for sub-Cabinet appointments—just like we helped you all do in 2013—and for district judges, none of whom will even be on the calendar until both blue slips are returned positively. It is not exactly a radical change.

Back to Merrick Garland for a minute. Look, I made the decision—and my colleagues on the Republican side joined me in making that decision—because I knew for sure, for absolute certainty, that if the roles were reversed and there were a Republican President and a Democratic Senate, you wouldn't have filled the vacancy. How did I know that? You have to go back to the 1880s to find the last time a vacancy on the Supreme Court occurred in the middle of a Presidential election year and was confirmed by a Senate of a different party from the President's—1880.

Oh, but that was not enough. In 1992, our friend Joe Biden, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, with a Republican in the White House, a Democratic Senate, and no vacancy on the Supreme Court, helpfully opined that if a vacancy occurred, he wouldn't fill it.

Oh, but guess what. Eighteen months before the end of the Bush 43 term, the majority leader of the Senate, Harry Reid, and a fellow named CHUCK SCHUMER said that if a vacancy occurred, they wouldn't fill it. That was 18 months before the end of the Bush term.

On the business of filibustering the Executive Calendar, there is one thing I left out, and I want to catch up here. Back in 2003, when my good friend the Democratic leader started all of this that we have been wrestling with since then, he said: I am the leader of the filibuster movement, and I am proud of it. The Buffalo News, May 27, 2003. I am the leader of the filibuster movement, and I am proud of it. The Buffalo News. CHARLES E. SCHUMER recommended using an extreme tactic—a filibuster—to block some of the Bush administration's nominees for Federal judgeships. Talk about being proud of something. He started this whole thing that we have been wrestling with since 2003. He cooked it up and convinced his colleagues to do it, and once it started, it continued until 2013 when it was turned off.

So, look, where are we? The Executive Calendar is very close to being returned to the way it was treated by

both parties down to 2000—not the legislative calendar but the Executive Calendar. There is nothing radical about this. He is acting like it is a sad day for the Senate. If you want to pick a sad day for the Senate, go back to 2003 when we started filibustering the Executive Calendar. He started it. That was a sad day. This is a glad day. We are trying to end the dysfunction on the Executive Calendar.

Let's talk about dysfunction. There were 128 cloture votes in the last Congress, many of them on 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 circuit 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 nominees until—listen to this—the 1950s, when former Judiciary Committee Chairman James Eastland of Mississippi afforded them the status because he did not want Federal judges who had been appointed by President Eisenhower to interfere with segregationist policies in the Jim Crow South. When he became the Judiciary Committee chairman, our former colleague Ted Kennedy restored blue slips to their historical purpose of ensuring consultation as opposed to serving as a one-Member veto of a qualified judicial nominee.

All we have done is restore blue slips for circuit court nominees to the consultative function they have played for most of their history.

I have been under Presidents of both parties. They do not defer to us on circuit court judges. We don't get to pick them. We almost do get to pick them when they are district court judges and when we are of the same party as the White House. We have a lot of clout because the chairmen honor the blue slips for district court judges. They are entirely contained within our States, and none of them get out here on the floor unless the Senators approve

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?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Ex.]

## YEAS—48

|              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Baldwin      | Hassan    | Reed       |
| Bennet       | Heinrich  | Rosen      |
| Blumenthal   | Hirono    | Sanders    |
| Booker       | Jones     | Schatz     |
| Brown        | Kaine     | Schumer    |
| Cantwell     | King      | Shaheen    |
| Cardin       | Klobuchar | Sinema     |
| Carper       | Leahy     | Smith      |
| Casey        | Lee       | Stabenow   |
| Collins      | Manchin   | Tester     |
| Coons        | Markey    | Udall      |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez  | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth    | Merkley   | Warner     |
| Durbin       | Murphy    | Warren     |
| Feinstein    | Murray    | Whitehouse |
| Gillibrand   | Peters    | Wyden      |

## NAYS—51

|           |            |            |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Alexander | Fischer    | Perdue     |
| Barrasso  | Gardner    | Portman    |
| Blackburn | Graham     | Risch      |
| Blunt     | Grassley   | Roberts    |
| Boozman   | Hawley     | Romney     |
| Braun     | Hoeben     | Rounds     |
| Burr      | Hyde-Smith | Rubio      |
| Capito    | Inhofe     | Sasse      |
| Cassidy   | Isakson    | Scott (FL) |
| Cornyn    | Johnson    | Scott (SC) |
| Cotton    | Kennedy    | Shelby     |
| Cramer    | Lankford   | Sullivan   |
| Crapo     | McConnell  | Thune      |
| Cruz      | McSally    | Tillis     |
| Daines    | Moran      | Toomey     |
| Enzi      | Murkowski  | Wicker     |
| Ernst     | Paul       | Young      |

## 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 the same kind of rules 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 debating 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 debate about 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 judgeship 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 200-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 administration. That didn't happen with 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 around those Cabinet officers 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 waiting 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 leader 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,

even in recent years to now—128 compared to 12. When those 128 people finally got votes, the support was substantial. When they finally got votes, one-third of them got 70 votes or more. Thirteen percent got 90 votes or more. So you have 90 people voting for people that someone insisted we needed 30 hours of debate for, and there wasn't a debate at all.

Twenty district judges had cloture filed on them. Twelve of those district judges had nobody vote against them after 30 hours on the floor, where, in all likelihood, nobody had anything to say during those 30 hours.

The average amount of time that we spent talking about nominees during the 30 hours that has been insisted on is less than 1 hour. The person who generated the most discussion, at least this year, was the new Attorney General. That is a pretty important job. There should have been quite a bit of discussion. In fact, it was our intention—the intention of the standing order that Senator LANKFORD and I filed—and it will continue to be the intention, that that person will still have 30 hours of debate if anybody thought that was necessary.

Supreme Court justices, Cabinet members, and circuit judges would all have 30 hours of debate. But even with the Attorney General, less than 4 hours was used to talk about what everybody listening would believe is one of the most important jobs possible.

For the 10 other nominees who have had cloture filed on them prior to this week, almost no debate time was used. In fact, again, even in the case of Attorney General William Barr, four-thirtieths of the time was used. That means that twenty-six-thirtieths of the time wasn't used, but we couldn't use it for anything else. We couldn't use it for another nominee. We couldn't use it for a piece of legislation. We couldn't use it to talk about how the government spends its money basically to debate an appropriations bill that would be on the floor. It just couldn't happen.

Last week, we confirmed Bridget Bade to be a judge of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. We used less than 1 minute of the 30 hours that the minority insisted on—less than 1 minute of the 30 hours—but nothing else could be done during those 30 hours.

Every Member of the Senate knows that the abuse of this process is done to delay and to keep us from confirming not only other people who need to be confirmed but to keep us from getting to the work we need to get to. It prevents us from taking up other legislation. It prevents us from doing our job.

It has to be discouraging when you talk to people in the future about this: Would you be willing to serve as the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for something? Would you be willing to serve as the Assistant Deputy Secretary of Treasury for IRS? And, by the way, you really can't start anything new, and you may never get voted on.

When you do get voted on, you may not actually be able to serve in that job for more than a few months if you serve the rest of the term of this Presidency.

People will begin to say no, and we all know that.

Today we have 140 people who are waiting to be voted on for jobs they have been nominated for. They are now out of committee. They have done all the paperwork. They have cleared all of the days. They have done everything they needed to do.

When President Reagan was President, the average number of days between the time you were voted out of committee and the time you were voted on on the floor was 5 days. By the time you had gotten out of committee, you had already been weeks, if not months, into this process. Five days later, you would get to know whether or not you were going to get the job.

With President Trump, the average number of days between the time you got out of committee and the time you got voted on was 55. That is 55 days when you are waiting to do the job that you have been willing to do, have answered every question you have been asked, have gone through all of the background checks you needed, and you are still waiting.

This system cannot work that way. We would never get everybody confirmed that a President is required to nominate, which means we also would never have time to get the other things done that the Senate needs to do.

I think the step we took today was an important one. We will talk about another category of people to be confirmed later today—district judges. I believe we will be able to make that change as well. Again, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and the circuit judges would all still have 30 hours available to them.

Our friends on the other side may continue to insist on that, but if they do, I guarantee that if you run a clock on this, in all likelihood nobody will ever use the 30 hours to talk about the nominee. If we didn't do it to talk about William Barr, we are not hardly going to do it to talk about anybody else.

Debate is an important thing. Having the right people in the right job is an important thing. It is also important to have them in the right job at the right time. Today, I believe the Senate is taking important steps to return back to the traditional role of the Senate in confirming nominees and giving Presidents an opportunity to do the job they were elected to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague. He has more institutional knowledge, has been here longer, and 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.

Words cannot express how disappointed I am—I truly am—to stand here as the only Member of the Senate who voted against the nuclear option in 2013 when it was a Democratic proposal and in 2017, the Republican proposal, and now what we did today. I have consistently voted against this because it is not who we are, and it is not about what we are about either.

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 also 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 has voted 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, whose seat I 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 always intended the Senate to be deliberate, and we are known as the most deliberate 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 once a constitutional recognition 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 often 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 represent our States.

Before 1917, there was no way to end a debate in the Senate whatsoever, from our beginning, so one Member could grind this place to a halt for however long they felt necessary. Then, at the urging of President Woodrow Wilson, the Senate adopted rule XXII that year, 1917, and first used it 2 years later to end a filibuster against the Treaty of Versailles.

For the next 80-plus years, some tweaks were made to the rule and its reach was expanded, but there was no real threat to the existence of the rule. In 2005, that all changed when then-Majority Leader Bill Frist made the first serious effort to change the rules of the Senate and reduce the power of every Member of this body by deploying the nuclear option. None other than John McCain and Robert C. Byrd, our dear departed friends, teamed up to form the Gang of 14 that cut a deal on a package of nominations that took the nuclear option off the table—but only for a little while.

In 2013, when Harry Reid and Democrats—my side of the aisle—voted to end the filibuster for Presidential nominees, I was one of only three Democrats to fight and vote against it. The other two, Mark Pryor and Carl Levin, are no longer serving in the Senate today, but we represented all wings of the Democratic Party—from the liberal end, to the conservative end, to the moderate centrist end. We stood together despite our differences because we knew that it would forever lessen the institution of the Senate and that it would come back to bite us when we weren't in the majority. That was the point we made at that time. That was the argument we made and pleaded with our colleagues.

For the past 5 years, we have seen the consequences of those actions. Today, our Republican friends are using the same excuse our Democrats used—historic obstruction. Democrats are using the same argument today that our Republican friends have used—unprecedented overreach. This is the hypocrisy that makes us understand why people think Washington sucks. It is on both sides. No one is innocent on this.

In 2013, the current majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, was furious about what the Democrats were threatening to do. He called it breaking the rules to change the rules. And I agreed with him. He was right. I voted with him.

In 2013, I heard and listened to Leader MCCONNELL when he said:

The American people decided not to give the Democrats the House, or to restore the filibuster proof majority they had 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 get-

ting 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 down 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, 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 Senate was set up by our Founding Fathers to force us to work together. Think about that. They knew that whatever we receive from the House would be hot as 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 vote with my Democratic friends and it makes sense, I tell them the same. If I vote against something of my Republican friends or Democrats, I explain to them. It has nothing to do with politics; it is policy. Does it make sense? Will it 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 Senate by the Constitution of the United States of America and by the Founding Fathers who created this body. Now, how we can do it in such a willing way makes no sense. How do you look people in the eye and say: I gave up my 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 an 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 a balance as I approach these things. And Republicans are—what they have done today is basically the same. We don't have obstructions we can't overcome if we respect each other. You can't blame everybody for everything. You can't blame somebody else for something you are unwilling to do. You can't blame somebody else if you don't have the patience to sit down and talk through your problems and try to understand better. You can't blame somebody else if you are not willing to give and take. That is what the whole process is about if you are going to be successful in life—anyone who has been successful. It is not “my way or the highway”; it is “our way going down the highway together.”

This move is a betrayal of the people we represent, and everyone in this body is complicit. It is a shame that we are going to go back and try to explain our positions with the votes that were made today. It is just a shame. It should never have come to this. For hundreds of years, we have managed to overcome obstructions and preserve our Founders' vision for the Senate, but for the last 6 years, Members on both sides of this aisle have decided that is no longer possible.



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 sorry, 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 chairman 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. Something comes 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 and to protect the institution of the Senate, that is not that hard, and I know because I have done it. I have voted against my colleagues on my side of the aisle. I was up front, and I was honest. I said: I am sorry; I can't go home and explain that. It doesn't make sense at all, and I am not voting for it.

If they want to get my vote, they are going to have to sit down and say: What would it take to get your vote?

And I would explain to them: You have to adjust this or adjust this and make sense.

It is fair to the minority, and if we were in the majority, or vice versa, the majority should be fair to us. If you can work through that, you can make it. You can make it on this side. If not, it is going to be a miserable 6 years for every Senator who just got elected, if we don't come back to reality.

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 no power to protect them now.

The solution to obstruction isn't ruining 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 come to our senses. I hope we act 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.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Michigan.

#### HEALTHCARE

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, not political. Despite all the debates, everything that has gone on around healthcare, for every family in Michigan and across the country and for every one of us, healthcare is personal, not political.

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 ins and outs of 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 over 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 could be working across the aisle right now to expand access to care and improve quality and reduce costs. This is something I work to do all the time. Instead, they are, once again, trying to take away your healthcare.

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. 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 Medicaid—their parents and their moms. That is taking healthcare away from two in three seniors who get their nursing home care from Medicaid healthcare. That is taking away healthcare from everyone who has benefited from expanding 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, and 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 to 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 into the budget 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 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 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 prenatal care, which is pretty basic as part of healthcare for women. Remember when being a woman was considered a preexisting condition? That is what we meant. These plans are bringing that back, which means if you are a woman, you have to pay more to be able to get basic healthcare, and that is wrong. We did away with that 10 years ago.

In July, the Trump administration slashed funding for programs that help people enroll in 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 are things like not getting dropped if you get sick. Prior to the Affordable Care Act, so many times people said to me: I have paid for insurance all my life and never needed it. I finally need it, and I got dropped after I got sick. What do you mean it only covers 1 day in the hospital or doesn't cover maternity care? What do you mean the insurance company can cap the number of cancer treatments I need? Isn't that up to my doctor?

Well, it is now, and it has been under the Affordable Care Act. Instead, we are in a situation where they are trying to get States to waive consumer protections and put decisions back in the hands of insurance companies.

Thanks to all of this sabotage, it is estimated that comprehensive health insurance costs 16.6 percent more this year than it otherwise would.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my statement, which will be about 2 minutes.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much.

It is estimated that comprehensive health insurance costs 16.6 percent more this year than it otherwise would because of all of this sabotage, upheaval, and chaos in the healthcare markets.

In case those sabotage attempts were too subtle, 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 Senate Republicans support what President Trump is doing, they passed a budget resolution out of committee last week through a partisan vote—only Republican votes—that includes repeal of the Affordable Care Act with no replacement in place.

In the meantime, the Affordable Care Act could be struck down by the courts, and more than 20 million people who gained health coverage through the Affordable Care Act could be out of luck.

Let me say, in conclusion, that just this week I heard from one of those 20 million people. Lisa from Norton Shores graduated with a marketing degree in the middle of a recession and worked a low-wage job at the local hospital for 8 years. When a part-time, temporary job opened up at a local marketing agency, the Affordable Care Act allowed Lisa to take the job and get the experience she needed for a career in her field. She was able to get healthcare separately from her job. That job led to another marketing job with a local company—this one with benefits.

A few years later, the original marketing agency offered Lisa a full-time job. Once again, the ACA allowed her to take it. Lisa wrote this:

It was only through the Affordable Care Act that I have been able to pull myself up to be a contributing member of society. It has allowed me to rise to my capabilities.

She added that if the ACA is overturned, "I will have to leave this job

for a position that includes health insurance. It would kill this awesome small business I work for. . . . This will be a top priority for me when I vote in 2020."

Lisa and millions of other people are sending a message. The only question is, Are folks listening?

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

#### KESSLER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kessler nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

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 debate on the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Rick Scott, Mike Rounds, Marco Rubio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be the United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Ex.]

YEAS—66

|           |         |              |
|-----------|---------|--------------|
| Alexander | Burr    | Cortez Masto |
| Barrasso  | Capito  | Cotton       |
| Blackburn | Cardin  | Cramer       |
| Blunt     | Cassidy | Crapo        |
| Boozman   | Collins | Cruz         |
| Braun     | Cornyn  | Daines       |

|            |           |            |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Duckworth  | Jones     | Rounds     |
| Durbin     | Kaine     | Rubio      |
| Enzi       | Kennedy   | Sasse      |
| Ernst      | Lankford  | Scott (FL) |
| Feinstein  | Lee       | Scott (SC) |
| Fischer    | Manchin   | Shaheen    |
| Gardner    | McConnell | Shelby     |
| Graham     | McSally   | Sinema     |
| Grassley   | Moran     | Sullivan   |
| Hassan     | Murkowski | Tester     |
| Hawley     | Perdue    | Thune      |
| Hoeven     | Portman   | Tillis     |
| Hyde-Smith | Risch     | Toomey     |
| Inhofe     | Roberts   | Warner     |
| Isakson    | Romney    | Wicker     |
| Johnson    | Rosen     | Young      |

NAYS—33

|            |           |            |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Baldwin    | Hirono    | Reed       |
| Bennet     | King      | Sanders    |
| Blumenthal | Klobuchar | Schatz     |
| Booker     | Leahy     | Schumer    |
| Brown      | Markey    | Smith      |
| Cantwell   | Menendez  | Stabenow   |
| Carper     | Merkley   | Udall      |
| Casey      | Murphy    | Van Hollen |
| Coons      | Murray    | Warren     |
| Gillibrand | Paul      | Whitehouse |
| Heinrich   | Peters    | Wyden      |

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 33. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I understand the majority is considering another change to how judicial nominees are considered.

My understanding is the majority leader may move to break the rules of the Senate and cut the time that Senators can debate nominees after cloture is invoked from 30 hours to 2 hours.

Just yesterday, the Senate rejected this change. The Lankford resolution was voted on and did not receive 60 votes, let alone the 67 votes required to change the rules.

The resolution would also have changed postcloture debate time on circuit court and Supreme Court nominees from 30 hours total to 30 hours divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. This means debate on a Supreme Court nomination could be limited to only 15 total hours of debate.

Despite bipartisan opposition to the Lankford resolution, the majority is now considering limiting debate time by breaking longstanding rules of the Senate.

Changing the rules is not only unnecessary, but also is dangerous, especially when we are talking about lifetime appointments. Further, given this administration's failure to properly vet its own nominees, the Senate should not restrict critical vetting and due diligence.

There is simply no need to limit debate on President Trump's judicial nominees. In fact, President Trump's

judicial nominees have been confirmed at a record pace.

Through his first 2 years in office, President Trump had more circuit court nominees confirmed than any other President had at the same point in their tenure—30 total. That is on top of two Supreme Court Justices and 53 district court judges.

Further, the current administration's circuit court nominees have been confirmed nearly twice as fast as 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 required the majority to hold rollcall 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 those nominees were confirmed unanimously.

In addition, we are right now in postcloture 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 time on Mr. Altman's nomination.

Despite all of this, Republicans are nevertheless breaking the rules and pushing the Senate 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 meant 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 same 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 Buescher, 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.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the postcloture time under rule XXII for all judicial nominations, other than circuit courts or Supreme Court of the United States, is 2 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the point of order is not sustained.

APPEALING RULING OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MCCONNELL. I appeal the ruling of the Chair and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Ex.]

YEAS—48

|              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Baldwin      | Hassan    | Reed       |
| Bennet       | Heinrich  | Rosen      |
| Blumenthal   | Hirono    | Sanders    |
| Booker       | Jones     | Schatz     |
| Brown        | Kaine     | Schumer    |
| Cantwell     | King      | Shaheen    |
| Cardin       | Klobuchar | Sinema     |
| Carper       | Leahy     | Smith      |
| Casey        | Lee       | Stabenow   |
| Collins      | Manchin   | Tester     |
| Coons        | Markey    | Udall      |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez  | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth    | Merkley   | Warner     |
| Durbin       | Murphy    | Warren     |
| Feinstein    | Murray    | Whitehouse |
| Gillibrand   | Peters    | Wyden      |

NAYS—51

|           |            |            |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Alexander | Fischer    | Perdue     |
| Barrasso  | Gardner    | Portman    |
| Blackburn | Graham     | Risch      |
| Blunt     | Grassley   | Roberts    |
| Boozman   | Hawley     | Romney     |
| Braun     | Hoeben     | Rounds     |
| Burr      | Hyde-Smith | Rubio      |
| Capito    | Inhofe     | Sasse      |
| Cassidy   | Isakson    | Scott (FL) |
| Cornyn    | Johnson    | Scott (SC) |
| Cotton    | Kennedy    | Shelby     |
| Cramer    | Lankford   | Sullivan   |
| Crapo     | McConnell  | Thune      |
| Cruz      | McSally    | Tillis     |
| Daines    | Moran      | Toomey     |
| Enzi      | Murkowski  | Wicker     |
| Ernst     | Paul       | Young      |

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate overrides the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

S. 972

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 colleague, 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 through 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 chairman 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 into law without further delay.

The RESA bill would reform our retirement savings laws in several important areas. For example, it would improve on an existing type of 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 far more feasible for 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 smaller 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 as workers at Fortune 500 companies have.

RESA also would create a new fiduciary safe harbor for employers that allow employees to invest in lifetime-income arrangements like annuities. 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 career.

This bill encourages employers to provide the kinds of tools and flexibility that employees need to plan for a financially secure retirement. RESA also would help employees 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 involves an option 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 a "stretch IRA."

The bill maintains this savings option for people who inherit an IRA or retirement account, but it places 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 to make it easier for Americans to save. 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 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding 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.

S. RES. 50

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.

Delays 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, only to spend 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 all of the 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—230 days. These are qualified nominees from my home State of North Dakota and the Presiding Officer'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 nominees to the highest levels of government, including the Supreme Court, circuit court, and for Cabinet-level officials.

This reform does streamline the process for other important 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 qualified 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 \$6.5 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 would 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 frightening 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, if 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 send 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 pretty rural. It is not just East Cleveland or Over-the-Rhine in Cincinnati. 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 home; 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. The 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. These 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 staffs, and most Americans who own homes, especially 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 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 in charge of housing.

Dr. Calabria has called for repealing 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 making housing affordable would 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 the end of the entities he would oversee that contribute to this housing market.

It is pretty clear—over his years of writing—whose side he is on. During the financial crisis, when Wall Street wrecked the economy and American communities were left to clean up the mess, Dr. Calabria blamed homeowners for this. He called homeowners who were underwater on their mortgage "deadbeats." Think about that. The guy who is going to oversee the whole housing agency market for the U.S. 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 home is worth less than what you owe the bank for your mortgage. That is called 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, Dr. Calabria calls these people 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 lived in the first half of 2007 had more foreclosures than had any ZIP Code 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 home, after 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 central nervous systems.

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 aren't deadbeats. They work hard. 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 economy was in a free fall. 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. The Hardest Hit Fund helps States like Ohio and Indiana and Arizona and Florida. It helps us weather a crisis. The housing markets and the workers in those States were devastated. The Hardest Hit Fund helped more than 25,000 struggling homeowners. It was not enough because the effort from the Senate was not enough, but it helped in the tearing down of thousands of plighted homes; it helped to make neighborhoods safer; and it helped them to recover.

Dr. Calabria said the Hardest Hit Fund was just subsidizing States because their housing markets were getting more affordable. What kind of per-

son thinks this way? What kind of person says these things? What kind of person is so hardhearted that he or she would possibly take these positions if he or she knows any of these people? Maybe he needs to go out and get to know some of these people.

We asked about his solution. He said we should just let prices fall. He would sit back and let homeowners suffer and communities suffer because of Wall Street's greed. This is the man the President of the United States and, apparently, the majority leader in the Senate—down the hall—want to lead in the overseeing of the housing finance in this country.

In more than 100 blog posts, articles, and papers, Dr. Calabria made his views clear. He said the goal of housing reform should actually be to shrink our mortgage market, that we should eliminate the GSEs and the Federal Housing Administration. My colleagues who plan to support his nomination today or tomorrow or whenever the vote comes should not act surprised if he raises costs for borrowers, if he makes it more difficult to develop affordable housing, or if he cuts off access to homeownership for American families. That is exactly what he has advocated for in his entire career.

This is a critical job. It is why nominees like him should be debated. Americans should have the chance to make their voices heard on a nominee like him, who can make it harder for them to buy homes.

My colleague down the hall is Senator MCCONNELL. He has the office 100 feet or so down the hall in which you see high-powered, expensive, suited, well-compensated lobbyists going in and out all day, streaming in and out. They are writing tax bills, fighting for the oil companies, enriching the pharmaceutical companies, and all of the kinds of things that lobbyists down the hall do who, I was going to say, work for Senator MCCONNELL. They don't actually work for Senator MCCONNELL, but they help Senator MCCONNELL with part of what his political organization is. As a result, Senator MCCONNELL, in order to help these special interests, is changing the Senate rules.

It is not enough that Senator MCCONNELL blocked a Supreme Court Justice for over a year. It is not enough that Senator MCCONNELL supports all of the dark money in politics or that billionaires can put money into political campaigns and nobody knows exactly where the money comes from. It is not enough that the Supreme Court is now controlled by the corporate elite in this country. It is not enough that the Senate is controlled by the corporate elite. It is not enough that the White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives except on the day it looks like a retreat for oil company executives, except on the day it looks like a retreat for big drug companies. That is not enough for Senator MCCONNELL. So what is he going to do? He is going to change the rules. He is going

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 power 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 mortgage. Think about that.

We shouldn't be rushing these people through. We need time for the people we serve to make their voices heard. 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 who will take the job at the FHFA seriously and 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 Car-

dinal 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 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 Cardinals 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, fend 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 exercises he 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 are close to 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 that we spend 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 measure directs the Secretary of the Interior to implement the Drought Contingency Plan agreements upon their execution by the seven basin States. The 2007 final environmental impact statement on Colorado River Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin 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.

I ask Senator MCSALLY, is that the correct reading of the bill?

Ms. MCSALLY. I thank Chairman MURKOWSKI. 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 an emergency response to 19 years of 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 within the analyses 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 environmental compliance is only applicable should 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. It 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 to move water from the Initial Units 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 provides a mechanism 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.

This legislation enables the goals of the DCP to be met by authorizing the storage and release of water in CRSP initial units, without charge, for a demand management plan approved by the Upper Division states and the Upper Colorado River Commission. This water will be delivered into such storage pursuant to the law of, and at the direction and control of, the State from which the water is delivered, subject to approval of the Upper Colorado River Commission. Development of the Demand Management Plan, which will include water accounting mechanisms and other operational factors, will require hard work by all four upper basin States, but once completed will be a critical tool for these states to improve their water security.

I ask Senator BENNET, who has been involved throughout the development of this bill, does he agree with my characterization?

Mr. BENNET. I thank Senator GARDNER. I agree with his assessment and those of Chairman MURKOWSKI, Senator MCSALLY, and Senator CORTEZ MASTO, 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 would be needed if Federal actions are outside the scope of effects analyzed in the existing compliance and decision documents.

I ask Senator SINEMA, if this is 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 of Arizona, and 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 reliable and secure 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? Is what he has 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 beautiful Blues 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 traders 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 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 43rd State.

A notorious 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 lead 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 CRAPO, 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 in 1954 and aided the French 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 received a fellowship under 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 Hialeah 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, Douglas 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 JEFF BECKER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jeff Becker, the Lee County Teacher of the Year from Island Coast High School in Cape Coral, FL.

Jeff believes building trust with his students is important for their future success. Every morning, Jeff greets students as they walk into the building and spends his lunch break in the cafeteria getting to know everyone.

Jeff is the digital media technology teacher, where he strives for his students to learn video skills. He is credited with transforming the school's news program, winning Best High School News Show at the Lee County Film Festival Awards in his first year of teaching.

He was previously in sales for 4 years and noted that, while he was having a fun time, he felt as though he should be doing something else with his life. He became a guidance counselor at Cape Coral High School in 2011 after earning his master's degree in elementary and secondary school counseling at Wilmington University.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Jeff for his dedication to the

students at his school and look forward to hearing of his continued good work in the years to come.●

#### 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 test.

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 HRITZ

• 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 views teaching as a 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 succeed. Her students 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 POEPPERLING

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Bryan Poepperling, 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 with emotion to receive this award 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 launched an organization aimed 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 is helping improve 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 "Safest 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 exchange. RIQI took 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 recognized 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 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

MEASURES REFERRED

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 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 7. An act 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.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

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 authorized 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.

EC-845. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cost Sharing: Energy Policy Act of 2005" ((RIN1991-AC13) (2

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's 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, a report entitled "Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-849. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Fiscal Year 2018 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Agency Privacy Management Report; to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and Appropriations.

EC-850. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, 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-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. Act 23-47, "Sense of the Council Urging the Federal Government to Prevent Nuclear War Resolution of 2019"; 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 "Uniformed 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 57th Annual Report of the activities of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### 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; 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 country roads, 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:

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 123. A resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments.

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.

Nominee: 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 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, and donee:

1. Self: \$0.00.
2. Spouse: \$1000.00, May 30, 2017, Dean Heller.
3. Children and Spouses: Sharon Shaw: none. Robert Shaw: none. Christine Abizaid: see attachment. Jill Murphy: see attachment. David Abizaid: none. Joanna Abizaid: none.
4. Parents: Ernest Abizaid—deceased; Fae Williams Abizaid—deceased.
5. Grandparents: Arthur Jepsen—deceased; Elva Jepsen—deceased; Amin Abizaid—deceased; Martha Abizaid—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Arthur Q. Jepsen: none; Gail Jepsen—deceased.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Sandra Burk—deceased; Richard Burk—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, Beto for Texas, VA, Federal Government, 11/03/2018, \$25.00.
- Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 11/03/2018, \$25.00.
- Murphy, Jill, Beto for Texas, VA, Federal Government, 10/27/2018, \$25.00.
- Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 10/27/2018, \$25.00.
- Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Federal Government, 10/27/2018, \$2.50.
- Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Fed Gov, 09/25/2018, \$5.00.
- Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Fed Gov, 09/25/2018, \$50.00.
- Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Fed Gov, 09/19/2018, \$50.00.
- Murphy, Jill, ActBlue, VA, Fed Gov, 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, 09/10/2018, \$100.00.
- Abizaid, Christy, Gina Ortiz Jones for Congress, TX, Dell, 09/01/2018, \$350.00.
- Abizaid, Christy, Gina Ortiz Jones for Congress, TX, Dell, 07/30/2018, \$500.00.
- Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, \$5.00.
- Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 04/20/2018, \$50.00.
- Abizaid, Christy, Elissa Slotkin for Congress, TX, se, 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, se, 02/20/2018, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 02/20/2018, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 02/20/2018, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, Elissa Slotkin for Congress, TX, se, 01/20/2018, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 01/20/2018, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 01/20/2018, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, Elissa Slotkin for Congress, TX, self-employed, 12/20/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 11/27/2017, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 11/27/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 11/20/2017, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 11/20/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, Elissa Slotkin for Congress, TX, self-employed, 11/20/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 10/27/2017, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 10/27/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 10/20/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 10/20/2017, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, Elissa Slotkin for Congress, TX, self-employed, 10/20/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 09/27/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 09/20/2017, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 08/20/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 08/20/2017, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 07/20/2017, \$50.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 07/20/2017, \$5.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 06/19/2017, \$25.00.  
 Abizaid, Christy, ActBlue, TX, self, 06/19/2017, \$2.00.

Stephen Akard, of Indiana, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Stephen J. Akard.  
 Post: Office of Foreign Missions.

(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: \$250.00, 10-01-2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$200.00, 09-30-2016, Donald J. Trump for President; \$250.00, 01-18-2016, Friends of Kip Tom.
  2. Spouse: Kay Akard: None.
  3. Children and Spouses: Julianne Akard: None; Claire Akard: None; Hope Akard: None.
  4. Parents: L. Philip Akard—Deceased; Julianne Akard—Deceased.
  5. Grandparents: William Akard—Deceased; Flava Akard—Deceased; Johannes Herzog—Deceased; Dorothea Herzog—Deceased.
  6. Brothers and Spouses: John Akard: None; Mark Akard: None; Matthew Akard: None; Maconna Akard (sp): None; Luke Akard: None; Carol Akard (sp): None.
  7. Sisters and Spouses: Dorothy Swartzell: None; David Swartzell (sp): None; Sarah Wilson: \$100.00, 10-07-2018, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$100.00, 09-20-2018, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 12-17-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$100.00, 12-03-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$100.00, 12-03-2017, Roy

Moore for U.S. Senate; \$100.00, 11-20-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 11-04-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 09-23-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 09-17-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 08-11-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 08-11-2017, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 11-18-2015, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$25.00, 10-08-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$25.00, 10-08-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 10-08-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 10-08-2016, Committee to Elect Darryl Glenn; \$50.00, 10-08-2016, Committee to Elect Darryl Glenn; \$50.00, 08-17-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 08-17-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$50.00, 08-17-2016, Committee to Elect Darryl Glenn; \$50.00, 08-17-2016, Committee to Elect Darryl Glenn; \$50.00, 07-10-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$25.00, 04-19-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$25.00, 04-19-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$25.00, 04-19-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$25.00, 04-19-2016, Senate Conservatives Fund; \$25.00, 04-19-2016, Stutzman for Senate; John Wilson (sp): 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, and 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; \$40,725.00, 11/30/2017, Republican National Committee; \$9,275.00, 11/30/2017, Republican National Committee; \$5,000.00, 10/26/2017, HALPAC; \$1,500.00, 10/19/2017, Reaching for a Brighter America PAC; \$24,625.00, 8/29/2017, Republican National Committee; \$1,200.00, 8/29/2017, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; \$2,700.00, 8/29/2017, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; \$50,000.00, 8/1/2017, Strengthen Majority Committee (\$25,000 went to NRSC and \$24,625 went to RNC, \$1,200 to Kay Granger Campaign Fund, and \$2,700 to Kay Granger Campaign Fund); \$25,000.00, 8/1/2017, NRSC; \$1,000.00, 5/16/2017, Mike Rogers for Congress; \$1,500.00, 5/12/2017, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; \$125,000.00, 1/16/2018, Trump Victory; \$2,700.00, 5/9/2018, Martha Roby for Congress.
  2. Children and Spouses: Christopher John Blanchard: deceased. Benjamin Nicholas Blanchard: \$1,000.00, 8/11/2017, Kay Granger Campaign Fund. Haleyann Denise Blanchard: None. Keren Cesia Blanchard: None. Jennifer Ruth Blanchard: None. Gracie Mae Blanchard: None. Lizbeth Lucero Blanchard: None.
  3. Parents: Peggy Cleveland Powell—None; Dwight Merrill Cleveland—deceased. John Miller Powell (step)—None.
  4. Grandparents: Oscar Hale—deceased; Stella Hale—deceased; Richard Scales (step)—deceased; Ann Scales—deceased; Mr. Cleveland—deceased when father was a child, did not know him.
  5. Brothers and Spouses: Mitchell Tyson Powell (step)—\$6,000.00, 7/19/2017, Kay Granger Campaign Fund; Michelle Brenny Powell—None.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Yvonne Annette Schneckengerger—None; Donald Michael Schneckengerger—None; Cynthia Cleveland Burnside—None; Sheldon John Burnside—None.

MARCH 4, 2019.

Hon. JIM RISCH,  
 Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
 U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT MENEDEZ,  
 Ranking Member, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
 U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER MENEDEZ: Please update my Committee Questionnaire and my Federal Campaign Contribution Report based on the information outlined below.

Committee Questionnaire: Part B. Question 6, entitled "Political Contributions" should be amended to include the following contributions:

1. Self: An Additional \$2,700.00, 5/9/2018, Martha Roby for Congress.

Federal Campaign Contribution Report: The "self" section of my Federal Campaign Contribution Report should be amended to include the following contributions:

An Additional \$2,700.00, 5/9/2018, Martha Roby for Congress.

Please note the FEC reflects six campaign contributions for 2018. I made two campaign contributions—one to Martha Roby's campaign, and one to Trump Victory. Martha Roby's campaign divided the contribution into two smaller amounts (one for the primary election and one for general election).

I have confirmed with Elise Dickens, of the Republican National Committee, that there is one contribution filed under my name in 2018 to Trump Victory, the joint fundraising committee between the RNC and Donald J. Trump campaign, in the amount of \$125,000 on January 16, 2018. This came as a result of a \$250,000 joint check from myself and John Blanchard, and \$125K was allocated to each person.

She further advised, once a check is received by Trump Victory, the RNC and Donald J. Trump campaign can then transfer their legally designated amounts.

The Breakdown of the \$125,000 Trump Victory contribution—

- \$2,700 to Donald J. Trump (primary) on 1/16/18
- \$2,700 to Donald J. Trump (general) on 1/16/18

\$85,700 to RNC (building fund) on 1/16/18  
 \$33,900 to RNC (general account) on 1/16/18  
 \*\*this has not been reported yet on FEC since the RNC has not transferred it over from the Trump Victory account.

\$125,000 total to Trump Victory in 2018  
 Thank you and the Committee for consideration of my nomination.

Sincerely,  
 LYNDIA BLANCHARD.

Joseph Cella, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu.

Nominee: Joseph James Cella.  
 Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Fiji, the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu.

(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, and donee:

1. Self: \$375, 5–12–06, Fidelis America PAC; \$250, 9–7–08, McCain-Palin Victory 2008; \$250, 9–29–08 Republican National Committee; \$150, 3–31–12 Rick Santorum for President, Inc.; \$100, 3–31–12, Rick Santorum for President, Inc.
2. Spouse: Kristen Renee Cella: \$500, 9–30–11, The American Way—Durant 2012.
3. Children: Francesca Teresa Cella: \$0; John Paul Cornelius Cella: \$0; Dominic Paschal Cella: \$0; Rita Rose Benedicta Cella: \$0; Mariana Lucia Cella: \$0; Anthony Gilbert Cella: \$0.
4. Parents: Janice Jean Cella: \$0; Robert Francis Cella: \$0 (deceased).
5. Grandparents: Irene Rose: (deceased) \$0; Emmett Rose: (deceased) \$0; Angela Cella: (deceased) \$0; Joseph Cella: (deceased) \$0.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Robert Francis Cella: \$35, 11–1–16, Make America Great Again PAC; Kelli Anne Cella: \$0.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Christina Marie Cella: \$27, 2–13–16, ActBlue; \$2.70, 2–13–16, ActBlue; \$50.00, 3–16–16, ActBlue; \$15.00, 3–31–16, ActBlue; \$50.00, 4–18–16, ActBlue; John Paul Nelson: \$3.86, 11–5–16, ActBlue; \$2.70, 11–5–16, ActBlue; \$3.86, 11–5–16, ActBlue; \$3.85, 11–5–16, ActBlue; \$3.86, 11–5–16, ActBlue; \$3.86, 11–5–16, ActBlue; \$15.00, 12–16–06, ActBlue; \$5.00, 1–2–17, ActBlue; \$5.00, 1–24–17, ActBlue; \$11.00, 1–30–17, ActBlue; \$11.00, 2–27–17, ActBlue; \$2.50, 4–17–17, ActBlue; \$11.00, 5–25–17, ActBlue; \$2.50, 6–18–17, ActBlue; \$2.50, 6–18–17, ActBlue.

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 the 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.
5. Grandparents: John R. and Elizabeth K. Fitzpatrick—deceased. Joseph A. and Katherine D. McDonough—deceased.
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.

Kenneth S. George, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

Nominee: Kenneth Suggett George.

Post, Ambassador, Uruguay.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

- Kenneth Suggett George, Self: \$1,000.00, 04.02.2012, Elizabeth Ames Jones for Texas Senate; \$500.00, 04.02.2012, Christi L. Craddock (Texas Railroad Commission); \$2,500.00, 02.08.2013, Friends of Jeb Hensarling; \$2,500.00, 05.29.2013, Republican National Committee; \$2,000.00, 08.16.2016, Republican National Committee; \$1,000.00, 09.06.2013, Dallas Entrepreneur PAC; \$1,200.00, 09.09.2013, Committee to Protect Prosperity and Free Enterprise; \$200.00, 09.09.2013, Keith Rothfus

for Congress; \$200.00, 09.30.2013, Gary G. Miller for Congress; \$2,600.00, 11.25.2013, French Hill for Arkansas; \$1,000.00, 02.27.2014, Edward W. Gillespie for Senate; \$2,600.00, 03.17.2014, Friends of Jeb Hensarling; \$500.00, 03.26.2014, Texans for Dan Patrick; \$500.00, 04.21.2014, Sean Duffy for Wisconsin; \$500.00, 05.23.2014, Chart H. Westcott; \$2,600.00, 06.05.2014, French Hill for Arkansas; \$40.00, 07.12.2014, Libertarian Party of Texas; \$5,000.00, 10.17.2014, Texans for Dan Patrick; \$1,250.00, 12.13.2014, Texans for Dan Patrick; \$2,500.00, 12.15.2014, Morgan D. Meyer; \$107.50, 03.23.2015, Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers; \$2,200.00, 06.16.2015, Rick Perry; \$2,700.00, 11.13.2015, Ted Cruz for President; \$2,700.00, 11.20.2015, Marco Rubio for President; \$100.00, 06.14.2016, Texans for Greg Abbott; \$2,000.00, 08.17.2016, Trump Victory; \$2,700.00, 08.24.2016, Trump Victory; \$1,000.00, 08.29.2016, Donald B. Huffines; \$250.00, 08.31.2016, Dallas County Council of Republican Women; \$2,500.00, 10.26.2016, Texans for Dan Patrick; \$1,000.00, 11.03.2016, Sid Miller; \$5,000.00, 01.11.2017, Trump for America, Inc.; \$2,700.00, 02.28.2017, Friends of Jeb Hensarling; \$1,000.00, 03.21.2017, Faith Johnson for Dallas County District Attorney; \$2,700.00, 03.29.2017, Pete Sessions for Congress; \$1,000.00, 06.19.2017, Republican Party of Texas; \$1,000.00, 10.18.2017, Faith Johnson for Dallas County District Attorney; \$1,000.00, 10.19.2017, Van Taylor for Congress; \$2,700.00, 10.20.2017, Trump Victory; \$2,700.00, 10.26.2017, Pete Sessions for Congress; \$1,000.00, 10.30.2017, Republican Challengers Fund; \$2,500.00, 12.28.2017, Estes for Texas; \$2,500.00, 12.28.2017, Miller for Texas; \$500.00, 12.31.2017, Bunni Pounds for Congress; \$2,500.00, 01.18.2018, Dallas County Republican Party-Primary; \$1,500.00, 03.27.2018, Jake Ellzey for Congress; \$2,200.00, 05.23.2018, Bunni Pounds for Congress; \$1,500.00, 05.23.2018, Jake Ellzey for Congress; \$5,000.00, 10.19.2018, Pete Sessions for Congress; \$2,700.00, 10.22.2018, French Hill for Arkansas; \$1,000.00, 10.22.2018, Lisa Luby Ryan, Texas State Representative Campaign; \$2,700.00, 11.05.2018, Van Taylor for Congress.

Patricia Mast George, Spouse: \$2,600.00, 09.30.2013, Pete Sessions for Congress; \$2,600.00, 12.09.2013, French Hill for Arkansas; \$1,000.00, 02.20.2014, Texans for John Cornyn, Inc.; \$2,500.00, 06.30.2014, Friends of Jeb Hensarling; \$2,700.00, 03.31.2015, Pete Sessions for Congress; \$1,200.00, 09.02.2015, Committee to Protect Prosperity and Free Enterprise; \$300.00, 09.02.2015, Bruce Poliquin for Congress; \$300.00, 09.02.2015, Thomas Earl Emmer, Jr. for Congress; \$300.00, 09.30.2015, French Hill for Arkansas; \$2,700.00, 11.07.2016, Friends of Jeb Hensarling; \$2,700.00, 11.07.2016, Pete Sessions for Congress; \$2,700.00, 06.30.2017, Pete Sessions for Congress; \$2,700.00, 10.23.2017, Trump Victory; \$500.00, 02.01.2018, Van Taylor Campaign; \$500.00, 02.19.2018, Vic Cunningham Campaign; \$1,000.00, 05.08.2018, War Veterans Fund benefitting Mike Waltz, Dan Crenshaw, Clayton Hinchman, Jake Ellzey and Lynne Blankenship; \$500.00, 05.15.2018, Bunni Pounds for Congress; \$2,700.00, 07.04.2018, French Hill for Arkansas; \$1,000.00, 09.17.2018, Dallas Entrepreneurs—Sessions 2018; \$500.00, 09.24.2018, Morgan Meyer Campaign; \$500.00, 10.14.2018, Crenshaw for Congress.

Kenneth Suggett George II, Son: None.

Carolyn Dudley George, Son.

Patrick Sarsfield George, Son: \$2,700.00, 06.30.2015, Rick Perry for President; \$1,000.00, 12.14.2015, Marco Rubio for President; \$1,000.00, 05.31.2017, Republican Party of Texas; \$25.00, 06.05.2017, Republican Party of Texas; \$25.00, 07.05.2017, Republican Party of Texas; \$100.00, 07.14.2017, Ted Cruz for Senate; \$25.00, 08.05.2017, Republican Party of Texas; \$25.00, 09.05.2017, Republican Party of Texas; \$25.00, 11.05.2017, Republican Party of Texas; \$25.00, 12.09.2017, Republican Party of Texas;

\$200.00, 05.12.2018, Texas for Jake Ellzey; \$1,000.00, 05.12.2018, War Veterans Fund benefitting Mike Waltz, Dan Crenshaw, Clayton Hinchman, Jake Ellzey and Lynne Blankenship; \$200.00, 05.12.2018, Lynne Blankenship for Congress; \$200.00, 05.29.2018, Michael Waltz for Congress; \$50.00, 07.14.2018, Trump Make America Great Again Campaign; \$50.00, 07.19.2018, Trump Make America Great Again Campaign; \$25.00, 09.05.2018, Republican Party of Texas.

Elizabeth Secrest George, Spouse: \$2,700.00, 06.30.2015, Rick Perry for President.

Clement Roberdeau George, Son: \$1,000.00, 12.02.2015, Marco Rubio for President.

Molly Cooper George, Spouse: None.

Elizabeth George Gosselin, Daughter: None.

Chase Karl Gosselin, Spouse: None.

Clement Enos George, Father: Deceased.

Betty Suggett George, Mother: Deceased.

Gransparents, Long Deceased.

Meredith George Tinsley, Sister: None.

Edward R. Tinsley, Brother-in-Law: \$1,000.00, 05.22.2014, National Restaurant Association PAC; \$500.00, 06.29.2015, Friends of John Boehner; \$1,000.00, 12.28.2015, National Restaurant Association PAC.

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 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, and donee:

- Self: \$177,563.00, 2013–present.  
 Spouse (deceased): N/A, N/A, N/A.  
 Children and Spouses: Sophie Gunter: None, N/A, N/A. Simon Gunter, None, N/A, N/A.  
 Parents: Milton Gunter (deceased): N/A, N/A, N/A. Sally Gunter (deceased): N/A, N/A, N/A.  
 Grandparents: Seymour Mintz (deceased): N/A, N/A, N/A. Jenny Mintz (deceased): N/A, N/A, N/A. Jacob Gunter (deceased): N/A, N/A, N/A. Sadie Gunter (deceased): N/A, N/A, N/A.  
 Brothers and Spouses: N/A, N/A, N/A.  
 Sisters and Spouses: Elyse Gunter: None, N/A, N/A.

Category, contributor, location, occupation, date, amount, recipient.

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 3/13/2014, \$2,600.00, Collins, Susan M (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 3/13/2014, \$2,600.00, Collins, Susan M (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 4/30/2014, \$2,600.00, McConnell, Mitch (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Jeffrey Ross Gunter MD Inc., 7/18/2014, \$2,600.00, Land, Terri Lynn (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Jeffrey Ross Gunter MD Inc., 7/18/2014, \$2,600.00, Land, Terri Lynn (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Jeffrey Ross Gunter MD Inc., 7/18/2014, \$2,600.00, Land, Terri Lynn (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Jeffrey Ross Gunter MD Inc., 7/18/2014, \$2,600.00, Land, Terri Lynn (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 10/8/2014, \$2,600.00, Strickland, Tory (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Ross, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 3/3/2015, \$2,700.00, Graham, Lindsey (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 5/29/2015, \$2,700.00, Kirk, Mark (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 5/29/2015, \$2,700.00, Kirk, Mark (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 6/24/2015, \$900.00, Johnson, Ron (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 7/7/2015, \$2,700.00, Nunes, Devin (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/10/2015, \$1,500.00, Ayotte, Kelly (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/13/2015, \$900.00, Ayotte, Kelly (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Av Dermatology, 3/30/2016, \$1,000.00, Heck, Joe (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 5/31/2016, \$2,700.00, Trump, Donald (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 5/31/2016, \$2,700.00, Trump, Donald (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey Ross Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 5/31/2016, \$19,600.00, Republican National Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Illinois (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Kansas (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of West Virginia (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of North Dakota (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Wisconsin (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Louisiana (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Missouri Republican State Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, New York Republican Federal Campaign Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Virginia (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Wyoming (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Mississippi (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Federal Cmte of Pennsylvania (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey Ross Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 7/25/2016, \$13,800.00, Republican National Cmte (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 7/27/2016, \$5,400.00, Cheney, Liz (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 7/27/2016, \$2,700.00, Cheney, Liz (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 7/27/2016, \$2,700.00, Cheney, Liz (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey Mr. Ross Mr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 8/30/2016, \$2,700.00, McCain, John (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 9/6/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Alabama (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 8/14/2016, \$2,700.00, Burr, Richard (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Mississippi (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Virginia (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of California (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Federal Cmte of Pennsylvania (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Illinois (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Kansas (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of North Dakota (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Alabama (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Missouri Republican State Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of West Virginia (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Wyoming (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Louisiana (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, New York Republican Federal Campaign Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Arkansas (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/11/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Wisconsin (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/17/2016, \$1,190.00, Connecticut Republican Campaign Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/17/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of South Carolina (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/17/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of Minnesota (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/17/2016, \$1,190.00, Republican Party of North Carolina (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/17/2016, \$1,190.00, New Jersey Republican State Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Argyle TX 76226, Retired, 10/17/2016, \$2,380.00, Republican Party of Tennessee (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/27/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of North Carolina (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/27/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Minnesota (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/27/2016, \$1,723.00, Connecticut Republican Campaign Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/27/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of Tennessee (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/27/2016, \$1,723.00, New Jersey Republican State Cmte (R).

Money to Parties, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 10/27/2016, \$1,723.00, Republican Party of South Carolina (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 12/20/2016, \$2,700.00, Royce, Ed (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 12/20/2016, \$2,700.00, Royce, Ed (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 12/21/2016, \$2,700.00, Nunes, Devin (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 12/21/2016, \$2,700.00, Nunes, Devin (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Physician, 4/24/2017, \$2,700.00, Granger, Kay (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeff Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Jeff Gunter MD, 6/2/2017, \$2,700.00, McHenry, Patrick (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 9/12/2017, \$2,700.00, Royce, Ed (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Dermatologist, 9/12/2017, \$2,700.00, Royce, Ed (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Doctor, 9/30/2017, \$2,700.00, Hawley, Josh (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeffrey R, Los Angeles, CA 90049, Doctor, 9/30/2017, \$2,700.00, Hawley, Josh (R).

Money to Candidates, Gunter, Jeff Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Jeff Gunter MD, 11/13/2017, \$2,700.00, McHenry, Patrick (R).

Total: \$177,563.00.

Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador.

Nominee: Ronald Douglas Johnson.  
Post: Ambassador, Republic of El Salvador.

(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, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Robert Todd Johnson, None; Lori Ann Johnson, None; Michael Todd Johnson, None; Joshua Lee Johnson, None.
4. Parents: Irvin T. Johnson—Deceased; Beatrice Johnson, None.
5. Grandparents: Herbert Johnson—Deceased; Ida Mae Johnson—deceased.
6. Brothers and Sisters: James H. Johnson—Deceased; Priscilla Jones, None; Chris Jones.

W. Patrick Murphy, of Vermont, 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 Kingdom of Cambodia.

Nominee: (Warren) Patrick Murphy, Jr.

Post: Cambodia.

(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, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: Kathleen M. Norman: none.
3. Children and Spouses: Seamus B. Murphy, none; Meghan V. Murphy, none; Gillian L. Murphy, none.
4. Parents: Warren P. Murphy, Sr., none; Margaret R. Murphy, none.
5. Grandparents: Robert Murphy—deceased; Theresa Murphy—deceased; George Albert—deceased; Alice Albert—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Christopher A. Murphy, none; Andrew F. Murphy, none.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Jennifer Murphy—deceased.

Daniel N. Rosenblum, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Nominee: Daniel N. Rosenblum.

Post: Republic of Uzbekistan.

(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.)

Contribution, 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, Hillary Victory Fund (Primary); \$1,675, 7/5, 8/17 & 9/30/2016, Hillary for America (General); \$1,000, 9/18/2016, Hillary Victory Fund (General); \$250, 12/23/2017, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$250, 2/8/2018, Soderberg for Congress.
3. Children: Jonah Rosenblum: None, N/A, N/A; Liana Rosenblum: None N/A, N/A.
4. Parents: Louis Rosenblum: None, N/A, N/A.
5. Grandparents: Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: None.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Janet Metz: None, N/A, N/A; Miriam Rosenblum: None, N/A, N/A; Sheldon Benjamin: None, N/A, N/A; Diane Rosenblum: \$500 (total), 7 periodic contri. between 12/20/15 and 5/7/16, Bernie 2016; \$86 (total), 16 contri. between 12/29/15 and 10/11/18, Act Blue; \$50 (total), 9/28 & 9/30/16, Americans for Responsible Solutions PAC; \$165 (total), 5 periodic contri. between 10/16/16 and 11/5/16, Deborah Ross for United States Senate; \$150 (total), 5 periodic contri. between 10/17/16 and 11/5/16, Russ for Wisconsin; \$150 (total), 4 periodic contri. between 11/15/16 and 12/3/16, Foster Campbell for United States Senate; \$15, 2/8/17, Elizabeth for MA, Inc.; \$40 (total), 4/13 & 4/17, Jon Osoff for Congress; \$50, 7/6/17, Friends of Bernie Sanders; \$75 (total), 8/3/17, 5/3/18 & 6/28/18, Amy McGrath for Congress; \$110 (total), 4 periodic contri. between 12/7/17 & 8/5/18, Doug Jones for Senate; \$80 (total), 1/29/18, 4/22/18 & 5/14/18, Kamala Harris for Senate; \$35 (total), 2/17/18 & 6/27/18, Friends of Maria; \$65 (total), 5/26/18, 7/25/18 & 9/2/18, Courage Campaign PAC; \$1250, 6/30/18, Sinema for Arizona; \$190, 8/3/18, Andrew Janz for Congress; \$12.50, 8/5/18, O'Connor for Congress; \$50, 8/9/18, Harder for Congress; \$100 (total), 8/9/18, 9/23/18 & 10/17/18, Jessica Morse for Congress; \$50, 8/16/18, Audrey Denny for Congress; \$75 (total), 10/5/18 & 10/24/18, Heidi for Senate; \$205 (total), 6 periodic contri. between 10/6/ & 11/4/18, Rosen for Nevada; \$20, 10/11/18, Linda Coleman for Congress; \$20, 10/11/18, Friends of Lucy Mcbath; \$20, 10/11/18, Lauren Underwood for Congress.

Henry Gordon: \$258 (total), 20 periodic contri. between 4/30/15 & 10/5/18, Act Blue; \$2.50, 5/25/16, Progressive Change; \$1,007 (ttl.), 28 periodic contri. between 4/30/15 & 5/25/16, Bernie 2016; \$55.19 (ttl.), 4 periodic contri. between 1/21/16 & 10/21/16, Russ for Wisconsin; \$27.69 (ttl.), 1/21/16 & 10/21/16, Catherine Cortez Masto for Senate; \$47.50 (ttl.), 4 periodic contri. between 4/13/16 & 10/21/16, Flores for Congress; \$35.19 (ttl.), 3 periodic contri. between 4/13/16 & 10/21/16, Pramila for Congress; \$35.20, 3 periodic contri. between 4/13/16 & 10/21/16, Zephyr Teachout for Congress; \$27.70 (ttl.), 10/21 & 23/16, 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, Nolan 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 Colorado; \$7.69, 10/21/16, Nelson for Wisconsin; \$7.69, 10/21/16, Katie McGinty Senate; \$10, 10/5/18, Heidi for Senate.

Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

Nominee: Donald Ray Tapia.

Post: Ambassador to Jamaica.

(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, and donee:

- Capito For West Virginia, \$5,200, 3/25/2013; Flake PAC, \$5,000, 4/02/2013; Andrew Walter For Congress, \$2,600, 8/26/2013; Andrew Tobin For Congress, \$2,600, 10/28/2013; National Rep Senatorial Com, \$15,000, 10/31/13; National Rep Senatorial Com, \$6,413, 11/07/13; NRSC, \$15,000, 11/02/2013; Jeff Flake For Senate, \$5,200, 11/19/2013; RNC, \$70,000, 2014; Tom Cotton For Senate, \$5,200, 3/19/2014; Flake PAC, \$5,000, 3/31/2014; Corey Gardner For Senate, \$5,200, 6/06/2014; Andy Tobin For Congress, \$2,700, 4/20/2015; Marco Rubio for President, \$2,700, 4/21/2015; Portman For Senate, \$2,700, 4/24/2015; Salmon For Congress, \$2,700, 6/10/2015; Carly For President, \$2,700, 8/26/2015; Joe Heck For Senate, \$2,700, 9/18/2015; Marco Rubio For President, \$2,700, 11/03/2015; Chris Christie For President, \$2,700, 11/25/2015; Marco Rubio For President, \$2,700, 12/10/2015; Conservative Solutions PAC, \$50,000, 2/22/2016; Biggs For Congress, \$2,500, 3/31/2016; Friends of John McCain, \$5,400, 5/03/2016; Trump Victory, \$25,000, 6/14/2016; Trump Victory, \$25,000, 6/28/2016; Volunteers For Nehlen, \$1,000, 7/10/2016; Trump Victory, \$25,000, 8/03/2016; Ken Bennett For Congress, \$2,500, 8/12/2016; Kiehne For Congress, \$2,500, 8/18/2016; Marco Rubio For Senate, \$2,700, 9/24/2016; Marco Rubio For Senate, \$2,700, 9/24/2016; Paul Babeu For Congress, \$5,000, 9/24/2016; Winning Women's Committee, \$10,000, 9/29/2016; Trump Victory, \$25,000, 10/12/2016; Trump Victory, \$5,000, 11/01/2016; Trump Make America Great, \$752, 11/26/2016; Comstock For Congress, \$966, 12/08/2016; Josh Mandel For Senate, \$5,400, 2/08/2017; Regan, \$5,100, 3/7/17; Marsha Blackburn Victory Fund, \$5,400, 3/30/2017; Roger Wicker For Senate, \$5,400, 4/05/2017; Paul Ryan, \$5,400, 4/25/17; Team Ryan, \$12,500, 4/25/17; NRCC, \$7,100, 4/25/17; RGA, \$25,000, 5/5/17; AZ Republican Party, \$25,000, 5/12/17; George P. Bush, \$5,000, 6/29/17, Steve Smith For Congress, \$5,400, 6/26/2017; RGA, \$25,000, 9/25/17; Trump Victory, \$94,600, 10/3/2017; Donald Trump For President, \$5,400, 10/06/2017; RNC, \$94,600, 10/06/2017; Jeff Flake, \$2,600, 11/7/17; Steve Ferrara, \$5,000, 11/8/17; RGA, \$25,000, 12/6/17; Martha McCally, \$5,400, 1/19/18; Moses Sanchez, \$3,175, 2/7/18; Matt Rosendale, \$2,700, 2/14/18; Andy Biggs, \$2,700, 2/22/18; Schweikert, \$5,000, 3/29/18; Schweikert Victory, \$5,000, 3/29/

18; Rick Scott, \$5,400, 4/5/18; RAGA, \$1,569.77, 4/11/18; Debbie Lesko, \$2,700, 4/13/18; NRSC, \$24,700, 5/13/18; Justin Olson, \$2,000, 5/25/18.

1. Spouse: N/A.
2. Children and Spouses: Tim & Sheri Tapia, None; Londa & Will Perkins, None.
3. Parents: Jessie Joseph Tapia—Deceased; Constance Geraldine Snapp—Deceased.
4. Grandparents: Thorthon Snapp—Deceased; Myrtle Snapp—Deceased; Maria Medina Tapia—Deceased.
5. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
6. Sisters and Spouses: Jessie Jane Cordell, None.

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.

Nominee: Kip Tom.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the UN.

(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 and donee:

1. Self: \$150,000, Apr-2016, Kip Tom for Congress; \$1,000, Dec-2017, Steve Braun for Congress; \$1,000, Jun-2016, Roger Marshall for Congress; \$2,300, Jun-2016, Growth Energy PAC; \$5,400, Mar-2015, Todd Young for Senate; \$5,400, Jun-2016, Todd Young for Senate; \$1,000, Apr-2014, Todd Rokita for Congress; \$1,876.07, Aug-2014, Jackie Walorski for Congress; \$1,500, Sep-2016, Todd Young Victory Fund; \$1,500, Oct-2015, Ind. Republican Fund; \$1,000 Oct-2017, Kyle Dukes for Sheriff.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Kyle and Angie Tom: \$5,400, Sep-2015, Kip Tom For Congress; Mark and Kandi Dunwiddie: \$5,400, Sep-2015, Kip Tom For Congress; Greg and Kassi Rowland; \$5,400, Sep-2015, Kip Tom For Congress; Kris Tom: \$2,700, Sep-2015, Kip Tom For Congress; Jon and Katie Fussel: \$5,400, Sep-2015, Kip Tom for Congress.
4. Parents: Everett and Marie Tom: \$5,400, Sep-2015, Kip Tom For Congress.
5. Grandparents: Everett and Violet Tom—deceased; Ellis and Francis Eby—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Kevin Tom—deceased.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Melinda and Russell Woda: \$5,400, Nov-2015, Kip Tom for Congress; Melodie and Scott Thompson: \$1,000, Oct-2015, Kip Tom for Congress; Melissa and Ray Gerber: none.

Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, 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 Iraq.

Nominee: Matthew H. Tueller.

Post: Iraq.

(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, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: DeNeece G. Tueller: none.
3. Children and Spouses: Marie Amara Tueller: none; Kyle Newkirk: none; Margaret Tueller Proffitt: none; Clark Proffitt: none; David G. Tueller: none; Ayae T. Tueller: none; Daniel B. Tueller: none; Christian M. Tueller: none.
4. Parents: Blaine C. Tueller, none; Jean Marie H. Tueller, none.
5. Grandparents: Lamont Tueller—deceased; Elva C. Tueller—deceased; Leland



Heywood—deceased; Marie E. Heywood—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: James B. Tueller, none; Beth D. Tueller, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Jan T. Lowman, none; Winfield N. Lowman, none; Anna T. Stone, none; Bernell Stone, none; Marie T. Emmett, none; Chad Emmett, none; Diane T. Pritchett, none; Lant H. Pritchett, none; Martha T. Barrett, \$150, 03/2016, Bernie 2016; Jeff Barrett, \$150, 03/2016, ActBlue; Elisabeth T. Dearden, none; Kirk Dearden, none; Rachel Tueller, none; Jeanne T. Krumperman, none; Paul Krumperman, none.

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.

Post: Malawi.

(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, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer Anne Scott: None. Nicolas Kennet Scott: None.
4. Parents: Deceased.
5. Grandparents: Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Neil and Cindy Scott, \$100, 2016 H. Clinton.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Leslie and David Loomis, None. Pat and Carl Napor, None. Carol and Konstantin Magalow, None.

John Barsa, of Florida, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

R. Clarke Cooper, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs).

Jane L. Corwin, of New York, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

Brett P. Giroir, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

Mark Rosen, of Connecticut, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of two years.

Robert C. Sisson, of Michigan, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

David Stilwell, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

Lance V. Yohe, of North Dakota, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment).

Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years.

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

\*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2018.

\*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

\*Rick A. Dearborn, of Oklahoma, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

\*Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

\*Joseph Ryan Gruters, of Florida, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

\*Heidi R. King, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

\*Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

\*Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

\*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Capt. Brendan C. McPherson and ending with Capt. Todd C. Wiemers, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2019.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### 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. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 997. A bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals 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. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

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. KLOBUCHAR):

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 opportunity zones for population census tracts affected by Hurricane Florence, Hurricane Michael, and the Mendocino, Carr, Camp, Woolsey, and Hill wildfires; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and 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.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1002. 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 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. PETERS (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 support 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 empower the States to set the maximum annual percentage rates applicable to consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, 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 Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act to improve the conservation of sharks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1009. A bill to establish a demonstration program to explore effective practices to improve early detection and management of injuries indicative of 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 1010. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish criminal liability for negligent executive officers of major corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. JONES):

S. 1011. 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. CASSIDY, 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 Mrs. 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. 1014. 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 poppy 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. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. 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 perfluorooctanoic acid 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. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BARRASSO, 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 reconstruction, 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. 140. A resolution urging the establishment of a Cyber League of Indo-Pacific States to address cyber threats; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

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 viola-

tions and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 169

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) 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 (Ms. WARREN) 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. MURKOWSKI) 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 (Mr. 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. TESTER) 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. 679

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. 679, a bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefit paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) 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 names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors 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 land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Or-

egon, 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. MARKEY, 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 LGBTI Peoples, and for other purposes.

S. 893

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 893, a bill to require the President to develop a strategy 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. SASSE, 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. 910

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

S. 919

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 919, a bill to reduce regulatory burdens and streamline processes related to commercial space activities, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 993, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain tax credits related to electric cars, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 85

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 85, a res-

olution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of Easterseals, a leading advocate and service provider for children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older adults, and their caregivers and families.

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 112, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children.

S. RES. 123

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 123, a resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and 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 (25 U.S.C. 1621u) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) VETERANS AFFAIRS COPAYMENTS.—The Service may pay, 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 (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.**

"(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) authorized for 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 or 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) EXCEPTION.—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 assessed by the Department of Veterans Affairs to an eligible Indian veteran receiving covered medical care.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 407(c), section 2901(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (25 U.S.C. 1623(b)), or any other provision of law, and in accordance with the relevant memorandum of understanding described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may accept a payment from the Service under subsection (c).

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes—

“(1) the number of veterans, disaggregated by State, who—

“(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, 2013; and

“(ii) ending on December 31, 2018; and

“(3) an update regarding efforts of the Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to streamline health care for veterans 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 barriers to efficiently streamline the provision of health care to veterans who are eligible for assistance from the Service.”.

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.

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) AUTHORIZATION 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 follows through the period at the end 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. 3012) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) By not later than January 1, 2021, the Assistant Secretary shall—

“(1) 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) conduct a study on the best practices and potential considerations regarding mandatory use of comprehensive caregiver assessment tools standardized across a planning and service area by an area agency on aging, which shall examine—

“(A) the current use of caregiver assessments, as of the date of the study;

“(B) the efficacy and feasibility of mandatory use of comprehensive caregiver assessment tools standardized across a planning and service area, including the value to caregivers and the older individuals to whom they provide care; and

“(C) the potential impact on the aging network of using such assessments; and

“(3) prepare and submit to Congress a report regarding the study under paragraph (2) that provides recommendations for the appropriate use of comprehensive caregiver assessments standardized across a planning and service area by an area agency on aging, and a proposed budget, based on the Assistant Secretary’s professional judgment, for appropriately implementing the recommendations.”.

(2) ASSESSING NEEDS OF CAREGIVERS.—Section 373(e)(3) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030s-1(e)(3)) is amended by inserting “assess the needs of family caregivers or older relative caregivers and” before “provide”.

(3) FAMILY CAREGIVER RESOURCE CENTER AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 202(b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (12); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) 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 collection;

“(ii) activities described in section 411(a)(11); and

“(iii) dissemination 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 ACUMEN PROVISIONS.—

(1) ASSISTANCE RELATING TO GROWING AND SUSTAINING CAPACITY.—Section 202(b)(9) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(b)(9)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) business acumen, capacity building, organizational development, innovation, and other methods of growing and sustaining the capacity of the aging network to serve older adults and caregivers most effectively.”.

(2) CLARIFYING PARTNERSHIPS FOR AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.—Section 306 of the Older

Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Nothing in this Act shall restrict an area agency on aging from providing services not provided or authorized under this Act, including through—

- “(1) contracts with health care payers;
- “(2) consumer private pay programs; or
- “(3) other arrangements with entities or individuals that increase the availability of home and community-based services and supports in the planning and service area supported by the area agency on aging.”.

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.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. 1021

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

**SECTION 1. WENDELL H. FORD (WESTERN KENTUCKY) PARKWAY.**

(a) DESIGNATION AS HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDOR.—Section 1105(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 2032; 131 Stat. 797) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(91) The Wendell H. Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway from the interchange with the William H. Natcher Parkway in Ohio County, Kentucky, west to the interchange of the Western Kentucky Parkway with the Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyriple) Parkway.”.

(b) DESIGNATION AS FUTURE INTERSTATE.—Section 1105(e)(5)(A) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 109 Stat. 597; 131 Stat. 797) is amended in the first sentence by striking “and subsection (c)(90)” and inserting “subsection (c)(90), and subsection (c)(91)”.

(c) NUMBERING OF PARKWAY.—Section 1105(e)(5)(C)(i) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 109 Stat. 598; 126 Stat. 426; 131 Stat. 797) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The route referred to in subsection (c)(91) is designated as Interstate Route I-369.”.

(d) OPERATION OF VEHICLES.—Section 127(1)(3)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), in the first sentence, by striking “clause (i) or (ii)” and inserting “clauses (i) through (iii)”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “(iii) The Wendell H. Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway (to be designated as a spur of Interstate Route 69) from the interchange with the William H. Natcher Parkway in Ohio County, Kentucky, west to the interchange of the Western Kentucky Parkway with the Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyriple) Parkway.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 140—URGING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CYBER LEAGUE OF INDO-PACIFIC STATES TO ADDRESS CYBER THREATS

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 losses from 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 cybercriminals 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 continues to contribute to the rise of cybercrime, exploiting weaknesses in the international system to undermine fair competition in technology and cyberspace, including through 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 expanding 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 alleging economic espionage by or to benefit a foreign country involved the People’s Republic of China;

Whereas more than 2/3 of the cases handled by the Department of Justice involving theft of trade secrets have a nexus to the People’s Republic of China;

Whereas experts have asserted that the Made in China 2025 strategy of the Government of the People’s Republic of China will incentivize Chinese entities to engage in unfair competitive behavior, including additional theft of technologies and intellectual property;

Whereas the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has also contributed to the rise of cybercrime and according to the 2018 Worldwide Threat Assessment by the Director of

National Intelligence: “We expect the heavily sanctioned North Korea to use cyber operations to raise funds and to gather intelligence or launch attacks on South Korea and the United States. . . . North Korean actors developed and launched the WannaCry ransomware in May 2017, judging from technical links to previously identified North Korean cyber tools, tradecraft, and operational infrastructure. We also assess that these actors conducted the cyber theft of \$81 million from the Bank of Bangladesh in 2016.”;

Whereas section 2(a)(8) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9201(a)(8)) states, “The Government of North Korea has provided technical support and conducted destructive and coercive cyberattacks, including against Sony Pictures Entertainment and other United States persons.”;

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 2016 (Public Law 114-122), 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 a continued increase and 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 section 215 of the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) calls for “robust cybersecurity cooperation 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 combatting cybersecurity threats”: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) urges the President to propose and champion the negotiation of a treaty with like-minded partners in the Indo-Pacific to ensure a free and open Internet free from economically crippling cyberattacks;

(2) calls for the treaty, which can be referred to as the Cyber League of Indo-Pacific States (in this resolution referred to as “CLIPS”), to include the creation of an Information Sharing Analysis Center to provide around-the-clock cyber threat monitoring and mitigation for governments that are parties to the treaty; and

(3) calls for members of CLIPS—

(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 respecting national sovereignty;

(E) to enforce laws protecting 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.”

#### SUBCOMMITTEE 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.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE 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.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The Subcommittee on Intellectual Property of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 2:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing, “Trailblazers and lost Einsteins: Women inventors and the future of American innovation.”

#### 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 hour 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:

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

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 Kylie Flannery for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kylie 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 Kylie 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 Kylie 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-thousand 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 totality of my interests, passions, skills, competencies 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.

## 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 16, 2019 during roll call no. 37, on Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 268, McGovern of Massachusetts Part B Amendment No. 2. Had I been present, I would have voted, "aye."

## 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

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

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 that 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 adversity.

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 filmmaking competition. The StudentCam competition tasked middle and high schoolers 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 Vucetich, 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 to account 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 Vucetich, Javier Pujols, and Aimet Ruiz exemplify the 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 PHILIPPINES

**HON. DON BACON**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 3, 2019*

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, late last year, an historic event took place 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 over a century ago. 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 used as a signal 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 not 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 compatriot 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 their 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 Wyoming, Army and Air Force record 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 captured 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



Gamlin. Adolph was the principal sentry on duty the tragic morning of battle that became known as the "Massacre of Balangiga". The record reflects that Gamlin fought bravely that day and acquitted himself with honor. His courage and skill in battle helped survivors to escape the onslaught and prevented the complete decimation of his unit.

Adolph Gamlin was a 20-year-old farm boy when he enlisted in 1898 with the 51st Iowa Volunteer Infantry and was sent off to the Philippines. He later joined other Spanish American War volunteers by re-enlisting in the Regular Army's 9th Infantry in 1900. Back to the Philippines in November, he caught up with Company C in January of 1901 when they were still in China and returned to Manila with his unit in June. He mustered out of the Army in 1903 at Fort Niagara in New York as Sergeant Gamlin and returned to Nebraska, married, had three children before his wife's untimely death. Adolph remarried and today his daughter, E. Jean Wall from that marriage, carries on in his memory. Over the years she has accumulated the single most complete library on Balangiga and its military history. Included are many letters left to her by her father. He was her hero, and now he is mine too.

Adolph Gamlin died in 1969 at age 92. Today he is at rest at the historic Wyuka Cemetery in Nebraska City. The diligent research of the "three sailors" found there were many heroes of the battle, valiant men never fully recognized. Gamlin was one of them. Today I am honored to capture this story to ensure it is never forgotten and available in our nation's archives so others may know their story for generations to come.

ALEXIS GAVALDON

**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 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 adversities.

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 McEACHIN**

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 COIRO

**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.

John 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's 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 (NJSPA), 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 Congressman 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 that you join our colleagues, Mayor Coiro'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 BAYLISS BOATWORKS

**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 Bayliss Boatworks of Wanchese, North Carolina, a team who every day applies their experience and unique craftsmen touch in creating the perfect vessels for their clientele.

Bayliss Boatworks was established in 2002. The team was able to draw up a number of contracts to begin their brand-new shop to create their exquisite boats used for fishing, travel and entertainment. Each boat is custom made to fit the needs and preferences of each client. These boats begin as a jig until it surpasses benchmarks like the "Whiskey Plank," hull rollover, and engine install. From there, the boats will have their cabins installed, flybridge and mezzanine build-out, interior cabinetry construction, paint, sea trial, and lastly, delivery to the client. The hard work of the employees can be seen on the water around the world. Since its establishment in 2002, Bayliss Boatworks have received mentions in magazines such as Marlin, being classified among the top builders in the world. It is a prestigious honor to be considered among the world's best boat craftsmen.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of Bayliss Boatworks as they celebrate 17 years in operation. May God bless the hardworking employees of Bayliss Boatworks, and I look forward to seeing their excellence for many years into the future.

DAVID GAVALDON

**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 David Gavaldon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

David Gavaldon is a student at Arvada K-8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by David 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 David Gavaldon 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 JANE GRIM

**HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 3, 2019*

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

**HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH**

OF FLORIDA

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 Interpersonal and Group Communications, 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.**HON. NEAL P. DUNN**

OF FLORIDA

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 in Dixie County 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 Cross 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**HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

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 get 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**HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI**

OF OREGON

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 a roof over their heads or put food on the table. The effects on future recruitment and our standing in the world are also deeply concerning.

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 Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination 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 re-

quirements 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 entire 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.

On April 3, 1969, CASE Construction Equipment began manufacturing its skid steer loaders for the first time in Burlington, Iowa.

In 1974, CASE moved its skid steer manufacturing operations to Wichita, Kansas.

In 1999, 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 annual commemoration of the Allies' victory in World War II.

Mr. Detweiler received the Andrew J. Higgins 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 Consulate General of France Vincent Sciana. He was honored for his work 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 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 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-new 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 Olivero 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 Olivero was born in Avellino, Italy, the youngest of 11 children. The Olivero 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 Olivero 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 returned 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 life-long 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 Olivero.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Gerardo Olivero's family and friends, and the residents of the State of New Jersey in recognizing his outstanding character and service to his community.

EZEKIEL HATFIELD

**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 Ezekiel Hatfield for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ezekiel Hatfield 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 Ezekiel Hatfield 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 Ezekiel Hatfield 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 3, 2019*

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, due to delayed flights on April 1, 2019, I was in transit and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 137.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY CHIEF  
HECTOR RODRIGUEZ OF POMONA

**HON. NORMA J. TORRES**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 3, 2019*

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Deputy Chief Hector Rodriguez of the Pomona Police Department. After almost 30 years of dedicated public service to the people and communities of the City of Pomona, Deputy Chief Rodriguez is finally retiring and will be sorely missed.

Before officially working for the department, Rodriguez formed part of the Pomona Police Explorer program in 1982. His remarkable career with Pomona Police Department began on January 2, 1990 as a Patrol Officer. Four years later, Rodriguez was promoted to the rank of Police Investigator to the Gang Unit and the Homicide Unit. Then, in 2005, he was promoted to Sergeant.

During his time in law enforcement, Rodriguez joined the Neighborhood Enforcement Team and LA Impact Task Force. These teams focused on quality of life issues. LA Impact specifically focused on uniting federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles County to investigate major crimes and the dismantling of major drug trafficking organizations. Additionally, Rodriguez served on the Pomona Police Department's SWAT Team for 18 years.

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 admirable 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. Xavier'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 services like 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 unavoidably detained on April 2, 2019 during roll call no. 140, on ordering the previous question for H. Res. 274, consideration of S.J. Res. 7 and H. Res. 271. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 141, on agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 274, consideration of S.J. Res. 7 and H. Res. 271, and suspension

authority. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 142, 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 workers 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 Con-

necticut, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for a term of five years, and other pending nominations.

TBA

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.

SD-G50

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

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for military construction and family housing.

SD-124

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of State.

SD-138

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities

To hold closed hearings to examine United State Special Operations Command's efforts to transform the force for future security challenges and implement the National Defense Strategy.

SVC-217

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Defense.

SD-608

3 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Airland

To hold hearings to examine Air Force modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

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 Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine perspectives on child nutrition reauthorization.

SH-216

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Justice.

SD-192

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the National Guard and Reserve.

SD-138

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Marine Corps ground modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine broadband mapping, focusing on challenges and solutions.

SD-G50

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on strengthening accountability to protect students and taxpayers.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance

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

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-428A

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 Ac-

countability 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

# 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. **Pages S2239–40**

#### 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. **Page S2234**

**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.

**Pages S2224–25, S2225–29**

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. **Pages S2224–25**

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. **Pages S2225–26**

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. **Page S2226**

**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. **Page S2244**

**Nomination Confirmed:** Senate confirmed the following nomination: Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

**Pages S2211–24, S2244**

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. **Page S2216**

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. **Page S2220**

**Messages from the House:** **Page S2233**

**Measures Referred:** **Page S2233**

**Measures Placed on the Calendar:** **Pages S2209, S2233**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S2233–34**

**Petitions and Memorials:** **Page S2234**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** **Pages S2234–39**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S2240–41**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** **Pages S2241–44**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S2230–33**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Page S2244**

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** **Page S2244**

**Record Votes:** Four record votes were taken today. (Total—61) **Pages S2216, S2220, S2224–26**



**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

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Defense Health Program, after receiving testimony from Vice Admiral Raquel Bono, Director, Defense Health Agency, Lieutenant General Nadja West, Surgeon General of the Army, Vice Admiral Forrest Faison, Surgeon General of the Navy, Lieutenant General Dorothy Hogg, Surgeon General of the Air Force, and Stacy Cummings, Program Executive Officer of the Defense Healthcare Management Systems, all of the Department of Defense.

### APPROPRIATIONS: FEMA

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine to examine the proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, after receiving testimony from Peter Gaynor, Acting Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

### 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 Non-proliferation, 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

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine missile defense policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from John C. Rood, Under Secretary for Policy, General Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy, USAF, Commander, United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, Lieutenant General Samuel A. Greaves, USAF, Director, Missile Defense Agency, and Lieutenant General James H. Dickinson, USA, Commander, United States Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command and Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense, all of the Department of Defense.

### 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;

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 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. Res. 23, supporting the goals and ideals of Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction, with an amendment;

S. Res. 27, calling for a prompt multinational freedom of navigation operation in the Black Sea and urging the cancellation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline;

S. Res. 35, supporting democratic principles and standards in Bolivia and throughout Latin America, with an amendment;

S. Res. 67, expressing the sense of the Senate on the importance and vitality of the United States alliances with Japan and the Republic of Korea, and our trilateral cooperation in the pursuit of shared interests, with an amendment;

S. Res. 95, recognizing the 198th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States;

S. Res. 96, commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People's Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. executive;

S. Res. 123, supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments; 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

Republic 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

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Intellectual Property concluded a hearing to examine women inventors and the future of American innovation, after receiving testimony from Robin L. Rasor, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina; Barbara Gault, Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington, D.C.; Patricia E. Bath, American Institute for the Prevention of Blindness, Los Angeles, California; and Sandra K. Nowak, 3M Company, St. Paul, Minnesota.

#### 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 ye-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.

**Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019:** The House considered H.R. 1585, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, April 3rd.

**Pages H3003–61**

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.

**Page H3012**

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 inten-

tionally 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); **Pages H3033–34, H3044–45**

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); **Pages H3035–37, H3045–46**

Meng amendment (No. 17 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–32) that ensures that parenting classes are made available to prisoners with limited English proficiency; **Page H3046**

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; **Pages H3046–47**

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; **Pages H3047–48**

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; **Pages H3048–49**

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; **Page H3049**

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; **Pages H3049–50**

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 na-

tional 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; **Pages H3050–52**

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; **Pages H3052–53**

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; **Page H3053**

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); **Pages H3053–54**

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; **Page H3054**

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; **Pages H3054–55**

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; **Pages H3055–56**

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; **Page H3056**

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; **Pages H3056–57**

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.

**Page H3061**

H. Res. 281, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) was agreed to by a yeas-and-nays vote of 231 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 145, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays 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 yeas-and-nays 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 “CREATES 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

*Committee on Homeland Security:* Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability held a hearing entitled “Ensuring Effective and Efficient Operations: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2020 DHS Management Directorate Budget Request”. Testimony was heard from Chip Fulghum, Deputy Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; and Chris Currie, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Team, Government Accountability Office.

#### 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 Armed Services:* to hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

*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.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, 9:30 a.m., 2008 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 “CREATES 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

**Program for Thursday:** Complete consideration of H.R. 1585—Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

## HOUSE

Bacon, Don, Nebr., E394  
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E397  
Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E396  
Budd, Ted, N.C., E393  
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E396  
Dunn, Neal P., Fla., E396

Estes, Ron, Kans., E397  
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E396  
Hurd, Will, Tex., E399  
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E399  
McAdams, Ben, Utah, E393  
McEachin, A. Donald, Va., E393, E395, E399  
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E393  
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E398

Pascarell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E395, E398  
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E396  
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E393, E393, E394, E395, E395,  
E397, E398, E398, E399, E400  
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E397, E399  
Shalala, Donna E., Fla., E394  
Torres, Norma J., Calif., E398  
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E395, E398



# Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at [www.govinfo.gov](http://www.govinfo.gov), free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, [contactcenter@gpo.gov](mailto:contactcenter@gpo.gov). ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov). Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.