House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, February 28, 2013.
I hereby appoint the Honorable ILRANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Barrow) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Barrow of Georgia 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. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

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

Eternal God, through whom we see what we could be and what we can become, thank You for giving us another day.

In these days our Nation is faced with pressing issues, while we honor the memory of many who acted courageously a half century ago to bring greater freedoms to all Americans. Grant wisdom, knowledge, and understanding to us all, as well as an extra measure of charity.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people’s House, who labor within these Halls under public scrutiny. Give them peace and an abundance of prudence in the work they do.

And may all that is done this day 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 her approval thereof.

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

SEQUESTRATION IS HERE
(Mr. Wilson of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Wilson of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, at midnight tonight, the Department of Defense and other government agencies will fall victim to the President’s sequester. Every American family will be affected by the shifting of funds.

In South Carolina’s Second Congressional District, which I am grateful to represent, the Army’s base at Fort Jackson in Columbia is expected to lose $75 million. Additionally, the Savannah River Site in Aiken and Barnwell will be forced to furlough thousands of hardworking employees and stall critical national missions due to a possible $230 million budget cut. Both of these shifts will endanger our national security.

The President and the Senate have refused to negotiate with House Republicans on a possible solution until today. House Republicans have voted twice to avoid sequestration. Our Nation has a spending problem we must address before it is too late and our debt spirals out of control. The President should change course and begin working with both Houses of Congress to tackle the national debt which threatens American families.

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

SEQUESTRATION
(Mr. Barrow of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Barrow of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in a few hours, the so-called “sequester” will begin to take effect, and the things we cannot do without will be cut just the same as the things we don’t need and can’t afford.

What got us to this point was the failure to compromise, and what’s kept us from solving this problem is that same failure to compromise. Only in Washington can so many folks agree on what the problem is, yet no solution is brought to the table.

My home State of Georgia is home to some of this country’s vital military installations, including Fort Gordon in my district, the central nervous system of our national defense. Nearly $1 billion in cuts will spread across these installations and will have devastating impacts on surrounding communities.

I urge my colleagues to come back to the table, find the spending cuts we need to avoid this disaster, and begin the process of putting these partisan games behind us.

SEQUESTRATION
(Mr. Brooks of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Brooks of Alabama. Madam Speaker, in 2011, I voted against the Budget Control Act and President Obama’s sequester because I believed and feared they posed a grave threat to...
national security. That fear has come true. As I stand here today, north Alabamians face job furloughs in the thousands because Washington would rather spend money on frivolous programs than protect national security.

Madam Speaker, I have voted against sequester at every opportunity. I sent a letter to the White House calling on the President to face and avoid the horrendous consequences of his sequester. I've escorted members of the House Armed Services Committee around Redstone to help them better understand how our civilian defense workers are critical to America's security, and I have repeatedly cosponsored legislation to end the sequester.

For nearly 2 years I have been fighting sequester and the hollowing out of our Armed Forces. It's time for the President and the Senate to do the same.

SEQUESTER

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Many of my constituents ask the question of what work are we doing for them. I'm very glad this morning that we will finally end the long journey for the Violence Against Women Act and finally vote on a recognized compromise that the Senate has proposed.

But I also say that I'm not here to talk about process and blame when it comes to this pending sequester, which most Americans do not understand. But I'm ready to work, and I believe we should stay and work. We should follow the Senate plan that follows the Buffett rule and provides for modest reductions in defense and does not provide for these devastating cuts until 2014.

We can get this done, but we cannot have any compromise when one side refuses to acknowledge that it takes revenue to run this government to be able to ensure that people have the resources that they need. Or, for example, in Texas, for my colleagues who refuted the idea that I stand for children, where we're losing some 4,000 spots in Head Start, we can do something. Madam Speaker. We simply need to stay and work and follow the Senate plan.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the White House to lead and turn away from Mayan politics: the world is going to end.

This strategy over the President's automatic cuts borders on untruthful. For example, the FAA released a list of 238 regional airports that could potentially close due to the President's cuts, saying that at least 100 of them would be closed. How can the FAA list 238 at-risk airports and admit that only 100 of them will close? It's Mayan politics.

238 affected airports puts more fear in people than 238 Mayans. Even with tomorrow's spending cuts, FAA operations and facilities will have $500 million more than 2008 levels, and air traffic is lower.

More money, less traffic, and dramatic cuts? My seventh-grader would say, "That's fuzzy math, Dad." It's true. He's right.

The truth will prevail.
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STOP THE SEQUESTER

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. As a member of the Veterans Affairs' Committee, as an American, and as the proud Representative of Ventura County—we are home to a large naval base with a very significant veteran community—I am extremely concerned about the impact the sequester will have on our women and men and their families who have courageously served, sacrificed, and defended our country.

If Congress fails to stop the across-the-board and unnecessary cuts at this moment, so many programs that help veterans—like transitioning to civilian life and finding employment—will be reduced.

More veterans with less resources is unacceptable. Our brave men and women deserve better. Now is the time to be doing more, not less. For our veterans' sake, we need to come together to stop this sequester now.

DEBT AND OVERSPENDING

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, $52,653. A lot of numbers have been associated with our skyrocketing debt and government overspending, but $52,653 is the amount each individual American man, woman, and child owes as of today to pay off the country's $16.6 trillion debt.

Clearly, overspending by the Federal Government has saddled us and our children—like Mountain Air Debt. And just as clearly, any alternative must include reduction in spending.

I'm not looking for winners or losers in D.C.; I want the American people to win when we make the cuts that need to be made. Controlling spending is a necessity. Targeted spending cuts, such as the House has twice proposed and passed, is vital to the sequestration solution.

There is nothing worse than passing on a legacy to our children of a lower standard of living. Madam Speaker, we can and must deal with this issue of debt and overspending so that our children will not have to face $52,653.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, while Congress is dealing with this manufactured sequester crisis, we have a real climate crisis occurring right outside the window.

There is clarity on what should be a bipartisan issue with the public. Seven out of 10 Americans believe the scientists that climate change is happening and that humans are making it worse. Every day, Americans see the impact. With record droughts and extreme storm events, 2012 set more than 3,500 monthly records for extreme heat, rain, and snow.

This week, 38 leading Republicans and national security advisors urged international action to prevent and mitigate the impact of climate change. Their letter highlights the importance of immediate action and expresses national security concerns should we fail to address these issues.

We should be addressing the real climate crisis instead of dealing with a phony, made-up fiscal crisis.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ANDREW LEWIS

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Andrew Lewis, who tragically and suddenly passed away this weekend.

Andrew was a volunteer leader for the Sierra Club for over 25 years, serving most recently as the chair of the Washington State chapter. He was a local leader known for his intelligence, humor, and dedication, and Andrew was also a friend.
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Over the course of his life, Andrew was a strong advocate for the protection of our wildlands and rivers—natural resources that make the Pacific Northwest such a special place.
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Andrew was also a friend.

As an avid rafter, Andrew had a great love for the rivers of Washington State. His early advocacy work helped lay the groundwork that eventually led to bipartisan legislation to protect the Middle Fork, Snoqualmie, and Pratt Rivers and expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, a bill that I'm proud to cosponsor.

I was fortunate to get to know him when we both served on the board of our children's school. Here, I saw his passion and love for his community and his family.

Andrew was a man that was large in stature, voice, and heart. My thoughts and prayers go to his wife Maaike, son
Peter, and his entire family. He will be missed by all of us who were fortunate to have known him.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 83, I call up the bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and ask for its immediate consideration. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 83, the bill is considered read. The text of the bill is as follows: S.47

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Title I—Enhancing Judicial and Law Enforcement Tools to Combat Violence Against Women

Title II—Improving Services for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking

Title III—Services, Protection, and Justice for Young Victims of Violence

Title IV—Violence Reduction Practices

Title V—Safe Homes for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking

Title VI—Safe Homes for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking

Title VII—Economic Security for Victims of Violence

Title VIII—Protection of Rattered Immigrants

Title IX—Safety for Indian Women

Title X—Ensuring Interagency Coordination and Expanded Reporting

Title XI—Other Matters

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

PART I—Penalties Against Traffickers

Subtitle A—Combating International Trafficking in Persons

Sec. 1201. Regional strategies for combating trafficking in persons.

Sec. 1202. Partnerships against significant trafficking in persons.

Sec. 1203. Protection and assistance for victims of trafficking.

Sec. 1204. Minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.

Sec. 1205. Best practices in trafficking in persons eradication.

Sec. 1206. Protections for domestic workers and other nonimmigrants.

Sec. 1207. Prevention of child marriage.

Sec. 1208. Child soldiers.

Subtitle B—Combating Trafficking in Persons in the United States

Sec. 1211. Criminal trafficking offenses.

Sec. 1212. Civil remedies; clarifying definition.

PART II—Ensuring Availability of Possible Witnesses and Informants

Sec. 1221. Protections for trafficking victims who cooperate with law enforcement.

Sec. 1222. Protection against fraud in foreign labor contracting.

PART III—Ensuring Interagency Coordination and Expanded Reporting

Sec. 1231. Reporting requirements for the Attorney General.

Sec. 1232. Reporting requirements for the Secretary of Labor.

Sec. 1233. Information sharing to combat child labor and slave labor.

Sec. 1234. Government training efforts to include the Department of Labor.

Sec. 1235. GAO report on the use of foreign labor contractors.

Sec. 1236. Accountability.

PART IV—Enhancing State and Local Efforts to Combat Trafficking in Persons

Sec. 1241. Assistance for domestic minor sex trafficking victims.

Sec. 1242. Expanding local law enforcement grants for investigations and prosecutions of trafficking.

Sec. 1243. Model State criminal law protection for child trafficking victims and survivors.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 1251. Adjustment of authorization levels for the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005.

Sec. 1252. Adjustment of authorization levels for the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008.

Subtitle D—Unaccompanied Alien Children

Sec. 1261. Appropriate custodial settings for unaccompanied minors who reach the age of majority while in Federal custody.

Sec. 1262. Appointment of child advocates for unaccompanied minors.

Sec. 1263. Access to Federal foster care and unaccompanied refugee minor protections for certain U Visa recipients.

Sec. 1264. GAO study of the effectiveness of border screenings.
(a) Definitions.—Subsection (a) of section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)) is amended—
(1) by striking paragraphs (5), (17), (18), (23), (29), (33), (36), and (37),
(2) by redesignating—
(A) paragraphs (34) and (35) as paragraphs (41) and (42), respectively;
(B) paragraphs (38) and (39), as redesignated, by inserting—
``(C) paragraphs (24) through (28) as paragraphs (30) through (34), respectively,'';
(D) paragraphs (17) through (22) as paragraphs (28) and (27), respectively;
(E) paragraphs (19) and (20) as paragraphs (23) and (24), respectively;
(F) paragraphs (39) through (46) as paragraphs (31) through (38), respectively;
(G) paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11), respectively;
and (H) paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively;
(3) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:
``(1) VILLAGE, VILLAGE.—The term ‘Alaska Native village’ has the same meaning given such term in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.),
(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking ‘serious harm,’ and inserting ‘serious harm to an unemancipated minor’;
(5) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, by striking ‘The term “through that—”’
and inserting ‘The term community-based organization’;
(6) in paragraph (7), as redesignated, by inserting after paragraph (5), as redesignated, the following:
``(6) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC.—The term culturally specific means primarily directed towards racial and ethnic minority groups (as defined in section 1707(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-8(g)).
(7) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term culturally specific services means community-based services that include culturally relevant and linguistically specific services and services that serve a specific geographic community that—
(7) by inserting after paragraph (8), as redesignated, by inserting in paragraph (9), as redesignated, the following:
``(8) HOUSING.—The term ‘homeless’ has the meaning provided in section 41401(a).’’;
(9) in paragraph (18), as redesignated, by inserting ‘‘or Village Public Safety Officers’’ after ‘‘governmental victim services programs’’;
(10) in paragraph (19), as redesignated, by inserting at the end following:
‘‘Intake or referral, by itself, does not constitute legal assistance to member Indian service;
(11) by inserting after paragraph (19), as redesignated, the following:
``(20) PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION OR PERSONAL INFORMATION.—The term ’personally identifying information’ or ’personal information’ means individually identifying information for—
or about an individual including information likely to disclose the location of a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, regardless of whether the information is encoded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected, including—
(A) a first and last name;
(B) a home or other physical address;
(C) telephone number (including a postal, e-mail or Internet protocol address, or telephone or facsimile number);
``(D) a social security number, driver license number, passport number, or student identification number; and
``(E) any other information, including date of birth, place of birth, racial or cultural background, or religious affiliation, that would serve to identify any individual.
(21) POPULATION SPECIFIC ORGANIZATION.—The term population specific organization means a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that primarily serves members of a specific underserved population and has demonstrated a commitment to providing culturally appropriate services to members of that specific underserved population.
(22) POPULATION SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term population specific services means victim-centered services that address the safety, health, economic, legal, housing, workplace, immigration, confidentiality, or other needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and that are designed primarily for and are targeted to a specific underserved population.
(23) in paragraph (23), as redesignated, by striking services and inserting ‘‘assistance’’;
(24) in paragraph (24), as redesignated, the following:
``(25) RAPID CRISIS CENTER.—The term ’rapid crisis center’ means a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization, or governmental entity in a State other than a Territory that provides intervention and related services in a manner that—
(25) by redesignating—
(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ‘‘52’’ and inserting ‘‘57’’;
(B) in paragraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ‘‘or’’;
and
(C) by inserting at the end following:
``(1) any federally recognized Indian tribe.
(26) by redesignating—
(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ‘‘or’’ and inserting ‘‘and’’;
(B) in paragraph (B), by striking ‘‘500,000’’ and inserting ‘‘250,000’’;
and
(C) by inserting after paragraph (27), as redesignated, the following:
``(28) SEX TRAFFICKING.—The term 'sex trafficking' means any conduct proscribed by section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, whether or not the conduct occurs in interstate or foreign commerce or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.
(29) SEXUAL ASSAULT.—The term ’sexual assault’ means any nonconsensual sexual act proscribed by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.
(30) in paragraph (34), as redesignated, the following:
``(35) TRIBAL COALITION.—The term ’tribal coalition’ means an established nonprofit, nongovernmental Indian organization, Alaska Native organization, or a Native Hawaiian organization that—
``(A) provides education, support, and technical assistance to member Indian service providers in a manner that enables those programs to establish and maintain culturally appropriate services, including shelter and rape crisis services, designed to assist Indian women and the dependents of those women who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and
``(B) is comprised of board and general members that are representative of—
``(i) the member service providers described in subparagraph (A); and
``(ii) the local affected population in which the services are being provided.
(31) by inserting after paragraph (38), as redesignated, the following:
``(40) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘unit of local government’ means any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.’’;
and
(32) in paragraph (42), as redesignated, the following:
``(43) VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ’victim service provider’ means a nonprofit, nongovernmental or tribal organization or rapid crisis center, in the case of a tribal coalition, that assists or advocates for domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, victims, including domestic violence shelters, faith-based organizations, and other organizations, with a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
(44) VICTIM SERVICES OR SERVICES.—The terms ’victim services’ and ’services’ mean services provided to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including telephonic or web-based hotlines, legal advocacy, economic advocacy, emergency and transitional shelter, accommodation and advocacy through medical, civil or criminal justice, immigration, and social support systems, crisis intervention, short-term individual and group support, victim identification, culture-specific services, population specific services, and other related supportive services.
(45) YOUTH.—The term ’youth’ means a person who is 11 to 24 years old.
(b) Grants Conditions.—Subsection (b) of section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)) is amended—
(1) in paragraph (2)—
(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:
``(i) disclose, reveal, or release any personally identifying information or individual information collected in connection with services provided, utilized through grantees’ and subgrantees’ programs, regardless of whether the information has been encoded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected;
and
(ii) disclose, reveal, or release individual client information without the informed, written, reasonably time-limited consent of the person (or in the case of an unemancipated minor, the minor and the parent or guardian or in the case of legal incapacity, a court-appointed guardian) about whose information is sought, whether for this program or any other Federal, State, tribal, or territorial grant program, except that consent for release may not be given by the abuser of the minor, incapacitated person, or the abuser of the other parent of the minor.
If a minor or a person with a legally appointed guardian is permitted by law to receive services without the parent’s or guardian’s consent, the minor or person with a guardian’s consent shall document their compliance with the conferral process with State and tribal coalition and technical assistance providers who receive funding through grants administered by the Office on Violence Against Women and authorized by this Act, and other key stakeholders.

(ii) Areas covered.—The areas of conferral under this paragraph shall include:

(1) subparagraph (A) of section 501(a) of such Code.

(iii) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act during the following 2 fiscal years.

(iv) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this Act, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding for the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for a grant under this Act.

(v) REMUNERATION.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury.

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(iii) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

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

(ii) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act to a nonprofit organization that has not accounted for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(iii) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under a grant program described in this Act and uses the grant funds to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, comparable data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(C) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—No amounts are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization, out of funds awarded under any grant program described in this Act through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in grant funds.

(ii) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization, out of funds awarded under any grant program described in this Act through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in grant funds.
Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

"(ii) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(iii) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all approved conference expenditures referenced in this paragraph.

“ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification that—

“(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under subparagraph (A)(iii) have been issued;

“(iii) no findings required under subparagraph (A)(v) have been made; and

“(iv) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under subparagraph (A) from the previous year.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the provisions of titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and section 307 of title 3, 502, 901, and 962 of this Act shall not take effect until the beginning of the fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLES E—ENHANCING JUDICIAL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

SECTION 101. STOP GRANTS.

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—

“(a) in section 1001(a)(18) (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(18)) by striking “$22,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “$22,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”;

“(b) in section 3001(b) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(b))—

“(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

“(A) by striking “and inserting “resources”; and

“(B) by inserting “for the protection and safety of victims,” after “women;”;

“(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;”;

“(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking,” as well as the appropriate treatment of victims;”;

“(4) by striking paragraph (5)—

“(i) by inserting “and legal assistance” after “victim services’’; and

“(ii) by striking “domestic violence and dat-

ing violence, dating violence, and stalking” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

“(iii) by striking “sexual assault and domest-

ic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

“(iv) by striking the period at the end and inserting—

“(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(20) developing, enhancing, or strengthening prevention and educational programming to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, with not more than 5 percent of the amount allocated to a State for this purpose;”;

“(c) in section 3007 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–1) —

“(1) in subsection (a), by striking “non-

partisan state government programs” and inserting “victim service providers”;

“(2) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “(not including populations of Indian tribes)”;

“(d) in subsection (c)—

“(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) grantees and subgrantees shall develop a plan for implementation and shall consult and coordinate with—

“(A) the State sexual assault coalition;

“(B) the State domestic violence coalition;

“(C) the law enforcement entities within the State;

“(D) prosecution offices;

“(E) State and local courts;

“(F) Tribal governments in those States with State or federally recognized Indian tribes;

“(G) representatives from underserved populations, including culturally specific populations;

“(H) victim service providers;

“(I) population specific organizations; and

“(J) other entities that the State or the Attorney General identifies as needed for the planning process.”;

“(2) by redesigning paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

“(3) by inserting after paragraph (2), as amended by clause (i), the following:

“(3) grantees shall coordinate the State implementation plan described in paragraph (2) with the State plans described in section 307 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10407) and the programs described in section 1404 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10606) and section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 2380–1b);”;

“(4) in paragraph (4), as redesignated by clause (i)—

“(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and not less than 25 percent shall be allocated for prosecutors”;

“(B) by redesigning subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D); and

“(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following:

“(i) not less than 25 percent shall be allocated for prosecutors;”;

“(D) in subparagraph (D) as redesignated by subparagraph (ii) by striking “for” and inserting “to”;

“(E) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—An application for a grant under this section shall include—

“(1) the certifications of qualification required under subsection (c);

“(2) proof of compliance with the requirements for the payment of forensic medical exams and judicial notification, described in section 2010;

“(3) proof of compliance with the requirements for paying fees and costs relating to...
domestic violence and protection order cases, described in section 2011(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)).

(5) any other documentation that the Attorney General may require.

(3) in paragraph (1)—

(b) in substanction (A), by striking ‘‘domestic violence and sexual assault’’ and inserting ‘‘domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking’’;

(c) in subparagraph (D), by striking ‘‘linguistically and’’; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(5) In disbursing grants under this part, the Attorney General may impose reasonable conditions on grant awards to ensure that the States meet statutory, regulatory, and other program requirements.’’

(b) in subsection (f), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; except that, for purposes of this subsection, the costs of the projects for victim services or tribes for which there is an exemption under section 49002(b)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 1392d(b)(1)) shall not count toward the total costs of the projects.’’; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(1) IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.—A State applying for a grant under this part shall—

(i) develop an implementation plan in consultation with the entities listed in subsection (c)(2), that identifies how the State will use the funds awarded under this part, including how the State will meet the requirements of paragraph (1); and

(ii) submit to the Attorney General—

(A) the implementation plan developed under paragraph (1); and

(B) documentation from each member of the planning committee as to their participation in the planning process;

(C) documentation from the prosecution, law enforcement, court, and victim services programs to be assisted, describing—

(i) the need for the grant funds;

(ii) the intended use of the grant funds;

(iii) the expected result of the grant funds; and

(iv) the demographic characteristics of the populations to be served, including age, disability, race, ethnicity, and language background;

(D) a description of how the State will ensure that any subgrantees will consult with victim service providers during the course of developing their grant applications in order to ensure that the proposed activities are designed to promote the safety, confidentiality, and economic independence of victims;

(E) demographic data on the distribution of underserved populations within the State and a description of how the State will meet the needs of underserved populations, including the minimum allocation for population specific services required under subsection (c)(3); and

(F) a description of how the State plans to meet the regulations issued pursuant to subsection (b);

(G) goals and objectives for reducing domestic violence-related homicides within the State; and

(H) any other information requested by the Attorney General.

(4) REALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—A State may use any returned or remaining funds for any authorized purpose under this part if—

(i) funds from a subgrant awarded under this part are returned to the State; or

(ii) the State does not receive sufficient eligible applications to award the full funding within the allocations in subsection (c)(4).

(iii) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘non-profit, non-governmental victim service organizations,’’ and inserting ‘‘victim service providers, staff from population specific organizations,’’;

(4) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘and’’; and

(5) SEC. 102. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION ORDERS.

(a) in General.—Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh et seq.) is amended by—

(i) in section 101 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh), subsection (a)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘States, and all that follows through ‘‘of local government’’ and inserting ‘‘grantees’’;

(ii) in paragraph (1), by inserting ‘‘and enforcement of protection orders across State and tribal lines;’’;

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and training in police departments to improve tracking of cases’’ and inserting ‘‘data collection systems, and training in police departments to improve tracking of cases and classification of complaints’’;

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting ‘‘and provide the appropriate training and education about domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking’’ after ‘‘computer tracking systems’’;

(v) in subsection (b), by inserting ‘‘and other victim services’’ after ‘‘legal advocacy service programs’’;

(vi) in paragraph (6), by striking ‘‘judges’’ and inserting ‘‘Judge, tribal, territorial, and local judges, courts, and court-based and court-related personnel’’;

(vii) in paragraph (8), by striking ‘‘and sexual assault’’ and inserting ‘‘dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking’’;

(viii) in paragraph (10), by striking ‘‘non-profit, non-governmental victim service organizations,’’;

(b) to develop and implement training programs for prosecutors and other prosecution-related personnel regarding best practices to ensure offender accountability, victim safety, and victim consultation in cases involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(c) to develop or strengthen policies, programs, and training for law enforcement, prosecutors, and the judiciary in recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking against immigrant victims, including the appropriate use of applications for nonimmigrant status under subparagraphs (T) and (U) of section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15));

(d) to develop and promote State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices to the extent practicable, including policies prohibiting polygraph examinations for a court, before ‘‘demonstrate’’;

(e) to develop, implement, or enhance sexual assault nurse examiner programs or sexual assault forensic examiner programs, including the hiring and training of such examiners;

(f) to develop, implement, or enhance Sexual Assault Response Teams or similar coordinated community responses to sexual assault;

(g) to develop and strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers and prosecutors regarding the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases and the appropriate treatment of victims;

(h) to provide human immunodeficiency virus testing programs, counseling, and prophylaxis for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(i) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’;

(j) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’;

(k) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’; and

(l) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’.

(5) SEC. 102. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION ORDERS.

(a) in General.—Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh et seq.) is amended by—

(i) in section 101 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh), subsection (a)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘States, and all that follows through ‘‘of local government’’ and inserting ‘‘grantees’’;

(ii) in paragraph (1), by inserting ‘‘and enforcement of protection orders across State and tribal lines;’’;

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and training in police departments to improve tracking of cases’’ and inserting ‘‘data collection systems, and training in police departments to improve tracking of cases and classification of complaints’’;

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting ‘‘and provide the appropriate training and education about domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking’’ after ‘‘computer tracking systems’’;

(v) in subsection (b), by inserting ‘‘and other victim services’’ after ‘‘legal advocacy service programs’’;

(vi) in paragraph (6), by striking ‘‘judges’’ and inserting ‘‘Judge, tribal, territorial, and local judges, courts, and court-based and court-related personnel’’;

(vii) in paragraph (8), by striking ‘‘and sexual assault’’ and inserting ‘‘dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking’’;

(viii) in paragraph (10), by striking ‘‘non-profit, non-governmental victim service organizations,’’;

(b) to develop and implement training programs for prosecutors and other prosecution-related personnel regarding best practices to ensure offender accountability, victim safety, and victim consultation in cases involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(c) to develop or strengthen policies, programs, and training for law enforcement, prosecutors, and the judiciary in recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking against immigrant victims, including the appropriate use of applications for nonimmigrant status under subparagraphs (T) and (U) of section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15));

(d) to develop and promote State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices to the extent practicable, including policies prohibiting polygraph examinations for a court, before ‘‘demonstrate’’;

(e) to develop, implement, or enhance sexual assault nurse examiner programs or sexual assault forensic examiner programs, including the hiring and training of such examiners;

(f) to develop, implement, or enhance Sexual Assault Response Teams or similar coordinated community responses to sexual assault;

(g) to develop and strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers and prosecutors regarding the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases and the appropriate treatment of victims;

(h) to provide human immunodeficiency virus testing programs, counseling, and prophylaxis for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(i) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’;

(j) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’;

(k) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’; and

(l) in paragraph 10, by striking ‘‘parties’’. 
$73,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.; and
(2) by striking the period that immediately follows another period.

SEC. 108. GRANTS FOR VICTIMS.

Section 1201 of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "arising as a consequence of" and inserting "relating to or arising out of"; and
(B) in the second sentence, by inserting "or arising out of" after "relating to";
(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting "AND GRANT CONDITIONS" after "DEFINITIONS"; and
(B) by inserting "grant conditions" after "definitions";
(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "victims services organizations" and inserting "victim service providers"; and
(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) to implement, expand, and establish efforts and projects to provide competent, supervised pro bono legal assistance for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, except that not more than 10 percent of the funds awarded under this section may be used for the purpose described in paragraph (2);"
(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "this section has completed" and all that follows and inserting the following: "this section;" (A) has demonstrated expertise in providing legal assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the targeted population; or (B) is partnered with an entity or person that has demonstrated expertise described in subparagraph (A); and
(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "it" and inserting "it";
(5) in subsection (f) in paragraph (1), by striking "the court," each place it appears, and inserting "court," before the semicolon; and
(ii) the defendant is in custody or has been served with an accusation or indictment before the semicolon; and
(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking "it" and inserting "it";
(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(f) ALLOCATION FOR TRIBAL COALITIONS.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 5 percent shall be available for grants under section 2001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3780).

(g) ALLOCATION FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 25 percent shall be available for projects that address sexual assault, including stranger rape, acquaintance rape, alcohol or drug-facilitated rape, and rape within the context of an intimate partner relationship;
(2) in section 2102(a) (42 U.S.C. 3786hh-1(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting "court," after "tribal government," and
(B) in paragraph (4), by striking "non-profit, private sexual assault and domestic violence programs" and inserting "victim service providers and, as appropriate, population specific organizations.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(19) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3781) is amended—

(1) by striking "$75,000,000" and all that follows through "2011." and inserting "$73,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.; and
(2) by striking the period that immediately follows another period.

SEC. 109. CONSIDERATIONS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—In making grants for projects described in paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b), the Attorney General shall consider—

(1) provide supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange of children and youth by and between parents in situations involving domestic violence, dating violence, child sexual abuse, sexual assault, or stalking;
(2) develop and promote State, local, and tribal legislation, policies, and best practices for improving civil and criminal court functioning, responses, and services in cases involving a history of domestic violence or sexual assault, or in cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse, including cases in which the victim proceeds pro se;
(3) educate court-based and court-related personnel and court-appointed personnel (including custody evaluators and guardians ad litem) and child protective services workers on the dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including information on perpetrator behavior, evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide, and on issues relating to the needs of victims, including safety, security, privacy, and confidentiality, including cases in which the victim proceeds pro se;
(4) provide appropriate resources in juvenile court matters to respond to dating violence, domestic violence, and sexual assault (including child sexual abuse), and stalking and ensure necessary services dealing with the health and mental health of victims are available;
(5) enable courts or court-based or court-related programs to develop or enhance—

(A) court infrastructure (such as specialized courts, coordinated courts, dockets, intake centers, or interpreter services);
(B) community-based initiatives within the court system (such as court watch programs, victim assistance programs, or community-based supplementary services);
(C) offender management, monitoring, and accountability programs;
(D) safe and confidential information storage and information-sharing databases within and between court systems;
(E) education and outreach programs to improve community access, including enhanced access for underserved populations; and
(F) other programs likely to improve court responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(2) develop and promote civil legal representation and advocacy services, including legal information and resources in cases in which the victim proceeds pro se to—

(A) victims of domestic violence; and
(B) nonoffending parents in matters—

\(’(i)\) that involve allegations of child sexual abuse;
(B) that relate to family matters, including civil protection orders, custody, and divorce; and
(3) in which the other parent is represented by counsel;
(4) collect data and provide training and technical assistance, including developing State, local, and tribal model codes and policies to improve the capacity of grantees and communities to address the civil justice needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking who have legal representation, who are proceeding pro se, or who are proceeding with the assistance of a legal advocate; and
(5) to improve training and education for judges, judicial personnel, attorneys, child welfare personnel, and legal advocates in the civil justice system.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In making grants for projects described in paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b), the Attorney General shall consider—
including child sexual abuse, that includes training on how to review evidence of past abuse and the use of evidenced-based theories to make recommendations on custody and visitation.
available under this section to make one-time planning grants to eligible entities to support the planning and development of specially designed and targeted programs for adult and youth victims in one or more underserved populations, including—

(1) identifying, building and strengthening partnerships with potential collaborators within underserved populations, Federal, State, tribal, territorial or local government entities, and public and private organizations;

(2) conducting a needs assessment of the community and the targeted underserved population or populations to determine what the barriers are to service access and what factors are most hindering input from the targeted underserved population or populations;

(3) identifying promising prevention, outreach and intervention strategies for victims from a targeted underserved population or populations; and

(4) developing a plan, with the input of the targeted underserved population or populations, for implementing prevention, outreach and intervention strategies to address the barriers to accessing services, promoting community awareness in the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the targeted underserved populations, and evaluating the program:

(d) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The Attorney General shall make grants to eligible entities for the purpose of providing or enhancing population specific outreach and services to adults and youth victims in one or more underserved populations, including—

(1) working with Federal, State, tribal, territorial and local governments, agencies, and communities to develop or enhance population specific services;

(2) strengthening the capacity of underserved populations to provide population specific services;

(3) strengthening the capacity of traditional victim service providers to provide population specific services;

(4) the effectiveness of criminal and civil justice interventions by providing training for law enforcement, prosecutors, judges and other court personnel on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the targeted underserved populations; or

(5) working in cooperation with an underserved population to develop and implement outreach, education, prevention, and intervention strategies that highlight available resources and the specific issues faced by victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking from underserved populations.

(e) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women at such time, in such form, and in such manner as the Director may prescribe.

(f) REPORTS.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall submit to the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women a report that describes the activities carried out with grant funds.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the funds identified in subsection (a) of this section and there authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

(h) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section the definitions and grant conditions in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) shall apply.

SECTION 109. CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES GRANT.

Section 121 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14043a) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “AND LINGUISTICALLY”;

(2) by striking “and linguistically” each place it appears;

(3) by striking “and linguistic” each place it appears;

(4) by striking subsection (a)(3) and inserting—

“(2) PROGRAMS COVERED.—The programs covered by paragraph (1) are the programs carried out under the following provisions:


“(E) Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-7) (Education, Training, and Enhanced Services to End Violence Against and Abuse of Women with Disabilities); and

“(5) in subsection (g), by striking “linguistic and”.

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

SECTION 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES.—Section 41601(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043g(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “other programs” and all that follows and inserting “other nongovernmental or tribal programs and projects that work with individuals who have been victimized by sexual assault, without regard to the age of the individual.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or tribal programs and activities” after “non-governmental organizations”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “linguistically” and;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting “(including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)” after “The Attorney General shall allocate to each State”;

(B) by striking the “District of Columbia, Puerto Rico,” after “ Guam”;

(C) by striking “62.5 percent” and inserting “60.25 percent”; and

(D) by striking “The District of Columbia shall be treated as a territory for purposes of calculating its allocation under the preceding formula.”;

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043g(f)(1)) is amended by striking “$50,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

SECTION 202. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13971 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle H—Enhanced Training and Services To End Abuse Later in Life

SEC. 40901. ENHANCED TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END ABUSE IN LATER LIFE.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
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“(1) the term ‘exploitation’ has the meaning given in the term section 8 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397g);

“(2) the term ‘later life’, relating to an individual, means the individual is 50 years of age or older; and

“(3) the term ‘neglect’ means the failure of a caretaker or fiduciary to provide the goods or services that are necessary to maintain the health or safety of an individual in later life.

“(b) Grant Program.

“(1) Grants Authorized.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in paragraph (2).

“(2) Mandatory and Permissible Activities.

“(A) Mandatory Activities.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use the funds received under the grant to:

“(i) provide training programs to assist law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, population specific organizations, victim service providers, victim advocates, and relevant officers in Federal, tribal, State, territorial, and local courts in recognizing and addressing elder abuse;

“(ii) provide or enhance services for victims of abuse in later life, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and neglect;

“(iii) establish or support multidisciplinary collaborative community responses to victims of abuse in later life, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, exploitation, and neglect; and

“(iv) conduct cross-training for law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, attorneys, health care providers, population specific organizations, faith-based advocates, victim service providers, and courts to better serve victims of abuse in later life, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, exploitation, and neglect;

“(B) Permissible Activities.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section may use the funds received under the grant to:

“(i) provide training programs to assist attorneys, health care providers, faith-based leaders, or other community-based organizations in identifying and addressing instances of abuse in later life, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, exploitation, and neglect; or

“(ii) develop and disseminate awareness campaigns to ensure that victims of abuse in later life, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, exploitation, and neglect receive appropriate assistance.

“(C) Waiver.—The Attorney General may waive 1 or more of the activities described in subparagraph (A) if making a determination that the activity would duplicate services available in the community.

“(D) Limitation.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section may not use more than 10 percent of the total funds received under the grant for an activity described in subparagraph (B)(i).

“(E) Eligible Entities.—An entity shall be eligible to receive a grant under this section if—

“(A) the entity is—

“(i) a public or private 501(c)(3) organization;

“(ii) a unit of local government;

“(iii) a tribal government or tribal organization;

“(iv) a population specific organization with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals over 50 years of age;

“(v) a victim service provider with demonstrated experience in addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; or

“(vi) a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition; and

“(B) the entity demonstrates that it is part of a multidisciplinary partnership that includes—

“(i) a law enforcement agency;

“(ii) a prosecutor’s office;

“(iii) a victim service provider; and

“(iv) a program or government agency with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals in later life;

“(C) Under funded Populations.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to proposals providing services to culturally specific and underserved populations.

“(D) Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

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

“SEC. 301. RAPÉ PREVENTION AND EDUCATION GRANT.

“Section 301 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1b) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)—

“(A) the entity is—

“(i) a State;

“(ii) a local government; or

“(iii) a nonprofit program or government agency with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals in later life;

“(B) the entity demonstrates that it is part of a multidisciplinary partnership that includes—

“(i) a law enforcement agency;

“(ii) a prosecutor’s office;

“(iii) a victim service provider; and

“(iv) a program or government agency with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals in later life;

“(2) in subsection (b)—

“(A) the entity is—

“(i) a State; or

“(ii) a local government; or

“(B) the entity is a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition; and

“(3) BASELINE FUNDING FOR STATES, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND PUERTO RICO.—A minimum allocation of $150,000 shall be awarded in each fiscal year for each of the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

“(a) Grants Authorized.—The Attorney General, working in collaboration with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Education, shall award grants to enhance the safety of youth and children who are victims of, or exposed to, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or sex trafficking and prevent future violence.

“(b) Program Purposes.—Funds provided under this section may be used for the following program purpose areas:

“(1) Services to Advocate for and Respond to Youth.—To develop, expand, and strengthen protective services to target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or sex trafficking, and to properly refer young people who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking.

“(2) Program Administration.—Funds provided under this section may be used for—

“(i) services to advocate for and respond to youth;

“(ii) the evaluation of programs and services to target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking;

“(iii) training to enhance the ability of school personnel, youth workers, victim service providers, child protective services, and other programs that serve children and youth to improve their ability to appropriately respond to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking, and to properly refer such children, youth, and their families to appropriate services.

“(3) Supporting Youth Through Education and Protection.—To enable middle schools, high schools, and other educational institutions to—

“(A) provide training to school personnel, including healthcare providers and security personnel, on the needs of students who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or sex trafficking;

“(B) develop and implement prevention and intervention policies in middle and high schools, including appropriate responses to, and identification and referral procedures for, victims who are perpetrators of domestic violence, dating violence, and sex trafficking, and procedures for handling the requirements of court protective orders issued to or against students;

“(C) provide support services for student victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or sex trafficking, such as a resource person who is either on-site or on-call;

“(D) implement developmentally appropriate educational programming for students responding to the needs of children and youth who are victims of, or exposed to, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking and the impact of such violence on youth; or

“(E) develop strategies to increase identification, support, referral, and intervention programming for youth who are at high risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or sex trafficking.

“(4) Eligible Applicants.—An entity shall be eligible to receive a grant under this section if—

“(A) a victim service provider, tribal non-profit, or population-specific or community-based organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth who are, including runaway or homeless youth, victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking;
“(B) a victim service provider that is partnered with an entity that has a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth; or

“(C) CRIMINAL VIOLATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2), an entity described in paragraph (2) shall be partnered with a public, charter, tribal, or nationally accredited private middle or high school, a school administered by the Department of Defense under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code or section 1462 of the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978, a group of schools, a school district, or an institution of higher education.

“(D) OTHER PARTNERSHIPS.—All applicants under this section are encouraged to work in partnership with organizations and agencies that have demonstrated efforts to support and assist such populations. Such entities may include—

“(i) a State, tribe, unit of local government, or territory;

“(ii) a population specific or community-based organization;

“(iii) batterer intervention programs or sex offender treatment programs with specialized knowledge and experience working with youth offenders; or

“(iv) any other agencies or nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with the capacity to provide assistance to the adult, youth, and child victims served by the partnership.

“(e) GRANTEE REQUIREMENTS.—Applicants for grants shall establish in connection with the grantee that coordinate with prevention programs to combat such crimes, after ‘sexual assault and stalking,’

“(1) require and include appropriate referral systems for child and youth victims;

“(2) protect the confidentiality and privacy of child and youth victim information, particularly in the context of parental or third party consent, mandatory reporting duties, and working with other service providers all with priority on victim safety and autonomy; and

“(3) ensure that individuals providing intervention or prevention programming to children or youth through a program funded under this section have completed, or will complete, training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking enforcement.

“(f) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section, the definitions and grant conditions provided for in section 4002 shall apply.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

“(h) PRIORITY.—The Attorney General shall prioritize grant applications under this section that coordinate with prevention programs in the community.”.

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

Section 303 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14040b) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)—

“(A) in paragraph (1)—

“(i) by striking ‘stalking on campuses,’ and inserting ‘stalking on campuses,’;

“(ii) by striking ‘against women on’ and inserting ‘against crimes on’; and

“(iii) by inserting ‘and’ to develop and strengthen prevention education and awareness programs; and

“(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘$500,000’ and inserting ‘$300,000’;

“(2) in subsection (b)—

“(A) in paragraph (1)—

“(i) by inserting ‘, strengthen,’ after ‘To develop’; and

“(ii) by inserting ‘including the use of technology to combat such crimes,’ after ‘sexual assault and stalking,’;

“(B) in paragraph (4)—

“(1) by inserting ‘and population specific services’ after ‘strength victim services programs’;

“(ii) by striking ‘entities carrying out’ and inserting ‘servicing providers’; and

“(iii) by inserting ‘regardless of whether the services are directed to individuals or in coordination with community victim service providers’ before the period at the end;

“(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) To develop or adapt and provide developmental, culturally appropriate, and linguistically accessible print or electronic materials to address both prevention and intervention in domestic violence, dating violence, sexual violence, and stalking.

“(D) To develop or adapt population specific strategies and projects for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus.

“(3) in subsection (c)—

“(A) in paragraph (2)—

“(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘any nonviolent relationship’ and inserting ‘victim services programs’;

“(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

“(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

“(D) describe how underserved populations in the campus community will be adequately served, including the provision of relevant population specific services;’;

“(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ‘2007 through 2011’ and inserting ‘2014 through 2018’;

“(4) in subsection (d)—

“(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

“(B) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following:

“(3) GRANT MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each grantee shall comply with the minimum requirements during the grant period:

“(A) The term ‘dating violence’, ‘domestic violence’, and ‘stalking’ have the meaning given such terms in section 4002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));’;

“(B) the term ‘sexual assault’ means an offense classified as a forcible or nonforcible sex offense under the uniform crime reporting system of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.’;

“(5) in subsection (e), by striking ‘there are all that follows through ‘stalking victim services programs’;’;

“(6) by adding a period at the end of clause (i) and inserting ‘crime report’; and

“(7) by inserting ‘crimes on’; and

“(8) by inserting ‘crimes on’; and

“(9) by adding a period at the end of clause (i) and inserting ‘crime report’;

“(10) To develop or adapt population specific services programs’; and

“(11) Requirements and conditions that coordinate with prevention programs.’;

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

“SEC. 304. CAMPUS SEXUAL VIOLENCE, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, AND STALKING EDUCATION AND PREVENTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(f)) is amended—

“(1) in paragraph (1)—

“(A) in subparagraph (C)(iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘, when the victim of such crime elects or is unable to make such a report’; and

“(B) in subparagraph (F)—

“(i) in clause (i)(VIII), by striking ‘and’ after the semicolon;

“(ii) in clause (ii)—

“(I) by striking ‘sexual orientation’ and inserting ‘national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity’; and

“(II) by striking the period and inserting ‘and’;

“(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) The grantee shall train all campus law enforcement to respond effectively to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(D) The grantee shall train all members of campus disciplinary boards to respond effectively to situations involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;’; and

“(2) in subsection (e), by striking ‘there are all that follows through the period and inserting ‘there is authorized to be appropriated $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.’; and

“(3) in subsection (g), by striking ‘domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.’; and

“(4) in subsection (h), by striking ‘section 1092(f)’ and inserting ‘section (a)’; and

“(5) in subsection (i), by striking ‘under section 1092(f)’ and inserting ‘under section (a)’; and

“(6) in subsection (j), by striking ‘under section 1092(f)’ and inserting ‘under section (a)’; and

“(7) by inserting at the end the following:

“(A) The term ‘dating violence’, ‘domestic violence’, and ‘stalking’ have the meaning given such terms in section 4002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));’;

“(B) by inserting after clause (i), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), the following:

“(i) The term ‘sexual assault’ means an offense classified as a forcible or nonforcible sex offense under the uniform crime reporting system of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.’; and
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will be used during any institutional conduct proceeding arising from such a report.

"(B) The policy described in subparagraph (A) shall address the following areas:

(i) Education programs to promote the awareness of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, which shall include—

(I) primary prevention and awareness programs to diminish student and new employee, which shall include—

(aa) a statement that the institution of higher education prohibits the offenses of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and the definition of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(bb) the definition of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in the applicable jurisdiction;

(cc) the definition of consent, in reference to sexual activity, in the applicable jurisdiction;

(dd) safe and positive options for bystander intervention that may be carried out by an individual to prevent harm or intervene when there is a risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against a person other than such individual;

(ee) information on risk reduction to recognize warning signs of abusive behavior and how to avoid potential attacks; and

(ff) the information described in clauses (ii) through (iv) of subparagraph (A).

(ii) Possible sanctions or protective measures that such institution may impose following a final determination of an institutional disciplinary procedure regarding rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(iii) Procedures victims should follow if a sex offense, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking has occurred, including information in writing about—

(I) the importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to the prosecution of criminal domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or in obtaining a protection order;

(II) to whom the alleged offense should be reported;

(III) options regarding law enforcement and other authorities, including notification of the victim’s options to—

(aa) notify proper law enforcement authorities, including on-campus and local police;

(bb) be assisted by campus authorities in notifying law enforcement authorities if the victim so chooses; and

(cc) decline to notify such authorities; and

(IV) where applicable, the rights of victims and the institution’s responsibilities regarding notification, no contact orders, restraining orders, or similar lawful orders issued by a criminal, civil, or tribal court.

(iv) Procedures for institutional disciplinary action in cases of alleged domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, which shall include a clear statement of—

(I) such proceedings shall—

(aa) provide a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution; and

(bb) be conducted by officials who receive annual training on the issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and how to conduct an investigation that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability;

(II) the accuser and the accused are entitled to the same opportunities to have others present during an institutional disciplinary proceeding, including the opportunity to be accompanied by and hear testimony or cross-examine the other party or have an advisor of their choice; and

(III) both the accuser and the accused shall be simultaneously informed, in writing, of—

(aa) the outcome of any institutional disciplinary proceeding that arises from an allegation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(bb) the institution’s procedures for the accused and the victim to appeal the results of the institutional disciplinary proceeding;

(cc) the results that, if any, occur prior to the time that such results become final; and

(dd) when such results become final.

(v) Information about how the institution will protect the confidentiality of victims, including how publicly-available record-keeping will be accomplished without the inclusion of identifying information about the victim, to the extent permissible by law.

(vi) Written notification of students and employees about existing counseling, health, mental health, legal assistance, and other services available for victims both on-campus and in the community.

(vii) Written notification of victims about options for consultation, including the opportunity to be accompanied to any related meeting or proceedings, including the opportunity to be present during an institutional disciplinary proceeding that arises from an alleged violation.

(viii) Written notification of the student or employee who reports to the Secretary of Education, is authorized to award grants for the purpose of preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by taking a comprehensive approach that focuses on youth, children exposed to violence, and men as leaders and influencers of social norms.

(b) Use of Funds.—The funds provided under this section may be used for the following purposes:

(1) TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION.—To develop, maintain, or enhance programs that change attitudes and behaviors around the acceptability of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Funds may be used for—

(A) age and developmentally-appropriate education on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, which shall include—

(aa) training for teachers, health care providers, faith leaders, older teens, and mentors;

(bb) community-based collaboration and training for those with influence on youth, such as parents, teachers, coaches, and working situations, if so requested by the victim, to the extent permissible by law.

(C) E FFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.
“(3) ENGAGING MEN AS LEADERS AND ROLE MODELS.—To develop, maintain or enhance programs that work with men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and to help men to serve as role models and social influencers of other men and youth at the individual, school, community or statewide levels.

(4) GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—

(a) a victim service provider, community-based organization, tribe or tribal organization, or other non-profit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and at least one of the following that has expertise in serving children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, youth domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, prevention, dating men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(b) a local community-based organization, population-specific organization, university or health care clinic, faith-based organization, or other non-profit, nongovernmental organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(c) a nonprofit, nongovernmental entity providing services for runaway or homeless youth who have experienced domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(d) Healthcare entities eligible for reimbursement under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395aaa(b)(7) and (8); 42 U.S.C. 280g–4) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(1) the development of measures and strategies to improve the response of the healthcare system to domestic or sexual violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and

(‘‘B) identify any other community, school, or State-based efforts that are working on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking prevention and explain how the grantee or partnership will add value, coordinate programs, and not duplicate existing efforts.

(3) CHOICE OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall prepare and submit to the Director an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require that includes—

(A) a description of the entity;

(B) a description of the population served by the entity;

(C) the development or enhancement and evaluation of comprehensive statewide domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, or other services appropriate to the geographic and cultural needs of a site;

(D) a plan for the development of measures and methods for the evaluation of the practice of health care providers or other service providers to guide health professionals and public health staff in identifying and responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and for identifying and documenting that health information is maintained in a manner that protects the patient’s privacy and safety, and safely uses health information technology to improve documentation, identification, assessment, treatment, and follow-up care;

(5) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.—The Director shall approve a grant under this section in each fiscal year to a partnership between a victim service provider, community-based organization, tribe or tribal organization, or other non-profit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and at least one of the following that has expertise in serving children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, youth domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, prevention, dating men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking:

(A) a public, charter, tribal, or nationally accredited school administered by the Department of Defense under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code or section 1402 of the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978, a group of schools, a school district.

(B) a local community-based organization, population-specific organization, university or health care clinic, faith-based organization, or other non-profit, nongovernmental organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(C) a community-based organization, population-specific organization, university or health care clinic, faith-based organization, or other non-profit, nongovernmental organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(D) Any other agencies, population-specific organizations, or nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with the capacity to provide necessary expertise to meet the goals of the program; or

(6) REPEALS.—The following provisions are repealed:

(a) Grants to Strengthen the Healthcare System’s Response to Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking.

(b) Repeals. —The following provisions are repealed:


(2) Section 493 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045c).

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM’S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

SEC. 501. CONSOLIDATION OF GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM’S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) Grants.—Section 399P of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 260g–4) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(1) GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM’S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

‘‘(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants for—

(1) the development or enhancement and implementation of interdisciplinary training for health professionals, public health staff, and allied health professionals;
Grantee may use amounts received under this section to address, as part of a grant or grant program, such education or training opportunities, which may include the use of distance learning networks and other available technologies needed to reach isolated rural areas, for medical, nursing, and other health profession students and residents on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and, as appropriate, other forms of violence and abuse.

(c) Grants funded under subsection (a)(3) may be used for—

(1) the development of training modules and policies that address the overlap of child abuse, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and elder abuse, as well as childhood exposure to domestic and sexual violence; and

(2) the development, expansion, and implementation of sexual assault forensic medical examination or sexual assault nurse examiner programs.

(iii) the inclusion of the health effects of lifetime exposure to violence and abuse as well as related protective factors and behavioral and mental health, professional training schools including medical, dental, nursing, social work, and mental and behavioral health care curricula, and allied health service training courses; or

(iv) the integration of knowledge of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking into health care accreditation and professional licensing examination, training, and credentialing programs.

(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—

(A) CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE.—To the extent consistent with the purpose of this section, a grantee may use amounts received under a grant made under this section to address, as part of a grant or grant program, such education or training opportunities, which may include the use of distance learning networks and other available technologies needed to reach isolated rural areas, for medical, nursing, and other health profession students and residents on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and, as appropriate, other forms of violence and abuse.

(2) A State department or other division of health, a local health clinic, hospital, or health system, or any other community-based organization, may make grants or enter into contracts to provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program, activity, or service carried out pursuant to this section. Not more than 8 percent of the funds appropriated under this section in each fiscal year may be used to fund technical assistance within this subsection.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall make publicly available materials developed by grantees under this section, including materials on training, best practices, and research and evaluation.

(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall publish a biennial report on—

(A) the distribution of funds under this section; and

(B) the programs and activities supported by such funds.

(4) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants or enter into contracts to provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program, activity, or service carried out pursuant to this section. Not more than 20 percent of the funds appropriated under this section in each fiscal year may be used to fund technical assistance within this subsection.

(B) RESEARCH.—Research authorized in paragraph (1) may include—

(A) research on the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and lifetime exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(B) research to determine effective health care interventions to respond to and prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(C) The Secretary shall—

(1) develop a system of data collection to assess the extent to which domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and lifetime exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence are linked to health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(2) research on the impact of domestic, dating, and sexual violence, childhood exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence, on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(2) AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall make publicly available materials developed by grantees under this section, including materials on training, best practices, and research and evaluation.

(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall publish a biennial report on—

(A) the distribution of funds under this section; and

(B) the programs and activities supported by such funds.

(4) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants or enter into contracts to provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program, activity, or service carried out pursuant to this section. Not more than 20 percent of the funds appropriated under this section in each fiscal year may be used to fund technical assistance within this subsection.

(B) RESEARCH.—Research authorized in paragraph (1) may include—

(A) research on the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and lifetime exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(B) research to determine effective health care interventions to respond to and prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(C) The Secretary shall—

(1) develop a system of data collection to assess the extent to which domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and lifetime exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence are linked to health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(2) research on the impact of domestic, dating, and sexual violence, childhood exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence, on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(2) AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall make publicly available materials developed by grantees under this section, including materials on training, best practices, and research and evaluation.

(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall publish a biennial report on—

(A) the distribution of funds under this section; and

(B) the programs and activities supported by such funds.

(4) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants or enter into contracts to provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program, activity, or service carried out pursuant to this section. Not more than 20 percent of the funds appropriated under this section in each fiscal year may be used to fund technical assistance within this subsection.

(B) RESEARCH.—Research authorized in paragraph (1) may include—

(A) research on the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and lifetime exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(B) research to determine effective health care interventions to respond to and prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(C) The Secretary shall—

(1) develop a system of data collection to assess the extent to which domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and lifetime exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence are linked to health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and

(2) research on the impact of domestic, dating, and sexual violence, childhood exposure to domestic, dating, and sexual violence, on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, vulnerable populations, and underrepresented populations; and
‘(D) research on the impact of adverse childhood experiences on adult experiences with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and adult health outcomes, including, in particular, efforts to limit the impact of adverse childhood experiences through the health care system.

‘(G) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

‘[9] PROHIBITED BIAS PROTECT STATE OR LOCAL RIGHTS.

‘(B) PROHIBITED BASIS FOR DENIAL OR TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE OR EVICTION.—

‘(1) IN GENERAL.—An applicant for or tenant of a covered housing program may not be denied admission to, or denied assistance under, terminated from participation in, or evicted from the housing and who engages in criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or who has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the applicant or tenant otherwise qualifies for admission, assistance, participation, or occupancy.

‘(2) CONSTRUCTION OF LEHR TERMS.—An incident of actual or threatened domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking shall not be construed as—

‘(A) a serious or repeated violation of a lease for housing assisted under a covered housing program; or

‘(B) the program under section 40297 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 or 12 U.S.C. 1397f.

‘(C) the program under section 514 of the Human Services Act of 1965 or 42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.;

‘(D) the program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1959 or 12 U.S.C. 1701q;

‘(E) the program under section 41403 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 or 42 U.S.C. 1397f.

‘(III) the distribution or possession of property among members of a household in a covered housing program.

‘(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(iii) the rights of access to or control of property, including civil protection orders issued to protect a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or

‘(II) the distribution or possession of property among members of a household in a covered housing program.

‘(iii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(iv) to supersede any provision of any Federal statute, or local law, that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

‘(D) DOCUMENTATION.—

‘(1) REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTATION.—If an applicant for, or tenant of, housing assisted under a covered housing program represents that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted; or

‘(iv) to supersede any provision of any Federal statute, or local law, that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

‘(E) FAILURE TO PROVIDE CERTIFICATION.—

‘(A) IN GENERAL.—If an applicant or tenant does not provide the documentation required under paragraph (1) within 14 business days after the tenant receives a request in writing for such certification from a public housing agency or owner of housing assisted under a covered housing program, nothing in this chapter may be construed to limit the authority of the public housing agency or owner to—

‘(i) terminate the participation of the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or

‘(iv) evict the applicant, the tenant, or a lawful occupant that commits violations of a lease.

‘(B) EXTENSION.—A public housing agency or owner of housing may extend the 14-business-day deadline for documentation described in this paragraph if the public housing agency or owner determines that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted;

‘(iii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(E) FAILURE TO PROVIDE CERTIFICATION.—

‘(A) IN GENERAL.—If an applicant or tenant does not provide the documentation required under paragraph (1) within 14 business days after the tenant receives a request in writing for such certification from a public housing agency or owner of housing assisted under a covered housing program, nothing in this chapter may be construed to limit the authority of the public housing agency or owner to—

‘(i) terminate the participation of the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or

‘(iv) evict the applicant, the tenant, or a lawful occupant that commits violations of a lease.

‘(B) EXTENSION.—A public housing agency or owner of housing may extend the 14-business-day deadline for documentation described in this paragraph if the public housing agency or owner determines that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted;

‘(iii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(iv) to supersede any provision of any Federal statute, or local law, that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

‘(D) DOCUMENTATION.—

‘(1) REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTATION.—If an applicant for, or tenant of, housing assisted under a covered housing program represents that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted;

‘(E) FAILURE TO PROVIDE CERTIFICATION.—

‘(A) IN GENERAL.—If an applicant or tenant does not provide the documentation required under paragraph (1) within 14 business days after the tenant receives a request in writing for such certification from a public housing agency or owner of housing assisted under a covered housing program, nothing in this chapter may be construed to limit the authority of the public housing agency or owner to—

‘(i) terminate the participation of the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or

‘(iv) evict the applicant, the tenant, or a lawful occupant that commits violations of a lease.

‘(B) EXTENSION.—A public housing agency or owner of housing may extend the 14-business-day deadline for documentation described in this paragraph if the public housing agency or owner determines that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted;

‘(iii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(iv) to supersede any provision of any Federal statute, or local law, that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

‘(D) DOCUMENTATION.—

‘(1) REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTATION.—If an applicant for, or tenant of, housing assisted under a covered housing program represents that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted;

‘(E) FAILURE TO PROVIDE CERTIFICATION.—

‘(A) IN GENERAL.—If an applicant or tenant does not provide the documentation required under paragraph (1) within 14 business days after the tenant receives a request in writing for such certification from a public housing agency or owner of housing assisted under a covered housing program, nothing in this chapter may be construed to limit the authority of the public housing agency or owner to—

‘(i) terminate the participation of the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or

‘(iv) evict the applicant, the tenant, or a lawful occupant that commits violations of a lease.

‘(B) EXTENSION.—A public housing agency or owner of housing may extend the 14-business-day deadline for documentation described in this paragraph if the public housing agency or owner determines that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted;

‘(iii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in violation of title 18, United States Code, or local law.

‘(iv) to supersede any provision of any Federal statute, or local law, that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

‘(D) DOCUMENTATION.—

‘(1) REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTATION.—If an applicant for, or tenant of, housing assisted under a covered housing program represents that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted;
“(1) states that an applicant or tenant is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(ii) states that the incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is the ground for protection under subsection (b) meets the requirements under subsection (b); and

(iii) includes the name of the individual who committed the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the name is known and safe to provide; 

(2) failure to comply with subsection (b).

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) was issued under the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 2335); and

(ii) was otherwise available under any provision of law.

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(i) in paragraph (4), by striking “; and” and inserting “; and

(ii) in paragraph (8), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”;

(iii) in paragraph (9), by striking “and” and inserting “; and

(iv) in paragraph (10), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”; and

(v) in paragraph (11), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting “; and

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

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—

(i) in paragraph (4), by striking “; and” and inserting “; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”.

(e) EMERGENCY TRANSFERS.—

(i) in paragraph (6), by striking “; and” and inserting “; and

(ii) in paragraph (7), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”.

(f) PROVISION.—

(i) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting “; and

(ii) in paragraph (9), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”.

(g) SEVERABILITY.—

(i) in paragraph (10), by striking “; and” and inserting “; and

(ii) in paragraph (11), by striking “; except that” and inserting “; except that.”.
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the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 because of noncompliance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 602. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13975 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in the chapter heading, by striking "CHIL\n
(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(iv) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

(B) E FFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect at the beginning of the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2013.

SEC. 603. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Subtitle N of title IV of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14094 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 4106(c) (42 U.S.C. 14094e(c)), by striking "$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018".

SEC. 604. PUBLIC CHARGE.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "crime" and inserting "crime, and information on any permanent protection or restraining order issued against the petitioner related to any specific crime described in paragraph (3)(B)"; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(iii) by striking "$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011" and inserting "$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018";

TITLe VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

SEC. 701. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

Section 4150(e) of the Violence Against Women Act (42 U.S.C. 14094(e)(6)) is amended by striking "fiscal years 2007 through 2011" and inserting "fiscal years 2014 through 2018".

TITLe VIII—PROTECTION OF BATTERED IMMIGRANTS

SEC. 801. U NIMMIGRANT DEFINITION.


SEC. 802. ANNUAL REPORT ON IMMIGRATION APPLICATIONS MADE BY VICTIMS OF ABUSE.

Not later than December 1, 2014, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes the following:

(1) The number of aliens who—

(A) submitted an application for nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U)(i), (15)(U)(ii), or (51) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)(i)) during the preceding fiscal year;

(B) were granted such nonimmigrant status during such fiscal year; or

(C) were denied such nonimmigrant status during such fiscal year.

(2) The mean amount of time and median amount of time to adjudicate an application for such nonimmigrant status during such fiscal year.

(3) The mean amount of time and median amount of time between the receipt of an application for such nonimmigrant status and the issuance of work authorization to an eligible alien during the preceding fiscal year.

(4) The number of aliens granted continued presence in the United States under section 107(c)(3) of the Trafficking Victims Protections Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(3)) during the preceding fiscal year.

(5) A description of any actions being taken to reduce adjudication and processing time, while ensuring the safe and competent processing, of an application described in paragraph (1) or a request for continued presence described in paragraph (4).

SEC. 803. PROTECTION FOR CHILDREN OF VWA SELF-PETITIONERS.

Section 245(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154a(c)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (E), by striking "or" at the end;

(ii) by redesigning subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

(iii) in clause (i) of section 101(a)(15)(U)(ii), if the alien attains 21 years of age after such parent's petition was filed but while it was pending.

(B) PRINCIPAL ALIENS.—An alien described in clause (ii)(I) of such section if the alien attains 21 years of age after the alien's application for status under such clause (i) is filed but while it is pending.

(2) The mean amount of time and median amount of time between the receipt of an application for such nonimmigrant status and the issuance of work authorization to an eligible alien during the preceding fiscal year.

(3) The number of aliens granted continued presence in the United States under section 107(c)(3) of the Trafficking Victims Protections Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(3)) during the preceding fiscal year.

(4) A description of any actions being taken to reduce adjudication and processing time, while ensuring the safe and competent processing, of an application described in paragraph (1) or a request for continued presence described in paragraph (4).

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "or"; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting paragraph (1) in its place.

(D) in the fourth sentence, by striking "At-
(i) by striking “a consular officer” and inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security”;
(ii) by striking the word “officer” and inserting “the Secretary”; and
(C) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking “abuse, and stalking.” and inserting “abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.”;
(2) in subsection (r)—
(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “crime.” and inserting “crime described in paragraph (5)(B) or on any permanent or restraining order issued against the petitioner related to any specified crime described in subsection (5)(B)(i).”;
(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.”;
(ii) by amending paragraph (4)(B)(i) to read as follows:
(iii) To notify the beneficiary as required by clause (i), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide such notice to the Secretary of State for inclusion in the mailing to the beneficiary described in section 833(a)(5)(A)(i).”;
and
(b) provision of information to k nonimmigrants.—section 833 of the international marriage broker regulation act of 2005 (8 u.s.c. 1375a(a)(5)(a)(I)).”;
and
(a) implementation of the international marriage broker act of 2005.—
(1) findings.—congress finds the following:
(A) the international marriage broker act of 2005 (subtitle d of public law 109–162; 119 stat. 3097) has been implemented with regard to investigating and prosecuting violations of the law, and for other purposes.
(B) six years after congress enacted the international marriage broker act of 2005 to regulate the activities of the hundreds of non-profit international marriage brokers operating in the united states, the attorney general has which compo

February 28, 2013

SEC. 808. regulation of international marriage brokers.

SEC. 808. regulation of international marriage brokers.
prosecution of civil and criminal penalties provided for by this section.

1. (B) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General shall consult with the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice to develop policies and public education designed to promote enforcement of this section.

2. (d) TRIBAL COALITION REPORT.—Section 833(f) of the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1375a(f)) is amended—

(a) by inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the” before “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C); and

(b) by inserting “Secretary of” or the “before” “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C).

3. (B) STUDY AND REPORT.— and inserting “STUDY AND REPORT.” and inserting “STUDIES AND REPORTS.”; and

4. (B) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Comptroller General shall conduct a study on the continuing impact of the implementation of this section and of section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) on the process for granting K nonimmigrant visas, including specifically a study of the items described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1).

5. (C) DATA COLLECTION.—The Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of State shall collect and maintain data on the continuing impact of the implementation of this section and of section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255), such alien's physical presence in the United States, such alien's presence in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and such alien's presence in the United States; and

6. (C) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the guidance required by section 384(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(u)) after “domestic violence” after “sexual assault,”

7. (c) CRIMINAL ANNUAL.—Section 2015(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1705(c)) is amended, by striking “(10) develop and promote legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.”.

8. TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

SEC. 901. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.

Section 203(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1705(g)(5)(c)) is amended by striking “(9) provide services to address the needs in the same application.”.

SEC. 902. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL COALITIONS.

Section 2001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1703gg-10(a)) is amended by striking “(6) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:—

(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may provide in the discretion of such Secretary or the Attorney General for the disclosure of information to national security officials to be used solely for a national security purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.”.

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the” before “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C); and

(B) by inserting “Secretary of” or the “before” “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C).

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the” before “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C); and

(B) by inserting “Secretary of” or the “before” “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C).

(3) by inserting “in a manner that protects

the confidentiality of such information” after “law enforcement purpose” after “(a)(2) (D) by striking “in paragraph (2) from applying for funding to a tribal coalition or organization described in paragraph (2) that fails to comply with this section, as determined by the Attorney General.

(4) ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER GRANTS.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits any organization from receiving additional grants under this title to carry out the purposes described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 903. CONSULTATION.

Section 903 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 18045d) is amended—

(a) by striking “(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “Attorney General is” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General are”;

(b) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

“(8) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may provide in the discretion of such Secretary or the Attorney General for the disclosure of information to national security officials to be used solely for a national security purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.”.

(b) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—Section 833(f) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1387(d)) is amended—

(a) by inserting “Secretary’s or the” before “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C); and

(b) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

“(B) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—Section 833(f) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1387(d)) is amended by striking “in paragraph (2) from applying for funding to a tribal coalition or organization described in paragraph (2) that fails to comply with this section, as determined by the Attorney General.

(4) TRIBAL COALITION GRANTS.—

(1) PURPOSE.—The Attorney General shall award a grant to tribal coalitions for purposes of—

(A) increasing awareness of domestic violence and sexual assault against Indian women;

(B) assisting Indian tribes in developing and promoting State, local, and tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.

(2) GRANTS.—The Attorney General shall award grants on an annual basis under paragraph (1) to—

(A) each tribal coalition that—

(i) meets the criteria for a tribal coalition under section 4002(a)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13952(a));

(ii) is recognized by the Office on Violence Against Women; and

(iii) provides services to Indian tribes; and

(B) organizations that propose to incorporate and operate a tribal coalition in areas where Indian tribes are located but no tribal coalition exists.

(3) USE OF AMOUNTS.—For each fiscal years 2014 through 2018, of the amounts appropriated to carry out this subsection—

(A) not more than 10 percent shall be made available to organizations described in paragraph (2)(B), provided that 1 or more organizations determined by the Attorney General to be qualified apply;

(B) not less than 90 percent shall be made available to tribal coalitions described in paragraph (2)(A), which amounts shall be distributed equally among eligible tribal coalitions for the applicable fiscal year.

(4) ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER GRANTS.—Receipt of an award under this subsection by a tribal coalition shall not preclude the tribal coalition from receiving additional grants under this title to carry out the purposes described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 101. MILESTONE REPORT APPLICATIONS.

Nothing in this subsection prohibits any tribal coalition or organization described in paragraph (2) from applying for funding to address sexual assault or domestic violence needs in the same application.”.

SEC. 102. CONSULTATION.

Section 903 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 18045d) is amended—

(a) by striking “(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “Attorney General is” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General are”;

(b) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

“(9) develop and promote legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.”.

SEC. 103. CONGRIBUTIONS.

Section 903 of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 and the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 13952) is added—

(a) by striking “and the Violence Against Women Act of 2000” and inserting “, the Violence Against Women Act of 2000”;

(b) by inserting “, and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013” before the period at the end;

(c) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

“(10) develop and promote legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.”.

SEC. 104. REQUIREMENTS.

Section 904 of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 13952c) is added—

(a) by striking “(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “Attorney General is” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General are”;

(b) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

“(9) develop and promote legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.”.

SEC. 105. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSES.

(a) INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 389(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1255a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the” before “Attorney General” after “Secretary” in subparagraph (C); and

(B) by inserting “Secretary of” or the “before” “Attorney General’s discretion”;
Health and Human Services’ and inserting “Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of the Interior,”; and
(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “and stalking” and inserting “stalking, and sex trafficking”; and
(3) by adding at the end the following:
"(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Attorney General shall submit to Congress an annual report on the annual consultations required under subsection (a) that—
(1) contains the recommendations made under subsection (b) by Indian tribes during the year covered by the report;
(2) describes actions taken during the year covered by the report to respond to recommendations made under subsection (b) during the year or a previous year; and
(3) describes how the Attorney General will engage in coordination and collaboration with Indian tribes, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of the Interior to address the recommendations made under subsection (b).
"(d) NOTICE.—Not later than 120 days before the date of a consultation under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall notify tribal leaders of the date, time, and location of the consultation.

SEC. 904. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

Title II of Public Law 90-284 (25 U.S.C. 1301 et seq. commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 204. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) DATING VIOLENCE.—The term ‘dating violence’ means violence committed by a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim, as determined by the length of the relationship, the type of relationship, and the nature and frequency of interactions between the persons involved in the relationship.

"(2) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term ‘domestic violence’ means violence 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 cohabited 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.

"(3) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term ‘Indian country’ has the meaning given the term in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code.

"(4) PARTICIPATING TRIBE.—The term ‘participating tribe’ means an Indian tribe that elects to exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over the Indian country of that Indian tribe.

"(5) PROTECTION ORDER.—The term ‘protection order’—

"(A) means any injunction, restraining order, or other order issued by a civil or criminal court for the purpose of preventing violent or threatening acts or harassment against, sexual violence against, contact or communication with, or physical proximity to, another person; and

"(B) includes any temporary or final order issued by a civil or criminal court, whether obtained by filing an independent action or as a pendent lite order in another proceeding, if the civil or criminal order was issued in a complaint, petition, motion filed by or on behalf of a person seeking protection.

"(6) SPECIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.—The term ‘special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction’ means the criminal jurisdiction that a participating tribe may exercise under this section but could not otherwise exercise.

"(7) SPouse Or intimate partner.—The term ‘spouse or intimate partner’ has the meaning given the term in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code.

"(b) NATURE OF THE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in addition to all powers of self-government recognized and affirmed by section 201 and 203, the powers of self-government of a participating tribe include the inherent power of that tribe, which is hereby recognized and affirmed, to exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over all persons.

"(2) CONCURRENT JURISDICTION.—The exercise of special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction described in paragraph (1) shall be concurrent with the jurisdiction of the United States, of a State, or of both.

"(3) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this section—

"(A) creates or eliminates any Federal or State criminal jurisdiction over Indian country;

"(B) affects the authority of the United States or any State government that has been delegated authority by the United States to investigate and prosecute a criminal violation in Indian country.

"(4) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(A) VICTIM AND DEFENDANT ARE BOTH NON-INDIANS.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A participating tribe may not exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over an alleged offense if neither the defendant nor the alleged victim is an Indian.

"(ii) is a spouse, intimate partner, or dating partner of a member of the participating tribe; or

"(iii) is a member of the participating tribe.

"(B) DEFENDANT Lacks TIES TO THE INDIAN TRIBE.

"(1) A participating tribe may exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over a defendant only if the defendant—

"(i) resides in the Indian country of the participating tribe;

"(ii) is employed in the Indian country of the participating tribe; or

"(iii) a member of the participating tribe; or

"(ii) resides in the Indian country of the participating tribe;

"(iii) is employed in the Indian country of the participating tribe.

"(C) CRIMINAL CONDUCT.—A participating tribe may exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over a defendant for criminal conduct that falls into one or more of the following categories:

"(1) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND DATING VIOLENCE.—An act of domestic violence or dating violence that occurs in the Indian country of the participating tribe.

"(2) VIOLATIONS OF PROTECTION ORDERS.—An act that—

"(A) occurs in the Indian country of the participating tribe; and

"(B) violates the portion of a protection order that—

"(i) prohibits or provides protection against violent or threatening acts or harassment against, sexual violence against, contact or communication with, or physical proximity to, another person; and

"(ii) is enforced by the participating tribe; and

"(iii) is consistent with section 2265(b) of title 18, United States Code.

"(D) RIGHTS OF DEFENDANTS.—In a criminal proceeding in which a participating tribe exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction, the participating tribe shall provide to the defendant—

"(1) all applicable rights under this Act; and

"(2) a term of imprisonment of any length may be imposed, all rights described in section 203(c);

"(3) the right to a trial by an impartial jury that is drawn from sources that—

"(A) reflect a fair cross section of the community; and

"(4) all other rights whose protection is necessary under the laws of the United States in order for Congress to recognize and affirm the inherent power of the participating tribe to exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over the defendant.

"(e) PETITIONS TO STAY DETENTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A person who has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in a court of the United States under section 203 may petition that court to stay further detention of that person by the participating tribe.

"(2) GRANT OF STAY.—A court shall grant the defendant a stay described in paragraph (1) if the court finds that there is a substantial likelihood that the habeas corpus petition will be granted; and

"(3) NOTICE.—An Indian tribe that has ordered the detention of any person has a duty to timely notify such person of his rights and the procedures under this subsection and under section 203.

"(f) GRANTS TO TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to the governments of Indian tribes (or to authorized designees of those governments)—

"(1) to strengthen tribal criminal justice systems to assist Indian tribes in exercising special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction, including—

"(A) law enforcement (including the capacity of law enforcement or court personnel to obtain information from national crime information databases);

"(B) prosecution;

"(C) trial and appellate courts;

"(D) probation systems;

"(E) detention and correctional facilities;

"(F) alternative rehabilitation centers;

"(G) culturally appropriate services and assistance for victims and their families; and

"(H) criminal codes and rules of criminal procedure, appellate procedure, and evidence;

"(2) 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 a crime of domestic violence or dating violence or a criminal violation of a protection order; and

"(3) to ensure that, in criminal proceedings in which a participating tribe exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction, juries are summoned, selected, and instructed in a manner consistent with all applicable requirements; and

"(4) to accord victims of domestic violence, dating violence, or sexual assault, and violations of protection orders rights that are similar to the rights of a crime victim described in section 3771(a) of title 18, United States Code, consistent with tribal law and custom."

"(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.
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be distributed under this paragraph shall de-
crease or otherwise limit the availability of
funds required to be awarded to States or
units of local government under paragraph
(8)(A)."

(3) by adding at the end the following new
subsections:

"(a) FUNDING FOR AUDITING SEXUAL
ASSAULT EVIDENCE BACKLOGS.—

"(1) ELIGIBILITY.—The Attorney General
may award a grant under this section to a
State or unit of local government for the
purpose described in subsection (a)(7) only if
the State or unit of local government—

"(A) submits a plan for performing the
audit of samples described in such sub-
section; and

"(B) includes in such a plan a good-faith es-
timate of the number of such samples.

"(2) AMOUNT.—A State or unit of local
government receiving a grant for the
purpose described in subsection (a)(7)—

"(A) may not enter into any contract or
agreement with any non-governmental ven-
dor laboratory to conduct an audit described
in subsection (a)(7); and

"(B) shall—

"(i) not later than 1 year after receiving
the grant, complete the audit referred to in
paragraph (1)(A) in accordance with the plan
submitted pursuant to paragraph (2); and

"(ii) not later than 60 days after receiving
possession of a sample of sexual assault evi-
dence that was not in the possession of the
State or unit of local government at the
time of the initiation of an audit under para-
graph (1)(A), subject to paragraph (4)(F), in-
clude in any required reports under clause
(v), the information listed under paragraph
(4)(B);

"(iii) for each sample of sexual assault evi-
dence that is identified as awaiting testing as
part of the audit referred to in paragraph
(1)(A)—

"(I) assign a unique numeric or alpha-
numeric identifier to each sample of sexual
assault evidence that is in the possession of
the State or unit of local government and is
awaiting testing; and

"(II) list the dates on or after which the
State or unit of local government would be
barred by any applicable statutes of limi-
tations from prosecuting a perpetrator of the
sexual assault to which the sample relates; and

"(iv) provide that—

"(I) the chief law enforcement officer of
the State or unit of local government, re-
spective to such individual, responsible for
documenting the compliance of the State or unit of
local government, respectively, with the reporting
requirements described in clause (v); or

"(II) such officer shall fulfill the responsi-

bility described in subclause (I) so long as such
designee is an employee of the
State or unit of local government, re-
spective to such individual, responsible for
documenting the compliance of the State or unit of
local government, respectively, with the reporting
requirements described in clause (v); and

"(v) comply with all grantee reporting re-
quirements in paragraph (2)."

(3) EXTENSION OF INITIAL DEADLINE.—The
Attorney General may grant an extension of
the deadline under paragraph (2)(B)(i) to a
State or unit of local government that demon-
strates that more time is required for
compliance with such paragraph.

(4) SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EVIDENCE
REPORTING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For not less than 12
months after the completion of an initial
count of sexual assault evidence that is
awaited in an audit referred to in paragraph
(1)(A), a State or unit of local government that
receives a grant award under subsection (a)(7) shall, not less than every 6 months, provide a report to the Depart-
ment of Justice, on a form prescribed by the
Attorney General, which shall contain the
information required under subparagraph (B).

"(B) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—A report
under this paragraph shall contain the fol-
lowing information:

"(i) the name of the State or unit of local
government filing the report;

"(ii) the period of dates covered by the re-
port;

"(iii) the cumulative total number of sam-
ples of sexual assault evidence that, at the end of the
reporting period,

"(I) are in possession of the State or unit
of local government at the reporting pe-
riod;

"(II) are awaiting testing; and

"(III) the State or unit of local government
has determined should undergo DNA or other appro-
priate forensic analyses;

"(iv) the cumulative total number of sam-
ples of sexual assault evidence in the posses-
sion of the State or unit of local government
that, at the end of the reporting period, the
State or unit of local government has deter-
mined should undergo DNA or other ap-
propriate forensic analyses, provided that
the reporting form shall allow for the State or unit
or local government, at its sole discre-
tion, to explain the reasoning for this de-
termination in some or all cases.

"(v) The cumulative total number of sam-
ples of sexual assault evidence identified by
an audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A) or
subparagraph (B)(i) for which DNA or
other appropriate forensic analysis has been
completed at the end of the reporting period.

"(vi) The cumulative total number of sam-
ples of sexual assault evidence identified by
an audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A) or
subparagraph (B)(i) for which DNA or
other appropriate forensic analysis was
completed prior to the end of the
reporting period.

"(vii) The total number of samples of
sexual assault evidence identified by the State
or unit of local government under paragraph
(2)(B)(i), since the previous reporting period.

"(viii) The cumulative total number of
samples of sexual assault evidence described
under clause (iii) for which the State or unit
of local government will be barred within 12
months by any applicable statute of limita-
tions from prosecuting a perpetrator of the
sexual assault to which the sample relates.

"(C) PUBLICATION OF REPORTS.—Not later
than 7 days after the submission of a report
under this paragraph, the Attorney General
shall, subject to subparagraph (A), publish a facsimile of the full con-
tents of such report on a public intern-

et website.

"(D) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFOR-
MATION.—Any personally identifiable
information or details about a sexual
assault that might lead to the identification
of the individuals involved;

"(E) OMISSION OF REPORTS.—The Attorney
General shall—

"(i) at the discretion of a State or unit of
local government required to file a report
under subparagraph (A), allow such State or
unit of local government, at its sole discre-
tion, to submit such reports on a more
frequent basis; and

"(ii) not apply to a sample of sexual assault
evidence that—

"(I) is not considered criminal evidence
(such as a sample collected anonymously
from a victim who is unwilling to make a
criminal complaint); or

"(ii) relates to a sexual assault for which
the prosecution of each perpetrator is barred
by a statute of limitations.

"(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) Awaiting Testing.—‘Awaiting
testing’ means, with respect to a sample of
sexual assault evidence, that—

"(I) the sample has been collected and is in
the possession of a State or unit of local
government;

"(II) DNA and other appropriate forensic
analyses have not been performed on such
sample;

"(III) the sample is related to a criminal
case or investigation in which final disposi-
tion has not yet been reached.

"(B) Final Disposition.—The term ‘final
disposition’ means, with respect to a crimi-

nal case or investigation to which a sample
of sexual assault evidence relates—

"(i) the conviction or acquittal of all sus-
pected perpetrators of the crime involved;

"(ii) a determination by the State or unit
of local government in possession of the sam-
ple that the case is unsolvable, unproven,
applied to all suspected perpetrators of the
crime involved;

"(iii) a declaration by the victim of the
crime involved that the act constituting the
basis of the crime was not committed.

"(C) Possession.—

"(i) In General.—The term ‘possession’,
when used with respect to possession of a
sample of sexual assault evidence by a State or unit
of local government, includes possession by
an individual who is acting as an agent of
the State or unit of local government for the
collection of the sample.

"(ii) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in
clause (i) shall be construed to create or
amend any Federal rights or privileges for
non-governmental vendor laboratories de-
scribed in regulations promulgated under
section 213630 of the DNA Identification Act

"(6) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTOCOLS, TECH-
NICAL ASSISTANCE, AND DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) PROTOCOLS AND PRACTICES.—Not later
than 18 months after the date of enactment
of the SAFER Act of 2013, the Director, in con-
junction with Federal, State, and local
law enforcement agencies and government
laboratories, shall develop and publish a de-
scription of protocols and practices the Di-
rector considers appropriate for the accu-
rate, timely, and effective collection and
processing of DNA evidence, including proto-
col and practices specific to sexual assault
cases. In developing such protocols and
practices, the Director shall take into account
the type of crimes involved, the location in
which the crime was committed, the status
of crime scene evidence to be tested; and

"(A) (B) (C) (D) (E) (F) (G) (H) (I) (J) (K) (L) (M) (N) (O) (P) (Q) (R) (S) (T) (U) (V) (W) (X) (Y) (Z)
(2) **Technical Assistance and Training.** The recipient, after consulting with the Inspector General and States and other local government units adopting the protocols and practices developed under paragraph (1), shall include in the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant: (A) the provisions under paragraph (1); (B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment of the funds to the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds; (C) "Defined Term."—In this section, the term "defined audit finding" means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or violation of law or has otherwise violated any other terms and conditions approved by operation of this paragraph.

(3) **Oversight and Accountability.**—All grants awarded by the Department of Justice under this title shall be subject to the following:

(1) **Audit Requirement.**—Beginning in fiscal year 2013, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(2) **Mandatory Exclusion.**—A recipient of grant funds under this title that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (3).

(3) **Priority.**—In awarding grants under this title, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that, during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this title, did not have an unresolved audit finding showing a violation in the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant program.

(4) **Reimbursement.**—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2 fiscal years described in paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

(A) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that the entity was erroneously awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment of the funds to the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(5) **Defined Term.**—In this section, the term "_defined audit finding" means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or violation of law or has otherwise violated any other terms and conditions approved by operation of this paragraph.

(6) **Nonprofit Organization Requirements.**—

(A) **Definition.**—For purposes of this section and the grant programs described in this title, the term "nonprofit organization" means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **Prohibition.**—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this title to a nonprofit organization that has an unresolved audit finding showing a violation of the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant.

(7) **Administrative Expenses.**—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 percent of the grant amounts awarded under this title may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of Justice.

(8) **Conference Expenses.**—

(A) **Limitation.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this title may be used by the Attorney General for conferences that are not necessary for the performance of the functions of the Department of Justice.

(B) **Written Approval.**—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) **Recovery.**—The sum of the written estimates approved by operation of this paragraph shall be included as part of the budget of the Department of Justice.

(9) **Prohibition on Lobbying Activity.**—A grantee is not authorized to be appropriated under this title may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

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

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, state, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(C) **Penalty.**—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under this title has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) bar the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this title for not less than 5 years.

**Title XI—Other Matters**

**SEC. 1006. Sunset.**—Effective on December 31, 2018, subsections (a)(6) and (n) of section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)(6) and (n)) are repealed.

**Title XII—Sexual Abuse in Custodial Settings**

**SEC. 1101. Sexual Abuse in Custodial Settings.**—

(a) **Suits by Prisoners.**—Section 7(e) of the Civil Rights of Prisoners Act (42 U.S.C. 1997e(e)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "or the commission of a sexual act as defined in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code”.

(b) **United States as Defendant.**—Section 1367(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "or the commission of a sexual act as defined in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code.”

(c) **Adoption and Effect of National Standards.**—Section 8 of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) **Applicability to Detention Facilities Operated by the Department of Homeland Security.**—(1) In general.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish a final rule adopting national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of rape and sexual assault in facilities that maintain custody of aliens detained for a violation of the immigration laws of the United States."

(2) **Applicability.**—The standards adopted under paragraph (1) shall apply to detention facilities operated by the Department of Homeland Security and to detention facilities operated under contract with the Department.

(3) **Compliance.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities operated by the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) **Considerations.**—In adopting standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall give due consideration to the recommended national standards provided by the Commission under section 7(e).

(5) **Definition.**—As used in this section, the term ‘detention facilities operated under contract with the Department’ includes, but is not limited to, contract detention facilities and detention facilities operated through an intergovernmental service agreement with the Department of Homeland Security.

**Title XIII—Other Matters**

**SEC. 1301. Detention Facilities Operated by the Department of Health and Human Services.**—
SEC. 1103. FEDERAL VICTIM ASSISTANTS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 40114 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14032) is amended in subsection (a)(2)(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C), and inserting—

"(3) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

"(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

"(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall give due consideration to the recommended national standards provided by the Commission under section 105(f) of this division'' and inserting

"protection compact with the United States Government and the foreign government, and proposed mechanisms to implement the plan and provide oversight.

"(A) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and

"(C) objective, documented, and quantifiable.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103) is amended in section 105(e)(1) of this Act, in coordination and cooperation with other officials at the Department of State, the heads of other relevant agencies, is authorized to establish a fund to assist foreign governments, in meeting unexpected, urgent needs in prevention of trafficking in persons, protection of victims, and prosecution of traffickers.

SEC. 1205. ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—A country shall be selected under paragraph (4) on the basis of a multi-year plan for achieving shared objectives; and

"(2) ELEMENTS.—A child protection compact under this subsection shall establish a multi-year plan for achieving shared objectives in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. The compact shall identify and account, if applicable, the national child protection strategies and national action plans for human trafficking of a country, and shall describe—

"(A) the specific objectives the foreign government and the United States Government expect to achieve during the term of the compact;

"(B) the responsibilities of the foreign government and the United States Government in the achievement of such objectives;

"(C) the particular programs and initiatives to be undertaken in the achievement of such objectives and the amount of funding to be allocated to each program or initiative by both countries;

"(D) regular outcome indicators to monitor and measure progress toward achieving such objectives;

"(E) a multi-year financial plan, including the estimated amount of contributions by the United States Government and the foreign government, and proposed mechanisms to implement the plan and provide oversight.

"(6) SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the agencies set forth in paragraph (1) and relevant officials of the Department of Justice, shall select contracts to be awarded to selected contractors, to enter into child protection compacts. The selection of contracts under this paragraph shall be based on—

"(A) the selection criteria set forth in paragraph (5); and

"(B) objective, documented, and quantifiable indicators, to the maximum extent possible.

"(7) SELECTION CRITERIA.—A country shall be selected under paragraph (4) on the basis of a multi-year plan developed by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Labor. Such criteria shall include—

"(A) a documented high prevalence of trafficking in persons within the country; and

"(B) document and maintain government and civil society programs to combat trafficking in persons, including prevention, protection of victims, and the enactment and enforcement of anti-trafficking laws against perpetrators.

"(8) SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of State may suspend or terminate assistance provided under this subsection in whole or in part for a country or entity if the Secretary determines that—

"(i) the country or entity is engaged in activities that are contrary to the national security interests of the United States or are inconsistent with the country’s or entity’s international obligations; and

"(ii) the country or entity has engaged in a pattern of actions inconsistent with the United States interests or foreign policy.
criteria used to determine the eligibility of the country or entity, as the case may be; or
“(iii) the country or entity has failed to adhere to its responsibilities under the Compact.”

“(B) REINSTATEMENT.—The Secretary may reinstate assistance for a country or entity suspended or terminated under this paragraph if the Secretary determines that the country or entity has demonstrated a commitment to correcting each condition for which assistance was suspended or terminated under subparagraph (A).”

SEC. 1203. PROTECTION AND ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

(a) TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES.—Section 106(d)(3) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106(d)(3)) is amended by inserting “, and make reasonable efforts to distribute information to enable all relevant Federal Government agencies to publicize the National Human Trafficking Resource Center Hotline on their websites, in all headquarters offices, and in all field offices throughout the United States” before the period at the end.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—Section 107(a)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “and shall brief Congress annually on such efforts” before the period at the end.

SEC. 1204. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 108(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7108(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “peacekeeping” and inserting “diplomatic, peacekeeping,”;

(B) by striking “and measures” and inserting “a transparent system for remediating or punishing such public officials as a deterrent, measures”;

(C) by inserting “, effective bilateral, multilateral, or regional information sharing and cooperation arrangements with other countries, and effective policies or laws regulating foreign labor recruiters and holding them criminally liable for fraudulent recruiting” before the period at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and has entered into effective, bilateral, multilateral, or regional law enforcement cooperation and coordination arrangements with other countries” before the period at the end;

(3) by adding at the end—

(A) by inserting “, including diplomats and soldiers,” after “public officials”;

(B) by striking “peacekeeping” and inserting “diplomatic, peacekeeping,”;

(C) by inserting “Government’s failure to appropriately address public allegations against such public officials, especially once such officials have returned to their home countries, shall be considered inaction under these criteria.” after “such trafficking;”;

(4) by redesigning paragraphs (9) through (11) as paragraphs (10) through (12), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following—

“(b) Whether the government has entered into effective, transparent partnerships, cooperative arrangements, or agreements that have resulted in concrete and measurable outcomes with—

“(i) domestic civil society organizations, private sector entities, or international nongovernmental organizations, or with bilateral or regional arrangements or agreements, to assist the government’s efforts to prevent trafficking, protect victims, and punish traffickers; or

“(ii) the United States toward agreed goals and objectives in the collective fight against trafficking.”.

SEC. 1205. BEST PRACTICES IN TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS ERADICATION.

Section 118(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7108(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “with respect to the status of severe forms of trafficking in persons that shall include”— and inserting “describing the anti-trafficking efforts of the United States and foreign governments according to the minimum standards and criteria enumerated in section 108, and the nature and scope of trafficking in persons in each country and analysis of the trend lines for individual government efforts. The report should include”—;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “;” and inserting “; and”;

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

and

(D) by inserting at the end following:

“(G) a section entitled ‘Promising Practices in the Eradication of Trafficking in Persons’ to highlight effective practices and use of innovation and technology in prevention, protection, prosecution, and partnership, including by foreign governments, the private sector, and domestic civil society actors.”

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by redesigning paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by adding at the end—

“(E) PUBLIC NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after notifying Congress of each country determined to have met the requirements, the Secretary of State shall provide a detailed description of the credible evidence supporting such determination on a publicly available website maintained by the Department of State.”.

SEC. 1206. PROTECTIONS FOR DOMESTIC WORKERS AND IMMIGRANTS.

Section 202 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 1375b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND VIDEO FOR CONSULAR WAITING ROOMS” after “INFORMATION PAMPHLET”;

and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “and video” after “information pamphlet”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) to promote the empowerment of girls at risk of child marriage in developing countries;”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking the term “peacekeeping” and inserting “diplomatic, peacekeeping,”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “peacekeeping” and inserting “diplomatic, peacekeeping,”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “peacekeeping” and inserting “diplomatic, peacekeeping,”;

(D) by adding at the end following:

“(2) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term ‘child marriage’ means the marriage of a girl or boy who is—

“(A) younger than the minimum age for marriage under the laws of the country in which such girl or boy is a resident; or

“(B) younger than 18 years of age, if no such law exists.”;

and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “peacekeeping” and inserting “diplomatic, peacekeeping,”;

and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking “peacekeeping” and inserting “diplomatic, peacekeeping,”;

and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—The Secretary of State shall brief Congress annually on such efforts before the period at the end.

(2) to promote the empowerment of girls at risk of child marriage in developing countries;”.

SEC. 1207. PREVENTION OF CHILD MARRIAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 106 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) PREVENTION OF CHILD TRAFFICKING THROUGH CHILD MARRIAGE.—The Secretary of State shall establish and implement a multi-year, multi-sectoral strategy—

“(1) to prevent child marriage;

“(2) to promote the empowerment of girls at risk of child marriage in developing countries;

“(3) that should address the unique needs, vulnerabilities, and potential of girls younger than 18 years of age in developing countries;

“(4) that targets areas in developing countries with high prevalence of child marriage; and

“(5) that includes diplomatic and programmatic initiatives.”.

(b) INCLUSION OF CHILD MARRIAGE STATUS IN REPORTS.—The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2348) is amended—

(1) in section 116 (22 U.S.C. 2351n), by adding at the end the following:

“(c) CHILD MARRIAGE STATUS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The report required under subsection (b) shall include, for each country in which child marriage is prevalent, a description of the status of the practice of child marriage in such country.

“(2) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term ‘child marriage’ means the marriage of a girl or boy who is—

“(A) younger than the minimum age for marriage under the laws of the country in which such girl or boy is a resident; or

“(B) younger than 18 years of age, if no such law exists.”;

and

SEC. 1208. CHILD SOLDIERS.

Section 404 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 2570e–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(b), (c), and (d), the authorities contained in section 518 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321) or 2347) and inserting “(b) through (f), the authorities contained in sections 516, 541, and 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2277, 2317, and 2348)”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) EXCEPTION FOR PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—The limitation set forth in subsection (a) that relates to section 511 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to programs that support military professionalization, security sector reform, and national and international respect for human rights, peacekeeping preparation, or the demobilization and reintegration of child soldiers.”.
Subtitle B—Combating Trafficking in Persons in the United States

PART I—PENALTIES AGAINST TRAFFICKERS AND OTHER CRIMES

SEC. 1211. CRIMINAL TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.

(a) DESTRUCTION, CONCEALMENT, REMOVAL, CONCEALMENT, REMOVAL, OR DESTRUCTION OF IMMIGRATION DOCUMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1597. Unlawful conduct with respect to immigration documents.

"(a) DESTRUCTION, CONCEALMENT, REMOVAL, CONCEALMENT, REMOVAL, OR DESTRUCTION OF IMMIGRATION DOCUMENTS.—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly destroy, conceal, remove, confiscate, or possess, an actual or purport to possess, in any way interfere with or prevent the enforcement of this section, shall be subject to the penalties described in subsection (b)."

(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (9) or (10)—

"(1) by striking "section 103(6)" and inserting "section 103(7)"; and

"(2) by striking "section 103(7)" and inserting "section 103(8)";

(c) VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 1589, 1590, 1591, 1592, and 1593'' and inserting "section 1589, 1590, 1591, 1592, and 1594''.

PART II—ENSURING AVAILABILITY OF POSSIBLE WITNESSES AND INFORMANTS

SEC. 1221. PROHIBITION AGAINST TRAFFICKING VICTIMS WHO COOPERATE WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT.

"(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 1115(a)(1)(III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1115(a)(1)(III)) is amended by removing "or any adult or minor children of a derivative beneficiary of the alien, as" after "age".

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

SEC. 1231. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SECRETARY OF LABOR.

"(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Section 105(d)(7) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7109(d)(7)) is amended—

"(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (J) as subparagraphs (I) through (O); and

"(2) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

"(B) the number of persons who have been granted continued presence in the United States under section 107(c)(9) during the preceding fiscal year and the mean and median time taken to adjudicate applications submitted under such section, including the time from the receipt of an application by law enforcement to the issuance of a visa and work authorization;"

"(ii) in the course of violating section 1357 of this title or section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324); and

"(B) WITH INTENT TO VIOLATE SECTIONS 1357 OF THIS TITLE OR SECTION 274 OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 1357(a)(10)'' and inserting "section 1357(a)(10)''.

"(c) VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

"(D) the number of victims who have applied for, been granted, or been denied a visa under section 101(a)(15)(T) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)) during the preceding fiscal year, broken down by the number of such persons described in subsection (I), (II), and (III) of such clause (ii);"
SEC. 1233. INFORMATION SHARING TO COMBAT CHILD LABOR AND SLAVE LABOR.

Section 105(a) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7121(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary of State shall, on a regular basis, provide information to Federal, State, and local governments and for the production of goods in violation of international standards to the Department of Labor to be used in determining the list described in subsection (b)(2)(C).

SEC. 1234. GOVERNMENT TRAINING EFFORTS TO INCLUDE THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Section 107(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(c)(4)) is amended—

(a) In General.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the use of foreign labor contractors to—

1. the first sentence, by inserting "the Department of Labor, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission," before "and the Department"; and

2. the second sentence, by inserting ", in consultation with the Secretary of Labor," before "shall provide".

SEC. 1235. GAO REPORT ON THE USE OF FOREIGN LABOR CONTRACTORS.

(a) In General.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

1. address the standards and practices of United States employers in—

   (A) the use of labor recruiters or brokers; or

   (B) directly recruiting foreign workers;

2. analyze the laws that protect such workers, both overseas and domestically;

3. describe the oversight and enforcement mechanisms in Federal departments and agencies for such laws; and

4. identify any gaps that may exist in these protections; and

(b) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

1. address the standards and practices of United States employers in—

   (A) the use of labor recruiters or brokers; or

   (B) directly recruiting foreign workers;

2. analyze the laws that protect such workers, both overseas and domestically;

3. describe the oversight and enforcement mechanisms in Federal departments and agencies for such laws; and

4. identify any gaps that may exist in these protections; and

5. recommend possible actions for Federal departments and agencies to combat any abuses.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

1. describe the role of labor recruiters or brokers working in countries that are sending workers in receiving funds, including any identified involvement in labor abuses;

2. describe the role and practices of employers in the United States that commission labor recruiters or brokers or directly recruit foreign workers;

3. describe the role of Federal departments and agencies in overseeing and regulating the foreign labor recruitment process, including certifying and enforcing under existing regulations;

4. describe the type of jobs and the numbers of positions in the United States that have been filled through foreign workers during each of the last 8 years, including positions within the Federal Government;

5. describe contracts or programs undertaken by Federal, State, and local government entities to encourage employers, directly or indirectly, to use foreign workers or to hire employers for using foreign workers; and

6. based on the information required under paragraphs (1) through (3), identify any common procedures, employment system, including the use of fees and debts, and recommendations of actions that could be taken by Federal departments and agencies to combat any identified abuses.

SEC. 1236. ACCOUNTABILITY.

All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this Act amended by this title shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

1. AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—In this paragraph, the term "unresolved audit finding" means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that use grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the final audit report is issued.

2. REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this title or an Act amended by this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

3. MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this title or an Act amended by this title shall have an unresolved audit finding that shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title or an Act amended by this title during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

4. PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this title or an Act amended by this title, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this title or an Act amended by this title.

5. REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded a grant under this title or an Act amended by this title and uses the funds to provide assistance to one or more sexual abuse victims, the Attorney General shall provide reimbursement to the entity for reasonable costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

6. NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this title or an Act amended by this title, the term "nonprofit organization" means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this title or an Act amended by this title to a nonprofit organization that is a for-profit organization, including any corporation, unless the Attorney General determines that the funds may be expended to support the program or project.

(C) DISQUALIFICATION.—If a nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this title or an Act amended by this title uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create and maintain a record of the compensation of the compensation of its officers, directors, and employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant or the program, the information necessary for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall provide the information described in this subparagraph available for public inspection.

SEC. 1237. CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.

(A) LIMITATION.—The Attorney General is not authorized to be appropriated the Department of Justice under this title or an Act amended by this title for the expenses of more than $20,000 in funds made available to the Department of Justice, unless the Deputy Attorney General for Administration or the Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy (as designated by the Deputy Attorney General) provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, hospitality for speakers, and entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph, and an annual certification indicating whether—

1. all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

2. all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued;

3. all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

4. includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

PART IV—ENHANCING STATE AND LOCAL EFFORTS TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

SEC. 1241. ASSISTANCE FOR DOMESTIC MINOR SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) In General.—Section 202 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. ESTABLISHMENT OF A GRANT PROGRAM TO DEVELOP, EXPAND, AND STRENGTHEN PROGRMS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS SUBJECT TO TRAFFICKING.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

1. ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term 'Assistant Secretary' means the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services.

2. ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The term 'Assistant Attorney General' means the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice.

3. ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means a State or unit of local government that—

A. has significant criminal activity involving the sale of children for sex;
"(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing sex trafficking of minors;

"(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat sex trafficking of minors, including—

"(i) evaluating the establishment of a residential care facility for minor victims of sex trafficking;

"(ii) the provision of rehabilitative care to minor victims of sex trafficking;

"(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers of sex trafficking, with a focus on sex trafficking of minors;

"(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving sex trafficking of minors;

"(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or other related services to runaway and homeless youth; and

"(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or minor, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

"(D) provides assurance that a minor victim of sex trafficking shall not be required to collaborate with law enforcement to have access to residential care or services provided with a grant under this section.

(4) SEX TRAFFICKING OF A MINOR.—The term 'sex trafficking of a minor' means an individual who—

"(A) is younger than 18 years of age, and is a victim of an offense described in section 1591(a) of title 18, United States Code, or a comparable State law; or

"(B)(i) is not younger than 18 years of age nor older than 20 years of age;

"(ii) before the individual reached 18 years of age, was described in subparagraph (A); and

"(iii) was receiving shelter or services as a minor victim of sex trafficking.

(5) QUALIFIED NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'qualified nongovernmental organization' means an organization that—

"(A) is not a State or unit of local government, or an agency of a State or unit of local government;

"(B) has demonstrated experience providing services to victims of sex trafficking or related populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff standardized in the treatment of sex trafficking victims; and

"(C) demonstrates a plan to sustain the provision of services beyond the period of a grant awarded under this section.

(6) DURATION.—(i) IN GENERAL.—A grant made under this section shall be for a period of 1 year.

"(ii) RENEWAL.—The Assistant Attorney General may renew a grant under this section for up to 3-year periods.

(7) PREPRIOR.—In making grants in any fiscal year, the Attorney General shall provide for the preceding fiscal year in which grants are made under this section, the Assistant Attorney General shall give priority to an eligible entity that received a grant in the preceding fiscal year and is eligible for renewal under this subparagraph, taking into account any evaluation of the eligible entity conducted under paragraph (4), if available.

(8) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Assistant Attorney General shall consult with the Assistant Secretary with respect to—

"(A) evaluations of grant recipients under paragraph (4);

"(B) avoiding unintentional duplication of grants; and

"(C) any other areas of shared concern.

(9) USE OF FUNDS.—(A) LOCATION.—Not less than 67 percent of each grant made under paragraph (1) shall be used by the eligible entity to provide residential care and services (as described in clauses (1) through (4) of subparagraph (B)) to minor victims of sex trafficking through qualified nongovernmental organizations.

"(B) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded pursuant to paragraph (2) may be used for—

"(i) providing residential care to minor victims of sex trafficking, including temporary or long-term placement as appropriate;

"(ii) providing 24-hour emergency social services response for minor victims of sex trafficking;

"(iii) providing minor victims of sex trafficking with clothing and other daily necessities needed to keep such victims from returning to living on the street;

"(iv) case management services for minor victims of sex trafficking;

"(v) mental health counseling for minor victims of sex trafficking, including specialized counseling and substance abuse treatment;

"(vi) legal services for minor victims of sex trafficking;

"(vii) specialized training for social service providers, public sector personnel, and private sector personnel likely to encounter sex trafficking victims on issues related to the sex trafficking of minors and severe forms of trafficking in persons;

"(viii) outreach and education programs to provide information about deterrence and prevention of sex trafficking of minors; and

"(ix) programs to provide treatment to individuals charged or cited with purchasing or attempting to purchase sex acts in cases where—

"(I) a treatment program can be mandated as a condition of a sentence, fine, suspended sentence, or probation, or is an appropriate alternative to criminal prosecution; and

"(II) the individual was not charged with purchasing or attempting to purchase sex acts with a minor; and

"(x) screening and referral of minor victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(10) EVALUATION.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of programs funded by the grant.

"(B) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall—

"(i) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought; and

"(ii) provide such additional information as the Assistant Attorney General determines to be essential to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

(11) DETERMINATION.—The Assistant Attorney General shall enter into a contract with an academic or non-profit organization that has experience in issues related to sex trafficking of minors and evaluation of grant programs to conduct an annual evaluation of each grant made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with the grant.

(12) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section that is found to have utilized grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost occurred.

(13) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if, during the 5 fiscal years before the eligible entity submits an application for the grant, the eligible entity has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

(14) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 3 percent of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section.

(15) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—For fiscal years 2016 and 2017, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct an audit of all 4 eligible entities that receive block grants under this section.

(16) MATCH REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall provide a non-Federal match in an amount equal to not less than—

"(i) 15 percent of the grant during the first year;

"(ii) 25 percent of the grant during the first renewal period;

"(iii) 40 percent of the grant during the second renewal period; and

"(iv) 50 percent of the grant during the third renewal period.

(17) NO LIMITATION ON SECTION 204 GRANTS.—An entity that applies for a grant under section 204 is not prohibited from also applying for a grant under this section.

(18) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 to the Attorney General for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017 to carry out this section.

(19) GAO EVALUATION.—Not later than 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains—

"(A) an evaluation of the impact of this section in aiding minor victims of sex trafficking in the jurisdiction of the entity receiving the grant; and

"(B) recommendations, if any, regarding any legislative or administrative action the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

(20) SUNSET PROVISION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective during the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.
SEC. 1242. EXPANDING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR INVESTIGATIONS AND PROSECUTIONS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Section 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7105c) is amended—

1. in subsection (a)(1)—
(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “,” which involve United States citizens, or aliens admitted for permanent residence, and “;”;
(B) by redesigning subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), respectively; and
(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

(B) to train law enforcement personnel how to identify victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and related offenses;”

and

(D) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated, by inserting “and prioritize the investigations and prosecutions of those cases involving minor victims” after “sex acts”;

2. by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

3. by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(D) NO LIMITATION ON SECTION 202 GRANT APPLICATIONS.—An entity that applies for a grant under section 202 is not prohibited from also applying for a grant under this section.

(4) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by striking “$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011” and inserting “$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017”;

and

5. by adding at the end the following:

“(F) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of and submit to Congress a report evaluating the impact of this section on—

(1) the ability of law enforcement personnel to identify victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and investigate and prosecute cases against offenders, including offenders who engage in the purchasing of commercial sex acts with a minor; and

(2) recommendations, if any, regarding any legislative or administrative action the Comptroller General determines appropriate to improve the ability described in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 1243. MODEL STATE CRIMINAL LAW PROTECTION FOR CHILD TRAFFICKING VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS.

Section 225(b) of the Trafficking Victims Reauthorization Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended—

1. in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

2. by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

3. by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) protects children exploited through prostitution by including safe harbor provisions that—

(A) treat an individual under 18 years of age who has been arrested for engaging in, or attempting to engage in, a sexual act with another person in exchange for monetary compensation as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons;

(B) prohibit the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution offense;

(C) require the referral of an individual described in paragraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including comprehensive service or community-based programs that provide assistance to child victims of commercial sexual exploitation; and

(D) provide that an individual described in subparagraph (A) shall not be required to prove fraud, force, or coercion in order to receive the protections described under this paragraph.”.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations


The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) is amended—

1. in section 112A(b)(4) (22 U.S.C. 7109a(b)(4)), by striking “$2,000,000” and inserting “$1,000,000”;

2. by striking “2008 through 2011” and inserting “2014 through 2017”;

and

3. by adding at the end the following:

“(B) $11,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017.”.


The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–164) is amended—

1. by striking section 102(b)(7); and

2. in section 201(c)(2), by striking “$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011” and inserting “$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017.”.

Subtitle D—Unaccompanied Alien Children

SEC. 1261. APPROPRIATE CUSTODIAL SETTINGS FOR UNACCOMPANIED MINORS WHO REQUIRE THE PROTECTION OF HUMANITY WHILE IN FEDERAL CUSTODY.

Section 235(c)(2) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(2)) is amended—

1. by striking “Subject to” and inserting the following:

“(A) MINORS IN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CUSTODY.—Subject to;” and

2. by adding at the end the following:

“(B) ALIENS TRANSFERRED FROM DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CUSTODY.—If a minor described in subparagraph (A) is transferred from the custody of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary shall consider placement in the least restrictive setting available, taking into account the alien’s danger to self, danger to the community, and risk of flight. Such aliens shall be eligible to participate in alternative to detention programs, utilizing a continuum of alternatives based on the alien’s need for supervision, which may include placement of the alien with an individual or an organizational sponsor, or in a supervised area of residence.”.

SEC. 1262. APPOINTMENT OF CHILD ADVOCATES FOR UNACCOMPANIED MINORS

Section 255(c)(6) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(6)) is amended—

1. by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary; and

2. by striking “and criminal”; and

3. by adding at the end the following:

“(B) APPOINTMENT OF CHILD ADVOCATES.—

(I) INITIAL SITES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall appoint child advocates at 3 new immigration detention sites to provide independent child advocates for trafficking victims and vulnerable unaccompanied alien children.

(ii) ADDITIONAL SITES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary shall appoint child advocates at not more than 3 additional immigration detention sites.

(iii) SELECTION OF SITES.—Sites at which child advocate programs will be established under this subparagraph shall be located at immigration detention sites that serve a population of more than 50 children who are held in immigration custody, and shall be selected sequentially, with priority given to locations with—

(A) the largest number of unaccompanied alien children; and

(B) the most vulnerable populations of unaccompanied children.

(iv) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A child advocate program may not use more than 10 percent of the Federal funds received under this section for administrative expenses.

(v) NONEXCLUSIVITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to restrict the ability...
of a child advocate program under this section to apply for or obtain funding from any other source to carry out the programs described in this section.

"(iii) CONTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—A child advocate program selected under this section shall contribute non-Federal funds, either directly or through in-kind contributions, to the costs of the child advocate program in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the child advocate program under this section. In-kind contributions may not exceed 40 percent of the matching requirement under this subparagraph.

"(D) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report describing the activities undertaken by the Secretary to authorize the appointment of independent Child Advocates for trafficking victims and vulnerable unaccompanied alien children to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

"(E) ASSESSMENT OF CHILD ADVOCATE PROGRAM.—

"(i) In general.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding the effectiveness of the Child Advocate Program operated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

"(ii) Matters to be studied.—In the study required under clause (i), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) evaluate the effectiveness of existing child advocate programs in improving outcomes for trafficking victims and other vulnerable unaccompanied alien children;

(B) evaluate the implementation of child advocate programs in new sites pursuant to subparagraph (B);

(C) evaluate the extent to which eligible trafficking victims and other vulnerable unaccompanied alien children are receiving child advocate services and assess the possible budgetary implications of increased participation in the program;

(D) evaluate the barriers to improving outcomes for trafficking victims and other vulnerable unaccompanied children; and

(E) make recommendations on statutory changes to improve the Child Advocate Program in relation to the matters analyzed under subclauses (I) through (IV).

"(iii) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall make recommendations on statutory changes to improve the Child Advocate Program in relation to the matters analyzed under subclauses (I) through (IV).

"(2) In subparagraph (A), by inserting "child advocate programs" in relation to the matters analyzed under subparagraph (B), for the purposes of conducting the study described in section 1253(a)(4) of the william wilberforce trafficking victims protection reauthorization act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U))", after "(8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U))", "(3) In paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall take into account—

(A) the degree to which Department of Homeland Security personnel are adequately ensuring that—

(i) all children are being screened to determine whether they are described in section 235(a)(2)(A) of the william wilberforce trafficking victims protection reauthorization act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U))

(ii) appropriate and reliable determinations are being made about whether children are described in section 235(a)(2)(A) of such Act, including determinations of the age of such children;

(iii) children are appropriately being permitted to withdraw their applications for admission, in accordance with section 235(a)(2)(B)(i);

(iv) children are being properly cared for while in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security and awaiting repatriation or transfer to the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services; and

(v) children are being transferred to the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services in a manner that is consistent with such Act;

and

(B) the number of such children that have been transferred to the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Federal funds expended to maintain custody of such children, and the Federal benefits available to such children, if any.


(A) In general.—Except as provided in paragraph (B), for the purposes of conducting the study described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide the Comptroller General with unrestricted access to all stages of screening and other interactions between Department of Homeland Security personnel and children encountered by the Comptroller General.

(B) Exception.—The Secretary shall not permit unrestricted access under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the security of a particular interaction would be threatened by such access.

"(b) Report to Congress.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the commencement of the study described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that contains the Commission’s findings and recommendations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or his designee, it shall be in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 113–2, if offered by the majority leader or his designee, which shall be in order without interjection of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMorris Rodgers) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 47, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, as we consider the Violence Against Women Act, I’d like to start by thanking our majority leader, Eric Cantor, and many Republicans in the House for their time and their commitment to this important issue.

The Violence Against Women Act first passed on the floor of this very House nearly two decades ago, and it has long enjoyed bipartisan support. Years later—after two reauthorizations, a pivotal Supreme Court case, and a nationwide expansion of laws condemning violence against women—Republicans are committed to protecting victims of violence and putting our endangered women in the harbor. That’s why we are bringing it to the floor today.

It’s important to protect all women against acts of domestic violence and other violent crimes and ensure that resources go directly to the victims. Because that is what this bill is really about: It’s about people.

RESERVATION. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. Pelosi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.
Madam Speaker, when Congress enacted the original Violence Against Women Act nearly two decades ago, we sent a very clear and immediate message to the American people: no—and I emphasize “no”—woman would ever be forced to live in fear of her own home. No one would ever be forced to fear for their lives and their safety in their own homes because of domestic violence. That promise formed the foundation of our work then, and it has served as cornerstone for our efforts in the years since to reauthorize and strengthen this landmark law.

Even as the times have changed, our commitments have remained the same, and strong, yet over the years we have always sought out ways to improve this legislation. Today on the floor of the House we will have a very clear choice. We have the choice to support the bipartisan legislation that has passed in the United States Senate. It passed by a twenty-eight-eight percent of the Senate voted for this legislation. A majority of the Republicans in the Senate supported this legislation. All of the women in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans alike—support the bipartisan legislation that I hope will have an opportunity to vote on today on the floor of the House.

In contrast, we have the House Republican proposal, which, while described in such lovely terms, is a step backward for the women in America and those who suffer domestic violence or sexual assault.

It’s really hard to explain why, what eyes are the Republicans looking through, that they do not see the folly of their ways on this legislation that they are proposing. Not only is it much weaker than the Senate bill; it is much weaker than current law. And that is why whatever groups you want to name, whether it’s 1,300 groups opposed from A to Y—we don’t have a Z—any group that cares about this matter throughout our country, in every State, oppose the Republican legislation that is on the floor today.

This is what the American Bar Association has stated in its letter to Members in opposition to the Republican bill, it says: The House substitute eliminates certain critical improvements and actually rolls back some provisions of the law that have been successful.

So let’s understand the difference between these two pieces of legislation that are on the floor today. Our bill, again, a reflection of the bipartisan bill in the Senate, says to all American women: you will be protected. The Republican proposal to the American women: we want to protect America’s women, everybody step forward—who is an American woman. Not so fast if you’re from the immigrant community, if you are a Native American, or if you are hope to be part of the LGBT community.

It’s just not right. America has always been, and our Constitution dem-
women safe to be well funded. I want the advocates of change to have the resources to turn victims into victors. I want law enforcement officers and prosecutors to have the tools to impose justice on behalf of my son and other women students not worthy of protection? I want education leaders to break the cycle of violence and to intervene more effectively and quickly when they connect with higher-risk victims.

Once again we stand at an important moment in history, when the House stands under the “E Pluribus Unum,” I pray that this body will do as the Senate has done and come together as one to protect all women from violence. As I stated, the LGBT victims that are not here, the native women that are not here, the immigrants who are not included in this bill, I would say, as Sojourner Truth would say, Ain’t they women? They deserve protection. And we talk about the constitutional rights. Don’t women on tribal lands deserve the constitutional right of equal protection and not to be raped and battered and beaten and dragged back onto native lands because they know they can be raped with impunity? Ain’t they women?

Once again we stand at an important moment in history, when the House stands poised to choose between the Republican “alternative” to the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act and the bipartisan, comprehensive Senate bill.

We can choose the real VAWA—which is the Senate bill—that will take positive steps to towards ensuring the safety of all women. Or we can choose the House GOP VAWA bill. Now this bill may look good on the surface, bearing the same bill number as the Senate bill. But it is really a wolf in sheep’s clothing and would exclude victims and weaken the strong, bipartisan Senate bill.

The choice is ours to make, and the choice is clear. It pains me to say that House Republicans took the Senate bill, which received such a strong bipartisan vote—winning the support of all Democrats, all female Senators, and a majority of Republicans—and transformed it into something nearly unrecognizable.

I have been a proud sponsor of the House version of the Senate bill—H.R. 11—and it has truly been rewarding to work to advance this legislation. This reflects years upon years of analysis and best practices, and input from law enforcement, victims, service providers, and many more.

But beyond the updates that have been recommended by the experts—the Senate bill is meaningful to me because of the people it will allow us to reach. I know how it feels to survive a traumatic experience and not have access to services. It is simply heart-breaking to think that every day we delay, there are women, and men, across this country who have nowhere to turn. The Senate version of the VAWA bill, which we will thankfully have the opportunity to consider on the House floor today, would be the one that actually offers hope—to: LGBT victims, tribal victims, college campuses, immigrants, rape survivors waiting for justice, and human trafficking victims.

The Republican alternative, on the other hand, is a shadow of the bill these victims need. I have a number of concerns about the House alternative. Several of the advocacy groups have determined that this legislation rolls back existing protections for victims, much like the bill we considered last year here in the House.

But I am also concerned about the reality that this House bill further marginalizes the most vulnerable populations of victims. It amazes me, that my Republican colleagues would rather be exclusive than inclusive.

The House bill removes protections for LGBT victims, who face domestic and sexual violence at rates equal to or greater than the rest of us, but who often face barriers to receiving services. Are LGBT women not worthy of protection? The House bill fails to offer meaningful protections for tribal victims, though domestic violence in tribal communities is an epidemic. Are tribal women not worthy of protection?

The House bill does not include protections for our students on college campuses, though we know that college campuses—which are supposed to be the site of learning and transformation—personal growth—are too often the site of horrifying assaults against vulnerable young women. Are our young college women students not worthy of protection?

The House bill removes trafficking legislation that passed with the support of a whopping 93 Senators. Are we unwilling to protect our women who are being sold throughout this country and abroad like chattel? Are they not worthy of protection?

The House bill is weaker in almost every way, for every group of victims. They even pared down the pieces that have not gained much attention, perhaps assuming we wouldn’t notice—like the housing protections that allow victims of violence to quickly get out of dangerous situations that will keep them safe from further abuse and harm. Implementing the House GOP VAWA bill would set the plight of women and our country as a whole back indefinitely. But we have a choice and the right choice would be to support the strong, bipartisan Senate version of VAWA—S. 47.

S. 47, the Senate bill: Removes successful programs such as STOP Grants and Transitional Housing Assistance Grants, legal assistance for victims, and many others that have helped law enforcement, prosecutors, and victim service providers assist women in need and hold perpetrators accountable.

Includes a new focus on sexual assault—due to the ongoing reality of inadequate reporting, enforcement, and services for victims—including a requirement that STOP grants be set aside 20% for tribes to fund sexual assault-related programs.

Includes new tools and best practices for reducing homicide by training law enforcement, victim service providers, and court personnel to intervene more effectively and quickly when they connect with higher-risk victims.

And, of course, the bill improves protections for immigrant survivors, Native American women, and LGBT victims.

As we have debated the bill over the past year or so, I have felt like I was in the Twilight Zone. Some alternate reality, where the passage of a bill; a bill that is supposed to protect all women; a bill that not too long ago would just seem like common sense; a bill that has previously enjoyed bipartisan support would be held up and watered down for purely partisan reasons. I found myself asking, “when will it end?”

The answer to that question is that it ends today. Right now. It is time to put up or shut up. On behalf of all victims of sexual or domestic assault, I challenge all of my colleagues to make the right choice. We all know that the Senate bill is the real comprehensive Violence Against Women Legislation that will protect all women. And we must vote against the House GOP VAWA and pass the Senate version of VAWA now. Women won’t wait any longer. Now is the time to show the people of this country that we value the lives of all women.

Why Section 904 of S. 47 IS CONSTITUTIONAL

Section 904 of S. 47, the Senate-passed version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, is constitutional under the Supreme Court’s precedent in United States v. Lara, based upon hearing before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, S. Rep. 112–126, at 128–131 (2012) (RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD OF THOMAS J. PERRIEL, ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL).

The question is whether the Senate VAWA reauthorization bill, S. 47, uses language that is nearly identical to the statutory language at issue in Lara: Speck v. United States, 541 U.S. 193 (2004). In

Lara, the Supreme Court addressed a Federal statute providing that Indian tribes’ governmental powers include “the inherent power of Indian tribes, hereby recognized and affirmed, to exercise criminal jurisdiction over all Indians,” including Indians who are not members of the prosecuting tribe (i.e., “non-member Indians”). 1 id. at 210 (appendix, quoting the statute). The Court held generally that Congress has the constitutional power to relax restrictions on the exercise of tribal inherent law, as long as it can show “a compelling reason to do so.” Id. at 196, and more specifically that “the Constitution authorizes Congress to permit tribes, as an incident of their inherent tribal authority, to prosecute nonmember Indians.” Id. at 210.

The Senate VAWA reauthorization bill, S. 47, uses language that is nearly identical to the statutory language at issue in Lara. Specifically, Section 904 of the Senate bill provides that a tribe’s governmental powers
include the inherent power of that tribe, which is hereby recognized and affirmed, to exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over all persons, including non-Indians, who reside on Indian reservations, or in Indian country, and the requirement that the victim be an Indian—will confine pros-
cutions to conduct that seriously threatens Indians' health and welfare and is committed by persons who, though non-Indian, have en-
tered into consensual relationships with the tribe. Section 904 of the Senate bill would not create or eliminate any Federal or State criminal jurisdiction over Indians. Nor would it affect the authority of the United States to investigate and prosecute crimes in Indian country.

In most respects, then, Section 904 of the Senate bill is far narrower than the statute upheld by the Supreme Court in Lara. As to the sixth consideration analyzed by the Lara Court, concerning the Supreme Court's precedents, it is noteworthy that in Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 435 U.S. 191 (1978), the key precedent here, the Court suggested that Congress has the constitutional authority to enact legislation that both restricts and, in turn, exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians. Indeed, the Oliphant Court expressly stated that the increasing sophistication of tribal court systems, the Indian Civil Rights Act's protection of de-
spondent's procedural rights, and the preva-
es of non-Indian crime in Indian country would not create or eliminate any Federal or State criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians. Id. at 195 & n.6, 210-12. Indeed, the Oliphant Court did not set forth constitutional limits that prohibit Congress from changing the relevant legal circumstances, i.e., from taking actions that modify or adjust the tribes' status.' Lara, 541 U.S. at 205 (citing Oliphant, 435 U.S. at 209-10). Oliphant "make[s] clear that the Constitution does not dictate the metes and bounds of tribal autonomy," and the Federal courts should not "second-guess the political branches' own determination about those metes and bounds." Id. In short, under both Oliphant and Lara, it is constitutional for Congress to change 'judicially made' federal Indian law through (the) legislation that the Senate is currently considering. Id. at 207.

After analyzing the six considerations list-
ed above and concluding that Congress can exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction consistent with the Supreme Court's earlier cases," id. at 205. Each of these six considerations also ap-
plies to Section 904 of the Senate bill. That is self-evident for the first four of those six con-
siderations. As to the fifth consideration, like the statu-
ute at issue in Lara, Section 904 of the Sen-
bill would effectuate only a limited change. Section 904 would touch only those criminal acts that occur in the Indian coun-
ty of a tribe and there therefore would not cover off-reservation crimes. Section 904 would affect only those crimes that have been traditional criminal jurisdic-
tion cases involving only non-Indians. Unlike the statute at issue in Lara, which covered all types of crimes, Section 904 is narrowly focused and thus, raises no systemic problems: those involving domestic violence, crimes of dating violence, and criminal violations of protection orders. The term 'domestic vio-
cence' is expressly defined in Section 904 to deal with violence committed by the vic-
tim's current or former spouse, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in com-
onmon, by someone who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim, as determined by the length of the relationship, the type of rela-
tionship, and the frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relation-
ship. Likewise, protection orders typically involve spouses or intimate partners.

In light of these features of Section 904—including being limited to narrow cat-
egories of crimes such as domestic violence and dating violence, the requirement that the crime be committed in Indian country, and the requirement that the victim be an Indian—will confine pros-
cutions to conduct that seriously threatens Indians' health and welfare and is committed by persons who, though non-Indian, have en-
tered into consensual relationships with the tribe. Section 904 of the Senate bill would not create or eliminate any Federal or State criminal jurisdiction over Indian country. Nor would it affect the authority of the United States to investigate and prosecute crimes in Indian country.

In most respects, then, Section 904 of the Senate bill is far narrower than the statute upheld by the Supreme Court in Lara. As to the sixth consideration analyzed by the Lara Court, concerning the Supreme Court's precedents, it is noteworthy that in Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 435 U.S. 191 (1978), the key precedent here, the Court suggested that Congress has the constitutional authority to enact legislation that both restricts and, in turn, exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians. Indeed, the Oliphant Court expressly stated that the increasing sophistication of tribal court systems, the Indian Civil Rights Act's protection of de-
spondent's procedural rights, and the preva-
es of non-Indian crime in Indian country would not create or eliminate any Federal or State criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians. Id. at 195 & n.6, 210-12. Indeed, the Oliphant Court did not set forth constitutional limits that prohibit Congress from changing the relevant legal circumstances, i.e., from taking actions that modify or adjust the tribes' status.' Lara, 541 U.S. at 205 (citing Oliphant, 435 U.S. at 209-10). Oliphant "make[s] clear that the Constitution does not dictate the metes and bounds of tribal autonomy," and the Federal courts should not "second-guess the political branches' own determination about those metes and bounds." Id. In short, under both Oliphant and Lara, it is constitutional for Congress to change 'judicially made' federal Indian law through (the) legislation that the Senate is currently considering. Id. at 207.

After analyzing the six considerations list-
ed above and concluding that Congress can exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction consistent with the Supreme Court's earlier cases," id. at 205. Each of these six considerations also ap-
plies to Section 904 of the Senate bill. That is self-evident for the first four of those six con-
siderations. As to the fifth consideration, like the statu-
ute at issue in Lara, Section 904 of the Sen-
bill would effectuate only a limited change. Section 904 would touch only those criminal acts that occur in the Indian coun-
ty of a tribe and there therefore would not cover off-reservation crimes. Section 904 would affect only those crimes that have been traditional criminal jurisdic-
tion cases involving only non-Indians. Unlike the statute at issue in Lara, which covered all types of crimes, Section 904 is narrowly focused and thus, raises no systemic problems: those involving domestic violence, crimes of dating violence, and criminal violations of protection orders. The term 'domestic vio-
cence' is expressly defined in Section 904 to deal with violence committed by the vic-
tim's current or former spouse, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in com-
onmon, by someone who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim, as determined by the length of the relationship, the type of rela-
tionship, and the frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relation-
ship. Likewise, protection orders typically involve spouses or intimate partners.

In light of these features of Section 904—including being limited to narrow cat-
egories of crimes such as domestic violence and dating violence, the requirement that the crime be committed in Indian country, and the requirement that the victim be an Indian—will confine pros-

entered into with Indian tribes between 1785 and 1796—that is, both immediately before and immediately after the drafting and ratification of the Constitution—expressly provided for the inherent territorial jurisdiction of non-Indians residing in Indian country. For example, the very first Indian treaty ratified by the United States Senate under the Federal Constitution—the 1789 Treaty with the Wyandot, Delaware, Ottawa, Chippewa, Potawatomi, and Sac Nations—provided that, “[i]f any person or persons, citizens or subjects of the United States, or any other person not being an Indian, shall presume to settle upon the lands confirmed to the said [Indian tribes], he and they shall not be out of the protection of the United States; and the said nations may punish him or them in such manner as they see fit” (emphasis added). Similar language appeared in the last Indian treaty ratified before the Constitutional Convention—the 1786 Treaty with the Shawnee Nation. It is difficult, then, to say that allowing non-Indian citizens of the United States to be tried and punished by Indian tribes for crimes committed in Indian country is somehow contrary to the Framers’ understanding of the Constitution’s design. Thus, the Lara Court’s holding that Indian tribes’ status as domestic dependent nations does not prevent Congress from recognizing their inherent authority to prosecute non-members is solidly grounded in our constitutional history. And with Congress’s express authorization, an Indian tribe can prosecute a non-member, regardless of whether he has consented to the tribe’s jurisdiction.

It is important to note that while the elements of Section 901 discussed above are more than sufficient to address the considerations raised by the Lara Court, we do not mean to suggest that each of these elements is required in order to address these considerations.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Pat Meehan, a champion in prosecuting those in domestic violence situations.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to put aside this rhetoric and to find a way to work together to pass the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act, to move this important legislation forward in a way in which we can reach a resolution.

I come to this as a former prosecutor who has seen firsthand the implications. I come to give a voice to people who do not have an opportunity to speak for themselves. Because one of the things that we realize is that a woman will be victimized 12 times, beaten 12 times before she has the courage to come forward to speak to somebody who needs to be there, to be able to help give them a sense of comfort and dignity to be able to retain control over the circumstances. The Violence Against Women Act enables the kinds of resources to be there to have the trained constitutional personnel who can make a difference.

I had a chance to visit SANE nurses, who work in emergency wards, giving victims of rape the dignity to be able to have an examination in the privacy of a room opposed to being violated a second time out in a public space in an emergency ward, to reduce the time they have to spend for that examination from 13 hours after a rape to 2 hours, to be able to collect the evidence and to help that victim to be able to make their case if they so choose in court.

I have had a chance to work with victims of violence against college campuses—one in four women who have, in college campuses, reported that they have been victims of rape or attempted rape. So, unquestionably, we must find a way to pass the Violence Against Women Act. We must reduce the rhetoric and the misrepresentations and the shamefulness representations on both sides about the good intentions to try to do this. There are differences of opinion in small areas. We must find a way to get over those. I rise today to make sure that we give a voice to those victims, to work together to find a way to pass the Violence Against Women Act.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington State, Congresswoman DelBene.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 47, the Senate-passed version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I want to thank the Speaker for bringing this bill to the floor for debate.

In a time when we must resolve some real disagreements on how to move our country forward, I’m pleased that we’re taking this important step towards the shared goal of reauthorizing the landmark Violence Against Women Act.

However, I cannot support the House substitute amendment, because it fails to include critical improvements passed by a large bipartisan margin in the Senate that would strengthen our efforts to combat violence against women.

I’m particularly disappointed that this amendment omits provisions that would enable tribes to address domestic violence in Indian country. This is an issue that’s critical in my district, the Lummi Nation, for example, which I visited just last week in Bellingham, Washington, has seen significant increases in violence against women over the past several years. The House substitute would continue to allow for disparate treatment of Indian and non-Indian offenders, while the bipartisan Senate bill includes key provisions that fill this legal gap.

There are many other ways in which the House substitute amendment unfortunately falls short.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the substitute amendment and support the Senate-passed reauthorization bill.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito).

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. BECERRA of California.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the leader for yielding.

My friends, every single day in America, one of every four women who have, in college campuses, reported that they have been victims of rape or attempted rape. If we don’t intervene, if we don’t find help, if we don’t end this cycle of violence for the Jahlil Clements of this country, we’re doing a great disservice to our country. So I’m going to vote “no” on the House bill and “yes” on the Senate bill for Jahlil Clements and all the Jahlil Clements throughout this great country.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chair of the House Democratic Caucus, Mr. Becerra of California.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Senate substitute amendment and pass the Violence Against Women Act in the same way we must give a voice to those victims, to work together to find a way to pass the Violence Against Women Act.
Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Congressman BERA, a physician and a new Member of Congress.

Mr. BERA of California. Today, I rise as a doctor to tell about the patients that I've taken care of who have suffered as victims of domestic violence.

As doctors, we don't choose to treat one patient or another patient. We choose to take care of every patient who presents, and as Members of Congress—As Americans—we don't choose to protect one woman and not protect another. We choose to protect all women in America. That is who we are as a Nation. I urge this body to reject the House version of this bill and to pass the bipartisan Senate version, which is a reflection of who we are in America and our values.

As the father of a daughter, this is personal. I want my daughter to grow up in a country in which we value and respect every woman, regardless of her background, ethnicity, creed. This is personal. Let's do the right thing. I urge this body to reject the House version of this bill and to pass the bipartisan Senate version, which is a reflection of who we are in America and our values.

The statistics are appalling. It's reported that, in the United States alone, more than 24 people each minute are victims of some sort of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. Beyond that, more than 12 million individuals each year. These types of crimes happen to individuals from all walks of life. No gender, race, ethnicity or socioeconomic status is immune. This bill provides protection for everyone who may become victim to sexual and domestic violence.

I support this bill because it implements new accountability standards that make programs more effective. These reforms prevent taxpayer dollars from being inappropriately spent. I can personally ensure that more money is being used to assist victims and to reduce the amount of violence that happens against women. By limiting the amount of money that can be spent on salaries and administrative costs, this bill provides protections for women by maximizing the amount of funding that goes directly to the victims. It is time for us to do the right thing and pass this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. KEATING, a former prosecutor and a champion on fighting for the safety of America's women.

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

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I was a DA for 12 years. I solicited and actually used these funds. We talk about issues. As people see issues, I see faces. I see the faces of innocent women who are victims, and I see the faces of perpetrators, themselves—the rapists, the batterers, the abusers—who sought to isolate these victims, to strip them away from their families, their jobs and, social service agencies, law enforcement.

I used these funds to create a lifeline for these victims, breaking down walls that exist in terms of people who spoke a different language, had a different culture, had a different nationality. This amendment creates these barriers, that make the victims more vulnerable, and it strengthens the hands of the perpetrators.

Please, all of you, join me in voting against this amendment, and then let's all join together with a piece of legislation that does not punish the victim but that puts perpetrators where they belong—behind bars.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to another champion on protecting women, the gentleman from Washington State, Mr. LARSEN.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. I rise today in support of the bipartisan Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act that we will vote on.

We wouldn't be here today without the courage of victims from all of our communities—women and men who are rich and poor, immigrant, Native American, folks from the LGBT community—all of whom spoke out about their experiences. Domestic violence does not discriminate, and with this bill, domestic violence protection will no longer discriminate. This bill improves protections for immigrants, for Native Americans, for members of the LGBT community.

In my district, Tulalip Tribes Vice Chair Deborah Parker has explained why these protections are so critical. She told me that, for far too long, Native American women have lacked serious protections on their reservations. This bill will make it easier for them to seek justice, and it also includes important amendments to the enforcement of the International Broker Regulation Act, a law that I sponsored in 2006.
Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to Congressman Kirkpatrick of Arizona who has again every day, every step of the way, been helpful in protecting all women, especially those on reservations.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was born and raised in the White Mountain Apache Nation. The necklace I wear today was made by an Apache woman. I've seen firsthand the troubles and hardships that our tribes experience. Now I represent 12 Native American tribes, and I stand on the floor of Congress to give them a voice.

Our Native American women, who need resources and protection, face great hardships. They often live in very remote areas. Unfortunately, Native American women are two-and-a-half times more likely to be assaulted in their lifetimes than other women.

As a prosecutor, I also saw firsthand the need to protect those who are vulnerable. That's why I have pushed so hard for the bipartisan Senate-passed version of this legislation. This legislation strengthens protections for Native American women and so many others.

My district needs this legislation. I urge my colleagues to come together and pass the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act today.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), a Member of Congress who has been a champion on this issue for a very long time, a health professional in her own right before coming to Congress.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I thank my leader for yielding, and I rise today in opposition to the Republican amendment that would undermine key provisions in the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization, and to urge strong support for the underlying Senate bill which protects our young people on our school campuses.

VAWA is a vital program addressing violence against women holistically: through prevention programs, survivor supports, and provisions to hold perpetrators accountable. But it is also a symbol that relationship violence and sexual assault is real and that it's unacceptable. It has been a symbol in this Congress that we can put aside our differences and come together to do what is right for violence victims and survivors. And as we saw in the Senate—and we will hopefully see it here in the House—this is still true.

Our daughters, sisters, and mothers, no matter where they are, including on our school campuses, deserve to live without fear of abuse, and we cannot delay their safety any longer. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Senate bill.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first let me thank Leader PELOSI and Congresswoman GWEN MOORE for their tremendous leadership to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

Today we have an opportunity to really stand up for tribal women, for the LGBT community, for immigrant women for women all across the United States and to finally pass the strongly bipartisan Senate version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. We should have done this a long time ago. After much grandstanding, feet dragging, and shameful politicking over protecting the right for all women to feel safe in their homes and workplaces, I hope today we can come together to say that violence against any woman is never an option.

When I was in the California Legislature, I authored the Violence Against Women Act for the State of California, and it was signed into law by a Republican Governor. It was, indeed, a bipartisan effort.

As someone who understands domestic violence on a deeply personal level, I know how traumatic it is, and I know the strong and consistent support system needed to emerge as a survivor. That is what the Senate's VAWA reauthorization will accomplish for all women—and I don't mean for some women; I mean for all women. So I urge Members to vote "no" on the amendment and "yes" on the underlying bill.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the champion on our side of the aisle for the reauthorization of this important legislation, our majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady and congratulate her on her leadership on this issue. As chairwoman of our conference, as a strong advocate for families, for women, for children in our conference, I urge her in her efforts to improve the ability for individuals, women, who are subject to domestic abuse to get the relief that they need. And in that spirit today, Madam Speaker, I come to the floor in support of the substitute amendment that today.

Today, Madam Speaker, a mother and her daughter will go to a shelter seeking safe harbor because they are scared. Another young woman will walk into a hospital emergency room seeking treatment for assault. In some cases, women will wait to report such violent crimes because they don't feel there is a support system in place to help them.

Our goal in strengthening the Violence Against Women Act is simple: we want to help all women who are faced with violent, abusive, and dangerous situations. We want to make sure that all women are safe and have access to the resources they need to protect themselves, their children, and their families. We want them to know that somebody is there and willing to help. And we want them to know that those who commit these horrendous crimes will not be punished and not let go. Madam Speaker, that's why we feel so strongly about providing the proper support system and needed relief to thousands of victims and survivors so that they can get on with their lives.

For the past several months, we've worked hard in this House to build consensus and to put together the strongest bill possible to improve on that which came from the Senate. Today, I encourage my colleagues to support the House amendment to the Violence Against Women Act in order to end violence against all people, against all women, and prosecute offenders to the fullest extent of the law.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), who has been a champion for ending violence against women for all women in America.
The effort to reauthorize VAWA failed, despite overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate, because House Republicans stripped the bill of critical provisions to help women, especially Native American women. Sadly, we are seeing this effort repeated on the floor today.

Once again, House Republicans are trying to weaken a bill that passed by a vote of 78–22 in the Senate in order to deny Native American women important protections. Sovereignty is not a bargaining chip. The Republican substitute is an attack on Native American women and does not respect sovereignty.

Studies have found that three out of five American Indian women will experience domestic violence; yet the Republican substitute makes it harder to prosecute abusers and is full of loopholes.

I urge my Republican colleagues to drop their opposition to the Senate bill and pass legislation that gives all women, including Native American women, vital protections against abuse.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dent).

Mr. Dent. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, which passed the Senate with a strong bipartisan majority. I do support that underlying bill.

The programs funded under this landmark legislation have proven effective over the past two decades in achieving real and meaningful reductions in domestic violence. Victims' advocates in my district and around the country rely on funding made available through VAWA for training programs, rape prevention and education, battered women's shelters, support for runaway, and community programs directed at ending the cycle of domestic violence.

In my home State, the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape currently operates 50 rape crisis centers that provide services to victims of sexual violence. These centers also utilize public awareness campaigns and prevention education to combat the root causes of sexual assault. Essential institutions such as these are counting on us in this body to ensure that VAWA funds remain available to support their often lifesaving work.

I am proud to serve as a board member of the Crime Victims Council of the Lehigh Valley. This private, nonprofit organization provides free, confidential assistance to victims of violent crime and their significant others to help them cope with the traumatic aftermath of victimization.

Another outstanding institution in my district is Turning Point of Lehigh Valley, which maintains a 24-hour hotline that serves as a constant resource for victims and their loved ones. Turning Point offers empowerment counseling, safe houses, court advocacy, prevention programs, and transitional assistance to ease former abuse victims into independent life. Our community depends on these organizations, and these organizations depend on VAWA.

VAWA has substantially improved our Nation's ability to combat violent crime and protect its victims, providing a strong safety net for women and children across the United States. According to the FBI, incidents of rape have dropped by nearly 20 percent from the law's enactment in 1994 through 2011. The rate of intimate partner violence has declined by 64 percent over that same period.

However, much work remains to be done. The CDC estimates that 1 in 4 women and 1 in 7 men have experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner at some point in their lifetime. The SPEAKEE program tempers the time of the gentleman's remarks.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman. Mr. Dent. Congress must reauthorize VAWA to prevent more innocent Americans from becoming victims and to provide critical services for those who do.

Further delaying this crucial legislation does this Congress no credit and leaves State and local service providers facing the likelihood of their ability to continue protecting some of the most vulnerable members of our society.

The Senate voted to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act with a strong bipartisan majority, and I would strongly encourage the House of Representatives to do the same, to support that underlying bill. Voting "yes" on the underlying bill will move the reauthorizing legislation to the President's desk immediately. It's the right thing to do, and it's about time we do it.

Ms. Pelosi. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to recognize our distinguished Democratic whip of the House, Mr. HOYER. He was there in the nineties when we worked to pass this legislation on the Appropriations Committee. He and ROSA DELAURO and Congresswoman NITA LOWEY and I worked to fund the Violence Against Women Act. He's been there on this issue for a long time. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the leader for her efforts in getting us to this point.

Today, after 2 months, I think we're going to do something very positive, and we're going to do it in a bipartisan way, and I think that's excellent. I think America will be advantaged. Every American—women, yes—but every American will be advantaged.

House Democrats support the fully inclusive reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act which passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 78–22, as has been referenced. A majority of Republican Senators, and all Republican women Senators, voted in favor. This bill represents a compromise, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the partisan, Republican-amended version so we can pass the Senate bill. I voted for the rule, which allows us that opportunity. Let us take it.

The changes House Republicans made in their version significantly weaken its provisions—and I want to say some Republicans. I want to make that clear. It's not all—aimed at protecting victims of domestic violence and empowering law enforcement to keep our people safe from these crimes.

The House Republican bill omits critical protections for Native Americans, for LGBT Americans, and for immigrants.

Furthermore, the House Republican bill removes protections for students on campus, victims of human trafficking, and those who've experienced rape or stalking.

Why? Why not protect everybody, all Americans?

When we fail to protect all victims, abusers can get away with the abuse and repeat it.

Madam Speaker, Congress ought not to be playing games with women's lives and with the lives of all who suffer from domestic violence. We owe it to the victims, their families, victims' advocates, law enforcement and prosecutors to make sure the protections of the Violence Against Women Act work and can meet the challenges we face today.

That's why we should defeat the weaker House Republican alternative and, instead, pass the fully inclusive version passed by Senate Democrats and Republicans. I expect it to be a bipartisan vote. It is a good day for America.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, just to clarify, on the House
substitute that we’ll be considering a little later, it ensures that money goes to victims by increasing accountability. It ensures and guarantees that grants to combat sexual assault are distributed equitably. It improves the ability of the government to prosecute abusers. It better protects Indian women from domestic violence, and it safeguards constitutional rights to ensure justice for victims.

At this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), our policy chairman.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam Speaker, I do want to stand in support of the House proposal today on protecting women across this Nation. This is something that protects all women. I know there’s been some interesting accusations that we’re trying to exclude people. This is for all women in all places.

As a dad of two daughters, I get this. I understand this. My two daughters were on this House floor not very many weeks ago getting a chance to visit and to be here and to be a part of this process and to connect some of the great ladies on both sides of the aisle, but to also get a chance to interact with people and to see how laws are made. And I want them to know, in the days ahead, laws here that are done are for every person and that we stand for every family.

This is a family issue. This is a woman’s issue. This is also a State legal issue. It’s a community issue, and it’s also a national issue that is right that we deal with today.

I want to encourage organizations in Oklahoma City like the YWCA that have a simple theme of eliminating racism, empowering women; and they work every single day to be able to help women that are in situations that they have got to escape out of.
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I also want to stand up for the 39 tribes in Oklahoma. I’ve met with some of the tribal leaders. The House version does three simple things on it. For my constituents, I want them to know that if there’s domestic violence that occurs—and the House version assures this—if they live in Indian country, if they work in Indian country, if they’re married or dating someone from Indian country, this law clearly protects them in that. All of section 900 I would encourage people to read and go through the details of how we stand beside the tribes and those that are in and around Indian country.

There needs to be prosecution, there needs to be protection. But most of all, we need to stand beside every single family and every single woman in this Nation to do what is right.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I have listened attentively to some of the comments made by those who support the House version of VAWA and they use words like ‘all women’ as the distinguished majority leader said. Not true in the Republican bill. Not all women if you’re gay, if you are from the immigrant community, or if you happen to be living on a reservation.

Let me hear the appeal from a freshman Member very eloquently. "Why can’t we work together and put partisanship aside?" That’s exactly what the Senate did, 78-22. A majority of the Republicans in the Senate voted for the far superior bill.

We’ve never had a perfect bill, you’re absolutely right. But we have a far superior bill that expands protections, as opposed to the House bill which not only is not as good as the Senate bill, it diminishes protections already in the law.

I heard the gentlelady talk eloquently about the money and where it needs to go. It’s sad to say that with

Mr. QUIGLEY. Well, if this is for all and this is for everybody, why attempt to strip out essential protections for immigrants, tribal, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender victims? Do they not also deserve protection? Once again, we have to stand up and fight for equal protections for all victims. The Senate seems to get what this body does not: we are all in this together.

These victims are not nameless, faceless members of some group of ‘others.’ They are our friends, our neighbors, our family members. We are a Nation built on justice, fairness, and equal protection. We are all stronger when we uphold these ideals and protect the most vulnerable among us. The Senate-passed VAWA embodies these principles and protects all victims. We should pass it today.

Ms. McNERIS. I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to a former prosecutor, the gentlelady from Indiana, SUSAN BROOKS.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. I rise in support of VAWA. It’s a matter of calling Black eyes. Bruises. Belts. Broken bottles. Children scared and crying in the corners, crying for it to stop. The lies and coverups to friends and family. A family frit out of control. And then the abuser gains the control and says, ‘’I’m sorry.’” I’ve done it once, I will do it again.” “‘I’ll change.”’ So the victim stays again and again and again, year after year.

The cycle of violence goes on from generation to generation, just like Britanny from Tipton County, Indiana, abused by her drug-addicted mother and married a man also the victim of severe child abuse. After they married, the cycle of violence continues. Britanny’s husband verbally and physically abused her while their children watched. She is in every one of our districts, whether you’re in a poor family or a rich family, whether you’re in the city, in the country, or on the farm. We as Members of Congress have the power and the control to change her life.

When Britanny finally took control and made the call, it was VAWA funds that made sure that the cops that responded recognized it. And I’ve done those ride-alongs, and they are the most dangerous things we can make.

When VAWA funds are involved, they keep shelters and transitional housing open so those victims have a safe place to stay. When VAWA has funds, it trains sexual assault nurses who help those victims through the humiliating exams they have to endure that that is so important so we have the evidence to put the abusers behind bars.

When VAWA funds are involved, we have advocates in prosecutors offices and in courtrooms who are trained to help victims get through the painful, long, difficult court process. And when VAWA funds are involved, we have counseling services needed for the victims and their families to heal. VAWA gives victims a fighting chance to gain control of their lives. If VAWA doesn’t pass, in my district Alternatives, Inc. will have to lay off two of their five victim advocates, shut down one of their offices and won’t be able to serve the victims the tribal leaders of the 39 counties that they served last year.

VAWA is a program that works. It’s one of those Federal Government programs that works. This bill is not a perfect bill. No bill that Congress passes is perfect. But I will tell you the victims being attacked can’t wait for perfect. The three women and the one man who die every day at the hands of their intimate partners cannot wait for perfection.

I’m a freshman, and I’m asked all the time, Isn’t there anything that Congress can agree on and get behind? I think we need to show the American people we can give control back to the women, men, and children who are subjected to the horrors that the hands of someone who supposedly loves them. This shouldn’t be about politics and fighting and about political party control. In my short time in Congress, I’ve seen too often that we lose sight of the people that we protect and to serve. And it is about control. That’s what their lives are about.

I urge every Member to think of the victims. Take those statistics and replace them with the Britanys in your district. Take control away from the abusers, provide it back to the victims with the control they need. Can’t we be the voice that they don’t have? We as Members of Congress have the ability to give control back to the victims, to give control to the cops, to give control to the sexual assault nurses, to give control to the victim advocates, to give some to the shelters and to the counselors. I’m asking this Congress to show the American people that we can, I do.

Please pass this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I have listened attentively to some of the comments made by those who support the House version of VAWA and they use words like ‘all women’ as the distinguished majority leader said. Not true in the Republican bill. Not all women if you’re gay, if you are from the immigrant community, or if you happen to be living on a reservation.

The cycle of violence goes on from generation to generation, just like Britanny from Tipton County, Indiana, abused by her drug-addicted mother and married a man also the victim of severe child abuse. After they married, the cycle of violence continues. Britanny’s husband verbally and physically abused her while their children watched. She is in every one of our districts, whether you’re in a poor family or a rich family, whether you’re in the city, in the country, or on the farm. We as Members of Congress have the power and the control to change her life.

When Britanny finally took control and made the call, it was VAWA funds that made sure that the cops that responded recognized it. And I’ve done those ride-alongs, and they are the most dangerous things we can make.

When VAWA funds are involved, they keep shelters and transitional housing open so those victims have a safe place to stay. When VAWA has funds, it trains sexual assault nurses who help those victims through the humiliating exams they have to endure that that is so important so we have the evidence to put the abusers behind bars.

When VAWA funds are involved, we have advocates in prosecutors offices and in courtrooms who are trained to help victims get through the painful, long, difficult court process. And when VAWA funds are involved, we have counseling services needed for the victims and their families to heal. VAWA gives victims a fighting chance to gain control of their lives. If VAWA doesn’t pass, in my district Alternatives, Inc. will have to lay off two of their five victim advocates, shut down one of their offices and won’t be able to serve the victims the tribal leaders of the 39 counties that they served last year.

VAWA is a program that works. It’s one of those Federal Government programs that works. This bill is not a perfect bill. No bill that Congress passes is perfect. But I will tell you the victims being attacked can’t wait for perfect. The three women and the one man who die every day at the hands of their intimate partners cannot wait for perfection.

I’m a freshman, and I’m asked all the time, Isn’t there anything that Congress can agree on and get behind? I think we need to show the American people we can give control back to the women, men, and children who are subjected to the horrors that the hands of someone who supposedly loves them. This shouldn’t be about politics and fighting and about political party control. In my short time in Congress, I’ve seen too often that we lose sight of the people that we protect and to serve. And it is about control. That’s what their lives are about.

I urge every Member to think of the victims. Take those statistics and replace them with the Britanys in your district. Take control away from the abusers, provide it back to the victims with the control they need. Can’t we be the voice that they don’t have? We as Members of Congress have the ability to give control back to the victims, to give control to the cops, to give control to the sexual assault nurses, to give control to the victim advocates, to give some to the shelters and to the counselors. I’m asking this Congress to show the American people that we can, I do.

Please pass this bill.
sequestration, $20 million, according to a new estimate from the Justice Department, will be cut from the Violence Against Women account. That means approximately 35,927 victims of violence would not have access to lifesaving services and resources.

So I want to appreciate that our colleagues have come together on the Senate bill. The House agrees with their bipartisan position. The President stands ready to sign it. It’s just the House Republicans that are odd people out on this.

It’s hard to understand why you think “some” equals “all.” It doesn’t. And that’s why it’s really important to reject the House version and support the Senate version.

I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Swalwell), a Member of our freshman class.

Mr. Swalwell of California. Preventing violence against women means preventing violence against all women, especially those from the LGBT community, especially those from the immigrant community, and I’m here to support the bipartisan Senate bill that was passed and to oppose the House amendment.

I was a prosecutor in Alameda County for 7 years. I worked day in and day out with women who came in as violence victims, people who had been battered. And it’s only because of the Violence Against Women funding that we had in our office that allowed us to provide them with the emotional and physical services that they needed that we could even begin to put them on the track of healing. Only because of this funding.

So right now it is incumbent upon us to make sure that this funding is available, as we move forward, to all women—all women. Violence against all women must be protected against, and we must have funding that shows that we will go aggressively after their abuse and provide them with the emotional and physical services that they need. Only because of this funding.

Today’s bipartisan bill gives us an opportunity to show that this House can do big things when we work together.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, I would just ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to please point to anywhere in the House bill that coverage for anyone is denied. To specifically state: Where is the coverage denied?

The House covers all victims. This bill does not exclude anyone for any characteristic. It only does the bill specifically prohibit discrimination; it directs the Attorney General to make a rule regarding antidiscrimination efforts as he sees fit.

Moreover, the STOP grant is reauthorized to permit funding to go toward men as well as women. The House bill enhances protections for Native American women. The House bill requires the Justice Department to cross-designate tribal prosecutors as Federal prosecutors in 10 federally recognized Indian tribes. This allows tribal prosecutors to move forward more quickly in Federal court.

The House bill provides a constitutional role for Federal prosecutors to prosecute non-Indian offenders for domestic violence crimes against Native American women. This is critical for victims to ensure that offenders do not have their convictions overturned.

The House increased accountability provisions. The House bill mandates better coordination among grantees and Federal employees to ensure money is spent effectively and efficiently. This is in response to allegations of misuse of funds. It limits administrative expenses and salaries to 5 percent, ensuring that money goes to victims and law enforcement. This ensures that money goes to victims, not bureaucrats.

At this time, I’m happy to yield 2 minutes to a champion for all human rights, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Smith).

Mr. Smith of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Violence Against Women Act sponsored by Congresswoman McMorris Rodgers. It authorizes $2.2 billion for VAWA to help victimized women and children seeking assistance to break the cycle of violence and live a life free from intimidation, fear, abuse and exploitation.

VAWA is landmark legislation with a proven track record of assisting abused and battered women and must be reauthorized. VAWA includes: $222 million in STOP grants, providing critical funding to improve the criminal justice system’s response to crimes against women; $1.4 billion in grants to encourage arrest policies and Enforce Protection Orders, providing resources to bring abusers to justice and providing victims with the legal protections to live free of fear from their abusers; $57 million for Legal Assistance for Victims, providing necessary funding to strengthen state legal systems and ensuring that agencies charged with handling domestic abuse and sexual assault cases are able to assist victims through the legal process; and millions more in housing assistance to shelter victims away from their abusers; grants to protect young women on college campuses; training and services for abuse against women in rural areas and those with disabilities; funding to reduce rape kit backlogs so we can identify past abusers and provide justice to their victims; and many more critical programs that strengthen communities and combat abuse against vulnerable populations.

I just want to point out something that far too little attention has been paid to: the Leahy Amendment cuts to the State Department Trafficking in Persons, TIP, Office contained in the Senate version.

A little over a decade ago, I authored the Trafficking Victims’ Protection Act of 2000, the landmark law that created America’s comprehensive policy to combat modern-day slavery. The TVPA created the State Department’s Trafficking in Persons Office, now led by an ambassador-at-large with a robust complement of over 50 dedicated and highly trained people.

The Leahy trafficking amendment to S. 47, title XII, guts the TIP Office and represents a significant retreat in the struggle to end human trafficking. The only way to fix it is to pass the McMorris Rodgers amendment, go to negotiations, and get this legislation fixed.

The TIP Office is an extraordinary advocacy mechanism and has had a huge impact worldwide. In addition to being an office that monitors labor and sex trafficking and makes recommendations for whether or not countries be ranked tier one, tier two, or tier three.

For over a decade, the Trafficking in Persons Office has been the flagships in our struggle to combat human trafficking. The Leahy amendment cuts the authorization for the TIP Office from about $7 million down to $2 million. It eviscerates the TIP Office; there is no doubt about that.

It shifts responsibilities to the regional bureaus. We have had problems over the last decade, as my colleagues, I’m sure, know. The regional bureaus have a whole large portfolio of issues that they deal with. When they deal with those issues, trafficking is on page 4 or page 5 of their talking points. The TIP Office walks past; it has now been demoted significantly.

A little over a decade ago, when I first did the trafficking bill, there was huge pushback from the State Department. They didn’t want human rights in general, and absolutely they did not want the trafficking-in-persons issue to be dominant and center stage. That’s why I’ve worked to move back and forth for combating human trafficking.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, authored by Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers.

It authorizes $2.2 billion for VAWA to help victimized women and children seeking assistance to break the cycle of violence and live a life free from intimidation, fear, abuse and exploitation.

VAWA is landmark legislation with a proven track record of assisting abused and battered women and must be reauthorized. VAWA includes: $222 million in STOP grants, providing critical funding to improve the criminal justice system’s response to crimes against women; $73 million in Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforce Protection Orders, providing resources to bring abusers to justice and providing victims with the legal protections to live free of fear from their abusers; $57 million for Legal Assistance for Victims, providing necessary funding to strengthen state legal systems and ensuring that agencies charged with handling domestic abuse and sexual assault cases are able to assist victims through the legal process; and millions more in housing assistance to shelter victims away from their abusers; grants to protect young women on college campuses; training and services for abuse against women in rural areas and those with disabilities; funding to reduce rape kit backlogs so we can identify past abusers and provide justice to their victims; and many more critical programs that strengthen communities and combat abuse against vulnerable populations.

I just want to point out something that far too little attention has been paid to: the Leahy Amendment cuts to the State Department Trafficking in Persons, TIP, Office contained in the Senate version.

A little over a decade ago, I authored the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, TVPA, of 2000—the landmark law that created America’s comprehensive policy to combat modern-day slavery.

The TVPA created the State Department’s Trafficking in Persons Office, now led by an ambassador-at-large with a robust complement of over 50 dedicated and highly trained people.

The Leahy trafficking amendment to S. 47, title XII, guts the TIP Office and represents a significant retreat in the struggle to end human trafficking. The only way to fix it is to pass the McMorris Rodgers amendment, go to negotiations, and get this legislation fixed.

The TIP Office is an extraordinary advocacy mechanism and has had a huge impact worldwide. In addition to being an office that monitors labor and sex trafficking and makes recommendations for whether or not countries be ranked tier one, tier two, or tier three.

For over a decade, the Trafficking in Persons Office has been the flagships in our struggle to combat human trafficking. The Leahy amendment cuts the authorization for the TIP Office from about $7 million down to $2 million. It eviscerates the TIP Office; there is no doubt about that.

It shifts responsibilities to the regional bureaus. We have had problems over the last decade, as my colleagues, I’m sure, know. The regional
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the office monitors labor and sex trafficking in every country of the world pursuant to minimum standards prescribed in the TVPA and makes recommendations for whether or not countries should be ranked Tier I, Tier II Watch List or Tier III. Countries with bad records who fail to meet standards often fail and the House has no means to fix the Leahey amendment in conference.

For over a decade the Trafficking in Persons Office has been the flagship in our struggle to combat human trafficking, but that will change if the Rogers VAWA fails and the House has no means to fix the Leahey amendment in conference.

Madam Speaker, for over a decade the Trafficking in Persons Office has been the flagship in our struggle to combat human trafficking.

The Leahy Amendment, cuts the authorization for the TIP office authorization from $7 million down to $2 million—effectively eviscerating the TIP office.

Making matters worse the Leahy Amendment shifts responsibilities to the regional bureaus—and we have had problems with regional bureaus and trafficking over the last decade—as my colleagues I’m sure know. Regional bureaus have a large portfolio of issues that they handle. As they deal with those other issues, trafficking is often relegated to page four or page five of their agenda and talking points. The TIP office on the other hand walks point, is singular in focus, and it is imperative that it be adequately resourced and vested with current-day powers to act. Under Leahy the TIP office is demoted significantly.

The simple fact of the matter is that since enactment of the TVPA in 2000, the regional bureaus have often sought to undermine and weaken TIP country ranking recommendations due to other so-called equities. Advancing human rights is general and combating human trafficking in particular, far too often takes a back seat to other priorities.

That’s why, back in 2000, I led the effort and wrote the law to make the Trafficking in Persons Office the lead in gathering, analyzing, and putting forward recommendations for every country.

That’s why slashing the Trafficking in Persons Office is an awful idea. The victims deserve better.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I’d like to talk to you about Lucy. Lucy is not the name of the person I’m referring to, although she is absolutely real.

I’m going to hold this against you; don’t you dare leave me.

The Violence Against Women Act’s self-petition process was a lifeline and a savior to her. She was able to explain the extreme violence that she lived through—she suffered through all of the time, and she was able to separate from her husband and seek a way to become a citizen and to stay in this country and get rid of her abuser. Sadly, the House version rolls this protection back. That’s why you should support the Senate version.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I’m happy to yield 2 minutes to a champion, a former judge who has worked on legal issues for many years, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentle lady for yielding.

Violence against women is awful. I think we can all agree with that. Behind the scenes everywhere throughout America, behind closed doors bad things are happening in those families. It is violent. It affects the spouse, the children, and the quality of life of our community. Today, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to do something about that to make America safer for women, primarily, and their children. We have two choices before us today: the House bill, the Senate bill.

But there’s another thing going on behind closed doors in America as well, and that’s sexual assault that is occurring in America. I spent time on the bench as a judge in criminal cases in Texas for 22 years; and one of the greatest scientific discoveries was DNA. It’s helped prosecute sexual assault cases.

DNA: when those outlaws commit sexual assault crimes against primarily women and children, they leave DNA behind the scene. We then examine the DNA and find out who the criminal was. But here’s the problem: there are 400,000 DNA rape kits that have not been tested, some going back 20 and 25 years. They’re so old that when it’s determined who the criminal is, those cases are prosecuted because the statute of limitations has run; 400,000 cases where rape victims are waiting for us to just analyze those sexual assault cases.

That concept is called the SAFER bill, sponsored by CAROLYN MALONEY and myself to try to fix that issue by taking money in one legislation and putting it in the SAFER legislation to analyze those 400,000 cases so victims know who committed the crime, and also outlaws go to prison and not get a free ride because there’s not money to test those cases.

That SAFER bill is in the Senate version. I encourage the House of Representatives to vote for the SAFER bill because it is in the legislation. And that’s just the way it is.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentle lady from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the ranking member of our Judiciary Committee.

I rise in support of the Senate bill, S. 47, which reauthorizes VAWA. It passed by a strong bipartisan vote of 78–22 on February 12.

It is also an honor to be next to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, who has really championed this bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam Speaker, I rise specifically to address section 904, which provides tribal governments with jurisdiction over the abuse of Native American women on tribal lands. Those statistics, which were set forth by Senator Unalik in a recent article, were very alarming. Native American women are two-and-a-half times more likely to be raped, one in three will be assaulted, and three out of five will encounter domestic violence.

And the criticism, the criticism we’ve heard against why the Senate version of this bill should not pass is because they say it doesn’t afford due process. All we need to do is to look at the defendant’s rights as set forth in the tribal court criminal proceedings under ICRA, the Indian Civil Rights Act, and TLOA, the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010.

The rights are there. Support the Senate version.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus from New York, Mr. JOE CROWLEY.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend and colleague from Detroit, Michigan, for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, it has been over 500 days since the Violence Against Women Act expired—500 days—and every day that has passed without a vote, my colleagues and I have been asking ourselves, What are we waiting for? Are we waiting for our colleagues in the Senate to have a strong, bipartisan vote and send us a bill worth voting on? Oh, wait a minute. They’ve already done that. But maybe we’re waiting for a bill that strengthens the Violence Against Women Act. Sorry, the Senate has already done that, as well.

Or maybe we’re waiting for support of hundreds of State, local, and national organizations. Oh, but wait. We’ve already had that with the passage of the Senate bill.

My colleagues, it’s time to end this wait for our mothers, for our daughters, and for our friends so they can get the protection and the service that they deserve because, let me tell you, those users are not waiting.

Today, we have the chance to pass the actual Senate bill, the bipartisan, commonsense legislation that has been waiting for a vote. So let’s vote “no” on the substitute amendment, support the underlying bill, and send this to the President’s desk.

I don’t believe my colleagues, if they saw a lesbian woman being beaten by their neighbor, that they would not want to have that violence stopped. I don’t believe that my Republican colleagues, if they saw a married, illegal undocumented person, even an illegal alien, being beaten by her husband, they would not want that stopped. I don’t believe...
that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if they saw a Native American woman being beaten or abused, that they would not want that to stop.

Why do they not have it specified in their legislation? The Senate bill does. Let’s stop this back-and-forth and pass the Senate legislation.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I would just like to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the House, the Republican majority in this House, passed legislation to go forward with reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act in May of last year. Funding has continued. Congress, including the Republicans in the House, has supported and continues to fund these important programs at $500 million a year. No program has gone unfunded as we have continued to focus on the important work of getting this bill reauthorized.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, SUSAN DAVIS.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, at last, at last. Madam Speaker, like Americans all across the country, this Chamber finally put the Senate Violence Against Women Act to the floor for a vote.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to oppose the Republican substitute. If we pass a strong and bipartisan reauthorization, women, including immigrants, Native Americans, and LGBT individuals, and other vulnerable populations, including Native women, immigrants, and LGBT individuals.

In contrast, as we have heard, the Republican substitute inexplicably continues to exclude these groups and put them at risk. That is exclusionary and hurtful.

Let’s swiftly pass the Senate VAWA and send it straight to the President’s desk for his signature. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on S. 47 and to stand up for all victims of domestic violence. They’ve waited far too long for this.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I’m pleased now to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the Senate overwhelmingly passed a strong, bipartisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act to extend meaningful protections to all women of domestic violence, including immigrants, Native Americans, and members of the LGBT community.

Domestic violence victims and their families have waited far too long for the House to act to reauthorize VAWA and to provide victims of domestic violence with important resources to help end this violence. It’s critical that we ensure that every single victim of domestic violence, no matter what they look like or where they come from or who they love, has access to these critical tools and resources.

According to the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, violence in four women will be victims of domestic violence in their lifetime. Each year, 15 million American children are exposed to domestic violence and all the dangers of this violence.

Has everyone really come to the point that we can’t persuade every single Member of Congress that violence against all women is indefensible and that we have a moral responsibility to do everything in our power to stop it? Do we really want to say to some women, someone gay, someone Hispanic, someone black, someone who they love, has access to these critical tools and resources to help end this violence? I hope not.

I urge my colleagues to pass the strengthened Senate version reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act and to protect all American women from violence.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, February 4, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY, Chairman, U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO: On behalf of the 157,000 members and affiliates of the American Psychological Association (APA), I am writing to thank you for your invaluable leadership in introducing the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (S. 47). As the legislative advocates, APA offers its full support of your efforts to ensure a comprehensive and inclusive reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

As you know, 1.5 million women in the United States reports experiencing domestic violence at some point in her life, and 15 million children live in families in which intimate partner violence has occurred within the past year. Domestic violence can result in significant mental and behavioral health consequences including depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, disordered eating behaviors, depression, suicide, postpartum depression, diminished self-esteem, social isolation, substance use disorders, and suicidal behavior. VAWA programs can help to mitigate these negative outcomes by providing a vital link to services and supports for survivors and their families.

APA applauds your commitment to protecting survivors of violence with a comprehensive VAWA reauthorization. In particular, we appreciate the inclusion of essential public health provisions to reauthorize and strengthen the health care system’s identification, assessment, and response to violence, as well as provisions to protect vulnerable populations, including Native women, immigrants, and LGBT individuals.

We welcome the opportunity to work with you to address these important issues. For further information, please contact Nida Corry, Ph.D., in our Public Interest Government Relations Office at (202) 336-5931 or ncorry@apa.org.

Sincerely,

GWENDOLYN PURYEAR KETTA, Ph.D., Executive Director, Public Interest Directorate.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC WITNESS, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (U.S.A.), February 1, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: In the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), we believe that “domestic violence is always a power God intended for good.” We believe that “God the Creator is preeminently a covenant Maker, the One who creates, and transforms the people of God. Domestic violence and abuse destroys covenants in which people have promised to treat each other in a loving and respectful way.”

Because of these convictions, we strongly support a robust reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and we thank you for your leadership in sponsoring S. 47. Further, we wish you to know that we have written to all of your Senate colleagues, asking them to support final passage of this bill, and urging them to oppose any amendments that you have not endorsed.

As you know, VAWA’s programs support state, tribal, and local efforts to address the pervasive and insidious crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. These programs make great progress towards reducing the violence, helping victims to be healthy and feel safe and holding perpetrators accountable. This critical legislation must be passed to ensure a continued response to these crimes.

Again, we thank you for your leadership on this important issue and look forward to the bill’s passage, so that we can build upon VAWA’s successes and continue to enhance our nation’s ability to promote an end to the violence, to hold perpetrators accountable, and to keep victims and their families safe from future harm. For our part, we commit to continue ministering with victims and survivors of violence and to work through our ministries and our advocacy, to end this desperate cycle of violence and brokenness.

We give thanks for your service to our nation and for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

The Reverend J. HERBERT NELSON II, Director for Public Witness.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN, February 6, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY, Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee, Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL CRAPO, Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO: The National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence—comprised of national, tribal, state, territorial and local organizations, as well as individuals, committed to securing an end to violence against women, including domestic violence, labor unions, advocates for children and youth, anti-poverty groups, immigrant and refugee rights organizations, women’s rights leaders, and education groups—wishes to express its strong and unequivocal support for the tribal provisions included in Title IX of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. As you are aware, these provisions are identical to those that were contained in S. 1925, the VAWA bill introduced in the 112th Congress. As such, the provisions were first voted affirmatively out of the Indian Affairs Committee, then added to S. 25 and passed out of the Judiciary Committee and finally went to conference in the final version of S. 1925 that passed the Senate last year with bipartisan support.
While we understand that some have expressed constitutional concerns with respect to the criminal jurisdiction provisions contained in section 904, Title IX of S. 47, we wish to respectfully point out that the provisions were drafted and put forward by the U.S. Department of Justice, and were thoroughly vetted before they were submitted to the American Indian and Alaska Native Tribal Justice Committees. We also wish to remind the members of the Senate of the terrifying rates of victimization that American Indian and Alaska Native women experience. Ninety-eight percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women will be raped in their lifetimes; 39% will be subjected to domestic violence in their lifetimes; 34% of Native victims of rape and sexual assault report that their assailants are non-Native individuals. On some reservations, Native women are murdered at more than ten times the national average. These startling statistics, coupled with the unfortunately high declination rates (U.S. Attorneys declined to prosecute nearly 52% of violent crimes that occur in Indian country; and 67% of cases declined were sexual abuse related cases), provide ample reason for Congress to act in passing section 904 intact.

Additionally, we offer for the consideration of the members of the Senate a letter submitted last year by over 50 U.S. law professors who carefully reviewed the provisions of section 904 and found them to be constitutional. We offer some relevant excerpts below:

It is important to note that Section 904 of S. 1925 does not constitute a full restoration of all tribal criminal jurisdiction—only that which qualifies as “special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction.” So there must be an established intimate-partner relationship to trigger the jurisdiction. Moreover, no defendant in tribal court will be denied Constitutional rights that would be afforded in state or federal courts. Section 904 provides ample safeguards to ensure that non-Indian defendants in domestic violence cases receive all rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

In other words, a defendant who has no ties to the tribal community would not be subject to criminal prosecution in tribal court. Federal courts have jurisdiction to review such tribal jurisdiction determinations after exhaustion of remedies. Section 904 is specifically tailored to address the victimization of Indian women by persons who have either married a citizen of the tribe or are dating a citizen of the tribe.

In closing, the National Task Force wishes to thank you for your tireless efforts to authorize the Violence Against Women Act, S. 47. We appreciate your leadership and look forward to working with you toward a speedy resolution.

The Leadership Conference believes that the reauthorization of VAWA is critical for protecting the civil and human rights of Americans to be free from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.


Vote Yes on VAWA (S. 47) and Oppose Any Amendments That Weaken Protections

Dear Members of the Senate—
The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 210 national organizations to protect and strengthen the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, we write to urge you to support S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (S. 47), and to vote against any amendments that would weaken this important legislation.

The Leadership Conference believes that the reauthorization of VAWA is critical for protecting the civil and human rights of Americans to be free from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. These protections are especially important for Native Americans and people of color, who experience the highest rates of domestic violence and sexual assault. Further, it is essential that these protections be extended to all instances of intimate partner violence, including for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people. In short, S. 47 would strengthen the U.S. government’s ability to prosecute perpetrators of violence and provide protections to all victims.

While domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking occur in all parts of the nation and affect people of all backgrounds, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, these forms of violence and harassment disproportionately affect the communities represented by The Leadership Conference. For example, 37 percent of Hispanic women are victims; 43 percent of African-American women and women of all races; and 34 percent of African-American men are victims; and a staggering 46 percent of American Indian or Alaska Native women are victims. These are murdered at more than ten times the national average. Twenty-two percent of American Indian or Alaska Native women experience intimate-partner victimization.

VAWA-graded programs have dramatically increased the protection against domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The annual incidence of domestic violence has decreased by more than 50 percent, since VAWA became law in 1994 and reporting by victims has also increased by 51 percent. Not only do these comprehensive programs save lives, they also save money. In its first six years, VAWA saved $12.6 billion in net averted social costs.

Yet, as law enforcement officers, service providers, and health care professionals have acknowledged, even with the successes of the current VAWA programs, there are significant gaps in current VAWA programs which, if addressed, could have a significant impact on diminishing the incidence of domestic violence in the United States. S. 47 helps address these concerns by strengthening services for minority communities and expanding protective orders to include lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. Further, S. 47 addresses the chronic violence against women in tribal communities by strengthening legal protections for Native victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. S. 47 also includes important improvements to VAWA protections for Native women.

The bill provides new tools and training to prevent domestic violence homicides. VAWA has provided for a coordinated approach, improving collaboration between law enforcement and victim service providers and supporting community-based responses and direct services for victims. As a result, victims’ needs have been better met, perpetrators have been held accountable, communities have become safer, and progress has been made toward ending the cycle and culture of violence within families. Without question, VAWA reauthorization is the key to ensuring that victims and survivors of violence have continued access to these critical services.

We look forward to working with you to swiftly adopt, without any weakening amendments, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (S. 47), and to vote against any amendments that would weaken this important legislation.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE TO END SEXUAL VIOLENCE, Washington, DC, January 28, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL CRAPO,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO: On behalf of 56 state and territorial sexual assault coalitions and 1800 rape crisis centers, I want to express our sincere gratitude for the introduction of S. 47. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) with the SAFER Act included represents the essential and comprehensive legislative package that is necessary to advance this nation’s response to the crime of rape and protect and support victims. S. 47 includes critical enhancements to address sexual assault including criminal justice improvements, housing protections, vital direct service and prevention programs, and SAFER’s policies to address the rape kit backlog.

We are urging all senators to stand with sexual assault survivors and support the swift passage of this far-reaching legislation.

Sincerely,

MONIKA JOHNSON HOSTLER,
Board President.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA,
January 31, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing on behalf of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors to urge you to take action on legislation to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

Thank you for introducing S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. Programs authorized by VAWA have saved lives as well as providing resources and training for communities like Santa Barbara County to address these reprehensible crimes, and the Board recognizes the importance of reauthorizing and enhancing the resources provided by this important public safety program.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act would expand the law’s focus on sexual assault and help ensure access to services for all victims of domestic and sexual violence. It also responds to these difficult economic times by consolidating programs, making them more efficient and effective, and adding accountability measures to ensure that Federal funds are used efficiently and effectively.

The Violence Against Women Act has been successful because it has consistently had strong bipartisan support for nearly two decades. Please work with the members of your committee to expedite action on S. 47 or similar legislation to reauthorize VAWA.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS P. WALTERS,
Washington Representative.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Madam Speaker, I’m pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a champion for all women and families.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Washington for the leadership that she has brought to this issue, and I also stand to thank Leader CANTOR and the leadership that he has placed on this.

It’s an incredible thing when you think about we still need the Violence Against Women Act. And I think for so many of us who have participated in giving birth to sexual assault centers and domestic abuse centers and child advocacy centers, we realize that for far too long domestic abuse was something that no one wanted to talk about; it should be swept under the rug; it should be hidden behind the four walls of a house. It was not something that was addressed as a crime, but we all knew it was a crime, and we knew it needed to be addressed. And we know that this act and the grants that have been provided to our State and local law enforcement agencies have allowed so many—so many—the people the safe harbor that was needed for their opportunity.

Now I stand here today to support our Republican alternative and the amendment that we have placed on this bill making certain that, in a fiscally responsible, targeted, and focused manner, the issue of violence will be swept under the carpet.

I urge my colleagues to pass the bipartisan bill.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2013.

Re NAACP Strong Support for S. 47, To Reauthorize the 1994 Violence Against Women Act

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Leahy,

On behalf of the NAACP, our nation’s oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I would like to sincerely thank you for your leadership in reintroducing S. 47, legislation strengthening and reauthorizing the 1994 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). As strong and consistent supporters of VAWA, the NAACP recognizes that this important legislation would improve criminal justice and community-based responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking in the United States.

As you know, the NAACP supported the passage of VAWA in 1994, and its reauthorization in 2000 and 2005. We have witnessed VAWA change the landscape for victims of violence in the United States who once suffered in silence. Victims of violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking have now been able to access services, and a new generation of families and justice system professionals has come to understand that domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking are crimes that our society will no longer tolerate.

Your bill will not only continue proven effective programs, but that it will make key changes to streamline VAWA and make sure that even more people have access to safety, stability and justice.

Thank you again for your continued leadership in this endeavor. Your thoughtfulness and tenacity in this area over the years has defended the lives of American women and children. You have a unique ability to work across the aisle to get results for women and children. You have my deepest gratitude.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP
Washington Bureau & Senior Vice President for Advocacy and Policy.


DEAR SENATOR: The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV), the...
oldest and largest national anti-domestic violence advocacy organization that serves more than 1.3 million domestic violence victims in more than 2,600 shelter programs nationwide, ensuring that support was available to the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 2013 introduced by Senators Patrick Leahy and Michael Crapo.

Since its initial passage in 1994, VAWA has dramatically enhanced our nation’s response to violence against women. More victims report domestic violence to the police and the state of New Mexican intimate partner violence against women has decreased by 53 percent. The sexual assault services program in VAWA’s Sexual Assault Services Program provides crucial services and support to victims of rape. VAWA provides for a coordinated community approach, improving collaborative efforts between law enforcement, victim service providers to better meet the needs of victims. These comprehensive and cost-effective programs not only save lives, they also save money. In fact, VAWA saved nearly $12 billion in net avered social costs in just its first six years.

But more work remains. The CDC’s 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that 1 in 4 women have been the victim of severe physical domestic violence and 1 in 5 women have been raped in their lifetime.

S. 47 renews successful programs that have helped law enforcement, prosecutors, and victim service providers keep victims safe and hold batterers accountable, and consolidates programs in order to reduce administrative costs and avoid duplication. The reauthorization is also mindful of our current fiscal situation, and more efficiently authorizes $7 billion per year from the 2005 reauthorization. New accountability measures have been included in the bill in order to ensure that VAWA funds are used efficiently and effectively.

S. 47 builds on existing efforts to more effectively combat violence against all victims and aims to ensure that VAWA programs reach more communities whose members need services. It expands the definition of “underserved” to include religion, sexual orientation, and gender identity to encourage development of services for people who have had trouble getting help in the past based on those categories. It also includes new provisions that focus on ensuring that grants can be used to make services available for all victims regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. The bill includes important provisions that will help Indian tribes better address the unique needs of domestic and sexual violence victims.

This bill addresses the ongoing crisis of violence against Native American victims, who face rates of domestic violence and sexual assault much higher than those faced by the general population, by strengthening existing programs and by narrowly expanding concurrent tribal criminal jurisdiction over those who assault Indian spouses and dating partners on tribal lands. This provision would ensure that no perpetrators of abuse are immune from accountability, but would do so in a way that protects rights and ensures fairness.

Intimate partner violence remains a critical problem in our nation. We cannot let victims of domestic and sexual violence continue to suffer. Congress must protect all victims of violence, hold all perpetrators accountable and provide justice for all.

We urge you to vote in favor of S. 47. Your support is essential to enhancing our nation’s ability to hold perpetrators accountable and keep victims safe from future harm. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RITA SMITH, Executive Director
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MISSOURI, Jefferson City, MO, February 6, 2013.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Since its initial passage in 1994, this nation’s leaders enacted the Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”). This landmark piece of legislation put in place a legal framework that better enabled states like Missouri to effectively investigate violent crimes against women, prosecute and punish offenders, and protect victims from further harm. In the wake of VAWA’s enactment, Congress has twice voted to reauthorize the law. With each reauthorization, Congress not only strengthened the provisions of the law, it also reaffirmed this country’s commitment to support survivors of personal violence and sexual assault. It is time to do so again.

Missouri women and their families rely on the programs and services that VAWA makes possible. For example, non-profit, community, and faith-based organizations use federal funds directed through VAWA’s Sexual Assault Services Program to provide vital support to victims of sexual assault. And Missouri prosecutors, police officers, and victim service providers training funded through the STOP (Services Training Officers Prosecutors) program, equipping them to better address violent crime against women.

But the work is just beginning. In 2011, over 40,000 incidents of domestic violence were reported in Missouri. Thirty women were murdered by their husbands or boyfriends. Missouri women reported more than 1,400 forcible rapes or attempted forcible rapes. And although over 10,000 women in need were able to find a place at a shelter, nearly 20,000 more were turned away.

By reauthorizing VAWA, this Congress will continue the effort undertaken nearly twenty years ago—the effort to eliminate violent crime perpetrated against our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, our neighbors, and our friends. I urge each of you to support this important legislation.

Respectfully,

CHRIS KOSTER, Attorney General, State of Missouri.

GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN’S ASSOCIATION, Rapid City, SD, February 4, 2013.

Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization

HON. PATRICK LEAHY, U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Leahy:

I write on behalf of the Great Plains Tribal Chairmen’s Association to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control to combat acts of domestic violence against Native women and children on Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handicaps the local tribal justice system. Non-Native men who abuse Native women hide behind these federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to vulnerable women and their families.

Nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetime. In the next 5 years, 1 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current system of justice, “inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women.” Tribal leaders, police officers, and prosecutors have testified to the fact that many perpetrators of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate leading to death or physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found, that, on some reservations, Native women were murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 will crack down on reservation based domestic violence by all offenders at the early stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 904, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They extend only to misdemeanor level crimes of domestic and dating violence. They are limited to enforcement of reservation-based crimes involving individuals who work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal member from that tribe. S. 47 also provides the whole range of constitutional protections to abuse suspects who would be subject to the authority of tribal courts.

On June 24, 2010, the United States Senate, by unanimous consent, passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA). On July 27, 2010, the House of Representatives passed the Tribal Law and Order Act. The tribal provisions in S. 47 are subject to a more narrow set of crimes, are limited to misdemeanor level punishments, and would provide the same broader range of protections to suspects of abuse than those required under TLOA. With such broad support for TLOA, it is troubling that some Members of Congress now claim that the same principles embodied in S. 47 raises constitutional concerns. Such concerns are unfounded.

In 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed a similar restoration of tribal government authority through an amendment to the Indian Civil Rights Act. Congress has this authority, and Native women throughout the United States desperately need us to act so that they can be afforded similar access to justice that many others take for granted.

The U.S. Supreme Court is decid ing to divest Indian tribes of authority over local reservation-based crimes, made the following statement:

"While recognizing that some Indian tribal court systems have become increasingly sophisticated and resemble in many respects their state counterparts.....We are not unaware of the prevalence of non-Indian crime on today’s reservations which the tribes forcefully argue requires the ability to try non-Indians. But these are considerations for Congress to weigh." Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 438 U.S. 191, 211 (1978) (emphasis added).

With this statement and resulting gaps in criminal jurisdiction on Indian lands have haunted Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. S. 47 takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority, and will go far in ensuring domestic safety for Native women nationwide. We serve you to support and vote for S. 47 when the measure moves to the Senate floor. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

TKE “RED TIPPED ARROW” HALL, Chairman, Mandan, Hidatsa, Arikara Nation, Three Affiliated Tribes,
Chairman, Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR, PUEBLO OF TESUQUE, Santa Fe, NM, February 5, 2012.
Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: I write on behalf of the Pueblo of Tesuque to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control over combat acts of domestic violence against Native women and children on Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handicaps the local tribal justice system. Non-Native men who abuse Native women hide behind these federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

Nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetimes, and more than 3 in 5 will suffer domestic violence. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current system of justice, “inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women” has led to no charges filed, and that on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average.

S. 47 will crack down on reservation-based domestic violence by all offenders at the early stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 904, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They extend only to misdemeanor level offenses and dating violence.

They are limited to enforcement of reservation-based crimes involving individuals that work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation. S. 47 also provides the full range of constitutional protections to abuse suspects who would be subject to the authority of tribal courts.

In June of 2010, the United States Senate, by unanimous consent, passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA). On July 27, 2010, the House of Representatives passed the measure under suspension of the rules. The tribal provisions in S. 47 are subject to a more narrow set of crimes, are limited to misdemeanor level offenses, and dating violence. The tribe would provide a broader range of protections to suspects of abuse than those required under TLOA. With such broad support for TLOA, it is troubling that Members of Congress now claim that the narrowly tailored proposal in S. 47 raises constitutional concerns. Such concerns are unfounded.

In 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a similar restoration of tribal government authority through an amendment to the Indian Civil Rights Act, and other Native American tribes have maintained strong, and Native women throughout the United States desperately need us to act so that they can be afforded similar access to justice that many others take for granted.

In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court, in deciding to divest Indian tribes of authority over local reservation-based crimes, made the following statement:

“We recognize that some Indian tribal court systems have become increasingly sophisticated and resubstantial in many respects than their state counterparts.... We are not unaware of the prevalence of non-Indian crime on today’s reservations where the tribes have the ability to try non-Indians. But these are considerations for Congress to weigh.” Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 435 U.S. 191, 211 (1978) (emphasis added).

This statement and resulting gaps in criminal jurisdiction on Indian lands have haunted Native women and tribal communities for years. Time has come for Congress to act. S. 47 takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority, and will go far in helping to prevent future acts of violence against Native women nationwide. Thank you for again including these vital provisions in your VAWA Reauthorization.

Sincerely,

MARK MITCHELL, Governor,
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, Chicago, IL, February 5, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND CRAPO: On behalf of the physician and medical student members of the American Medical Association (AMA), I am writing to express our support for S. 47, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013.” This bill, which reauthorizes the landmark Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), would strengthen and improve existing programs that assist victims and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

While violence against adult women has decreased 60 percent since VAWA was first passed in 1994, it remains a critical problem in our country and much more work remains to be done. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey released in December 2011, one in five women in the United States experienced dating violence in their lifetime and one in four women has been the victim of severe physical violence by a partner. Domestic and sexual violence are a health care problem affecting the most significant social determinants of health for women and girls.

We are pleased that S. 47 would address some of the critical gaps in delivery of health care to victims by strengthening the health care system’s identification and assessment of, and response to, victims. We also appreciate and support language in Title V of the bill on the development and testing of quality improvement measures for identifying, intervening, and documenting victims of domestic violence that recognizes and aligns with the important work underway by the AMA, the National Quality Forum, and other stakeholders in the quality improvement arena.

We commend you for your long-standing support for victims of violence and abuse and for your leadership in introducing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 2000. We urge swift passage of your bill in the Senate and look forward to working with you to ensure enactment of this important legislation this year.

Sincerely,
JAMES L. MADARA, MD.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of our time, 4½ minutes, to the distinguished gentlelady from Wisconsin (Mrs. Moore).

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

I’ve listened very carefully and very patiently to all of my colleagues in the House, and it seems that everyone in the Chamber is against violence against women. It’s just which women we want to protect that remains the question.

For the last 18 months, it appears that I have lived in some sort of twilight zone, like that program on TV, “Sliders,” where there are alternate realities. This debate recalls that alternate reality when we hear support of the House amendment over the Senate amendment and we hear that all women are protected.

For example, the Senate bill supports LGBT victims but the House bill strikes LGBT women as underserved communities. It also strikes the language that would have them as a protected group to not be discriminated against.

The distinguished floor leader has asked us to find areas in the legislation that are wanting, and I would submit that is one.

The distinguished floor leader has asked us to find ways that the substitute is wanting and the Senate bill is superior.

We give lip service to wanting to support tribal women. But when you stop and think about it, in 1978, the Supreme Court in the Oliphant case decided that Federal laws and policies divided tribes of criminal authority over non-Indians, and the substitute seeks to affirm that, even though that was clarified and codified in the U.S. Supreme Court in U.S. v. Lara, which said that, in fact, if this body voted, we could, in fact, confer upon Native Americans the authority to give—we have plenary power to enact legislation to relax restrictions on tribal sovereign authority, that we have the power to allow them to enforce domestic violence laws and rape laws on their land.

We do need it. Madam Speaker, because if you are a member of a tribe—say, for example, the Bad River Chippewa band of Chippewa in my State—and you are raped on native land, tribes don’t have any authority over that perpetrator if he is a non-Indian, even if he’s your husband. The local police in that area don’t have any authority. The county sheriff doesn’t have any authority. The State trooper can’t come in and arrest him. The only person that has any authority over that non-Indian is some Federal agent in Madison, Wisconsin, which is why there has been a 67 percent declination of prosecutions of sexual assault.
Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization

Hon. Patrick Leahy,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC

Dear Chairman Leahy: I write on behalf of the Susunvile Indian Rancheria to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control to combat acts of domestic violence against Indian women and children. Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handicaps the local tribal justice system. Non-Native men who abuse Native women hide behind these federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

Nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetimes, and more than 3 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current justice system, “inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women.” Tribal leaders, police officers, and prosecutors have testified to the fact that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found that, on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 will crack down on reservation based domestic violence by all offenders at the earliest stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 904, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They extend only to misdemeanor level crimes of domestic and dating violence. They give a limited enforcement power over reservation-based crimes involving individuals that work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation. S. 47 also allows police officers who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation to file a complaint with the Tribal Court.

In our role as state court judges working alongside tribal lands, we are in a unique position to see the shortcomings of the current system of justice afforded to the tribes through the federal district courts. Currently, only the U.S. Attorneys can prosecute these cases—but they seldom do, because there are not enough U.S. Attorneys to handle these cases and the nearest office of the U.S. Attorney is several hundred miles away. The remote locations of many tribal communities create serious obstacles to access for victims of these crimes, their family members, and the local community.

We believe that the provisions contained in S. 47 create an excellent path for supporting a system of tribal courts that can quickly, appropriately, and fairly respond to the epidemic of domestic violence on tribal lands. We have no way to get to federal court and the federal court has no capacity to reach or to provide access for these communities. Yet we know that dangerous domestic violence cases can be, and cannot stand by and let these crimes go unaddressed. Too many lives are at risk; too many families and children are left to suffer because the only system of justice afforded to them is utterly out of reach.

Accordingly, as the Senate considers S. 47, we strongly urge you to oppose the adoption of mandatory minimums. We urge you for your leadership on this important issue and for considering our views. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

MR. STACY DIXON, Tribal Chairman.

February 4, 2013.

Hon. Patrick Leahy,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC,

Hi. Mike Crago,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

Dear Senator Leahy and Senator Crapo:

We, the undersigned enforcement and criminal justice reform organizations, are writing to express our opposition to the inclusion of any mandatory minimum sentencing provisions in S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (VAWA).

We acknowledge that reducing the level of sexual, domestic, and dating violence and stalking directed against victims of violence is a worthwhile objective and an issue of national importance. We appreciate that many of the proposals contained in S. 47 enjoy broad bipartisan support, as well as the support of the American public. In its current form, S. 47 does not include any mandatory minimum sentences. We think it should remain that way through passage.

We do not believe that including mandatory minimum sentencing provisions for domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking offenses in S. 47 would be necessary, appropriate, or cost-effective. In fact, such provisions could be counterproductive in combating violence. According to the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, the threat of a disproportionate, unfair, and ineffectual punishment for an intimate partner abuser could deter a victim from reporting a crime. Because the victim and offender are often related or in an intimate relationship, many of the crimes included in VAWA will involve complex facts and unique circumstances. Such complicated crimes demand that courts have flexibility in tailoring punishments to reflect the crime and the offender, protects victims, and best meets the needs of the family or couple impacted.

Finally, more mandatory minimum sentences would only increase the burdens on and high costs of our already overcrowded federal prison system. A recent Congressional Research Service report shows that mandatory minimums are the primary driver of high prison populations and increasing prison costs. Mandatory minimum sentences are unfair, ineffective, and result in extraordinary costs to American taxpayers.

Accordingly, as the Senate considers S. 47, we strongly urge you to oppose the adoption of mandatory minimums. We urge you for your leadership on this important issue and for considering our views. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE: On behalf of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) and its 2,000 members who represent the nation’s 30,000 state family and juvenile court judges, I am writing in support of Title IX of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). In particular, I am writing to apprise you of the NCJFCJ’s strong support for the recognition of tribes’ need for and sovereignty over neighborhood and tribal courts to address the epidemic of domestic violence on tribal lands.

On January 21, 2011, the NCJFCJ adopted an organizational policy that states that we recognize tribal courts as equal and parallel systems of justice to the state court systems. We did so because our state court judge members have a strong history of working with tribal courts and are aware of their capacity to adjudicate local cases of domestic violence. Our organization has long supported the efforts of tribal courts to address these crimes, whether these crimes are committed by Indian or non-Indian persons, in order to protect the safety of the victims of these crimes, their family members, and the local community.

In our role as state court judges working alongside tribal lands, we are in a unique position to see the shortcomings of the current system of justice afforded to the tribes through the federal district courts. Currently, only the U.S. Attorneys can prosecute these cases—but they seldom do, because there are not enough U.S. Attorneys to handle these cases and the nearest office of the U.S. Attorney is several hundred miles away. The remote locations of many tribal communities create serious obstacles to access for victims of these crimes, their family members, and the local community.

We believe that the provisions contained in S. 47 create an excellent path for supporting a system of tribal courts that can quickly, appropriately, and fairly respond to the epidemic of domestic violence on tribal lands. We have no way to get to federal court and the federal court has no capacity to reach or to provide access for these communities. Yet we know that dangerous domestic violence cases can be, and cannot stand by and let these crimes go unaddressed. Too many lives are at risk; too many families and children are left to suffer because the only system of justice afforded to them is utterly out of reach.

Accordingly, as the Senate considers S. 47, we strongly urge you to oppose the adoption of mandatory minimums. We urge you for your leadership on this important issue and for considering our views. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

Patrick Leahy,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.
for S. 47 so that its tribal provisions can become law.

If you have any questions, we stand ready to answer with whatever information you may need.

Sincerely,
Hon. MICHAEL NASH,
President, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

SAMISH INDIAN NATION,

Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Leahy: I write on behalf of the Samish Indian Nation to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control to combat acts of domestic violence against Native women and children on Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handicaps the local tribal justice systems, rendering them incapable of addressing crimes against Native women and their families.

Nationwide, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetimes, and more than 3 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current system of justice, “inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women.”

Tribal leaders, police officers, and prosecutors have testified to the fact that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouched, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found that, on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 will crack down on reservation-based domestic violence and help all offenders at the early stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 901, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They only apply to misdemeanor-level crimes of domestic and dating violence.

They are limited to enforcement of reservation-based crimes involving individuals who work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation. S. 47 also provides the full range of constitutional protections for abuse suspects who would be subject to the authority of tribal courts.

In June of 2010, the United States Senate, by unanimous consent, passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA). On July 27, 2010, the House of Representatives passed the measure under suspension of the rules. The tribal provisions in S. 47 are subject to a more narrow set of crimes, are limited to misdemeanor level punishments, and would provide a broader range of protection for suspects of abuse than those required under TLOA.

With such broad support for TLOA—it is troubling that some Members of Congress would not vote for the narrowly tailored proposal in S. 47 raises constitutional concerns. Such concerns are unfounded.

In 2009, the Supreme Court of the United States determined a similar restoration of tribal governmental authority through an amendment to the Indian Civil Rights Act. Congress has this authority, and Native women throughout the United States desperately need us to act so that they can be afforded similar access to justice that many others take for granted.

In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court, in deciding to divert Indian tribes of authority over local reservation-based crimes, made the following statement:

“We recognize that some Indian tribal court systems have become increasingly sophisticated and resemble in many respects their state counterparts * * *. We are not unaware of the prevalence of non-Indian crime on today's reservations which for the tribes forcefully argue requires the ability to try non-Indians. But these are considerations for Congress to weigh.” Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 435 U.S. 101, 211 (1978) (emphasis added).

This statement and resulting gaps in criminal jurisdiction on Indian lands have haunted Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. S. 47 takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority, and will go far in helping to prevent future acts of violence against Native women nationwide. Thank you for again including these vital provisions in your VAWA Reauthorization.

Sincerely,
TOM WOOTEN,
ÉQUITAS,

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB GOODLATE,
Chairman, House Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROY CONVERSE,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Leahy, Chairman Goodlatte, Ranking Member Conyers: On behalf of ÉQUITAS: The Prosecutors' Resource on Violence Against Women’s (VAWA) reauthorization. ÉQUITAS’ mission is to improve the quality of justice in sexual violence, intimate partner violence, stalking, and human trafficking cases by developing, evaluating and refining prosecution practices that increase victim safety and offender accountability.

VAWA has unquestionably improved the nation’s justice systems’ ability to address escalating crimes of sexual violence, intimate partner violence, and stalking. This critical legislation must be reauthorized to ensure a continued commitment to addressing these crimes.

Since its original passage in 1994, VAWA has improved the criminal justice system's ability to keep victims safe, hold perpetrators accountable and help their children safe and hold perpetrators accountable. Thank you for your leadership and steadfast commitment to supporting victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. We look forward to hearing VAWA’s swift reauthorization If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at 202.965.1462 or StevenJansen@APAlnc.org.

Sincerely,
STEVEN JANSEN,
Vice President/COO.

Mrs. McOMMORIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield the balance of my time to the attorney, the wife, the mom, the gentle lady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. In closing, I just want to make sure that we’re clear: Republicans are committed to standing for all victims.

This bill, or amendment, strengthens penalties for sexual assault, improves the Federal stalking statute, provides for enhanced investigation and prosecution of sexual assault, and provides services for victims. Most importantly, our amendment is constitutional, and it will stand up to constitutional muster from the court.
The Senate passed a weakened bill that has a real chance of being overturned by the courts. I urge support for the House amendment.

The SPEAKER pro teminate. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

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

Sec. 101. STOP grants.
Sec. 102. Grants to encourage arrest policies and enforcement of protection orders.
Sec. 103. Legal assistance for victims.
Sec. 104. Consolidation of grants to support families in the justice system.
Sec. 105. Court-appointed special advocate program.
Sec. 106. Outreach and services to underserved populations.
Sec. 107. Culturally specific services grant.
Sec. 108. Reduction in rape kit backlog.
Sec. 109. Assistance to victims of sexual assault training programs.
Sec. 110. Child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

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

Sec. 201. Sexual assault service program.
Sec. 203. Training and services to end violence against women with disabilities grants.
Sec. 204. Grant for training and services to end violence against women in later life.

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

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

TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

Sec. 701. National Resource Center on Workplace Responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence.

TITLE VIII—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

Sec. 801. Clarification of the requirements applicable to U visas.
Sec. 802. Protections for a fiancé or fiancée.
Sec. 803. Regulation of international marriage brokers.
Sec. 804. GAO report.
Sec. 805. Annual report on immigration applications made by victims of abuse.
Sec. 806. Protection for children of VAWA self-petitioners.
Sec. 807. Public charge.
Sec. 808. Age-Out Protection for U Visa Applicants.
Sec. 809. Hardship waivers.
Sec. 811. Consideration of other evidence.

TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

Sec. 901. Grants to Indian tribal governments.
Sec. 902. Grants to Indian tribal coalitions.
Sec. 903. Tribal jurisdiction over crimes of domestic violence.
Sec. 904. Consultation.
Sec. 905. Analysis and research on violence against Indian women.
Sec. 906. Assistant United States Attorney Domestic Violence Tribal Liaisons.
Sec. 907. Special counsel.
Sec. 908. GAO Study.

TITLE X—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 1001. Sexual abuse in custodial settings.
Sec. 1002. Criminal provision relating to cyberstalking.

TITLE XI—SECONDARY POPULATIONS

Sec. 1101. In paragraph (2), by striking “(a) the term ‘underrepresented’ means any nonconsensual sexual act prohibited by Federal, tribal, or State law including when the victim lacks capacity to consent’;” and

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting “or ‘intimate partner’” after “former spouse” and after “as a spouse”;

(4) by amending paragraph (16) to read as follows:

“(16) LEGAL ASSISTANCE.—The term ‘legal assistance’—

(A) includes assistance to adult and youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in—

(i) family, tribal, territorial, immigration, employment, administrative, and other similar matters; and

(ii) criminal justice investigations, prosecutions and post-trial matters (including sentencing, parole, and probation) that impact the victim’s safety and privacy; and

(B) may include services and assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are also victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons as defined by section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102); except that intake or referral, without other action, does not constitute legal assistance.”;

(5) by amending paragraph (18) to read as follows:

“(18) PERSONAL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION OR PERSONAL INFORMATION.—The term ‘personally identifying information’ or ‘personal information’ means individually identifying information for or about an individual, including information likely to disclose the location of a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, regardless of whether the information is encoded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected, including—

(A) a first and last name;

(B) a home or other physical address;

(C) contact information (including a postal, e-mail or Internet protocol address, or telephone or facsimile number);

(D) a social security number, driver license number, passport number, or student identification number; and

(E) any other information, including date of birth, racial or ethnic background, or religious affiliation, that would serve to identify any individual.”;

(6) in paragraph (19), by striking “services” and inserting “assistance”; and

(7) in paragraph (21)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) any federally recognized Indian tribe;”;

(8) in paragraph (22)—

(A) by striking “52” and inserting “57”;

(B) by striking “150,000” and inserting “250,000”;

(9) by amending paragraph (23) to read as follows:

“(23) SEXUAL ASSAULT.—The term ‘sexual assault’ means any nonconsensual sexual act prohibited by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.”;

(10) by amending paragraph (33) to read as follows:

“(33) UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.—The term ‘underserved populations’ means populations who face barriers to accessing and using victim services, and includes populations underserved because of geographic location or religion, underserved racial and ethnic populations, populations underserved because of special needs (such as language barriers, disabilities, alienage status, or age), and any other population determined to
be underserved by the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as appropriate."; 

(11) by amending paragraph (37) to read as follows: 

(37) YOUTH.—The term ‘youth’ means a person who is 11 to 24 years of age.'';

(12) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(38) ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGE.—The term ‘Alaska Native village’ has the same meaning given such term in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (42 U.S.C. 1891 et seq.)."

(39) CHILD.—The term ‘child’ means a person who is under 11 years of age.

(40) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC.—The term ‘culturally specific’ (except when used as part of the term ‘culturally specific services’) means primarily composed of racial and ethnic minority groups (as defined in section 170(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300G-6(c))).

(41) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term ‘culturally specific services’ means community-based services and resources that are culturally relevant and linguistically specific to culturally specific communities.

(42) HOMELESS, HOMELESS INDIVIDUAL, HOMELESS PERSON.—The terms ‘homeless’, ‘homeless individual’, and ‘homeless person’—

(‘A) mean an individual who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; and

(‘B) includes—

‘(1) an individual who—

‘(i) is sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason;

‘(ii) is living in a motel, hotel, trailer park, camping ground due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations;

‘(iii) is living in an emergency or transitional shelter;

‘(iv) is abandoned in a hospital; or

‘(v) is awaiting foster care placement;

‘(ii) an individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings; or

‘(iii) migratory children (as defined in section 102 of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (60 Stat. 214)); who qualify as homeless under this section because they are living in circumstances described in this paragraph.

(43) POPULATION SPECIFIC ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘population specific organization’ means a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that primarily serves members of a specific underserved population and has demonstrated experience and expertise providing targeted services to members of that specific underserved population.

(44) POPULATION SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term ‘population specific services’ means victim services that—

‘(A) address the safety, health, economic, legal, housing, workplace, immigration, confidentiality, or other needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

‘(B) are designed primarily for, and are targeted to, a specific underserved population.

(45) RAPE CRISIS CENTER.—The term ‘rape crisis center’ means—

‘(A) a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization that provides intervention and related assistance, as specified in section 4101(b)(2)(C), to victims of sexual assault without regard to the age of the victims; or

‘(B) a rape crisis center that—

‘(i) is located in a State other than a Territory.

‘(ii) provides intervention and related assistance, as specified in section 4101(b)(2)(C), to victims of sexual assault without regard to the age of the victims;

(iii) is provided by an enforcement agency or other entity that is part of the criminal justice system; and

(iv) offers a level of confidentiality to victims that is comparable to a component entity that provides similar victim services.

(46) SEX TRAFFICKING.—The term ‘sex trafficking’ means any conduct proscribed by sections 1591 of title 18, United States Code, whether or not the conduct occurs in interstate or foreign commerce or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

(47) TRIBAL COALITION.—The term ‘tribal coalition’ means an established nonprofit, nongovernmental organization, Alaska Native organization, or a Native Hawaiian organization that—

‘(A) provides education, support, and technical assistance to member Indian service providers in a manner that enables those member providers to establish and maintain culturally appropriate services, including shelter and rape crisis services, designed to assist Indian women and the dependents of those women who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

‘(B) is comprised of board and general members that are representative of—

‘(i) the member service providers described in paragraph (A); and

‘(ii) the tribal communities in which the services are being provided.

(48) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘unit of local government’ means any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.

(49) VICTIM SERVICES.—The term ‘victim services’—

‘(A) means services provided to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including telephonic or web-based hotlines, legal advocacy, economic advocacy, emergency and transitional shelter, accompaniment and advocacy through medical, civil or criminal justice, immigration, and social support systems, crisis intervention, short-term individual and group counseling, information and referrals, culturally specific services, population specific services, and other related supportive services; and

‘(B) may include services and assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are also victims of human trafficking in persons as defined by section 1(5) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(50) VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ‘victim service provider’ means a nonprofit, nongovernmental or tribal organization or rape crisis center, including a State sexual assault coalition or tribal coalition, that—

‘(A) assists domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victims, in- cluding domestic violence shelters, faith- based organizations, and other organizations; and

‘(B) has a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

‘(C) by redesigning subparagraph (F) as follows:

‘(D) INFORMATION SHARING.—Grantees and subgrantees may share—

‘(i) nonpersonally identifying information in the aggregate regarding services to their clients and nonpersonally identifying demographic information in order to comply with Federal, State, tribal, or territorial reporting, evaluation, or data collection requirements;

‘(ii) court-generated information and law enforcement-generated information contained in secure, governmental registries for protection order enforcement purposes; and

‘(iii) law enforcement-generated and prosecution-generated information necessary for law enforcement, intelligence, national security, or prosecution purposes.

(51) LIMITATIONS.—Grantees and subgrantees may not—

‘(1) require an adult, youth, or child vic- tim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to provide a con- sent for release of his or her personally identifying information as a condition of eligi- bility for the services provided by the grantee or subgrantee;

‘(2) require any personally identifying information in order to comply with Federal reporting, evaluation, or data collection requirements, whether for this program or any other Federal grants or assistance; and

‘(3) by amending paragraph (12) to read as follows:

‘(A) information collected in connection with services requested, utilized, or denied through grantees’ and subgrantees’ programs, regardless of whether the information has been en- coded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected; and

‘(B) disclosure, reveal, or release any personal- ly identifying information or demographic in- formation collected in connection with services requested, utilized, or denied through grantees’ and subgrantees’ programs, regardless of whether the information has been en- coded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected; and

‘(C) by redesigning paragraph (13) to read as follows:

‘(A) an amendment to paragraph (13) of this subsection in alphabetical order based on the headings of such paragraphs, and renumbering such paragraphs as so reordered.

‘(B) GRANTS CONDITIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13922(b)) is amended—

‘(1) in paragraph (2)—

‘(A) in subparagraph (B), by amending clauses (i) and (ii) to read as follows—

‘(i) disclose, reveal, or release any person- ally identifying information or demographic in- formation collected in connection with services requested, utilized, or denied through grantees’ and subgrantees’ programs, regardless of whether the information has been en- coded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected; and

‘(ii) disclose, reveal, or release individual client information pursuant to the informed, written, reasonably time-limited consent of the person (or in the case of a non emancipated minor, the minor and the parent or guardian in the case of a legal in- capable, a court-appointed guardian, about whom information is sought, whether for this program or any other Federal, State, tribal, or territorial grant program, except that—

‘(I) consent for release may not be given by the abuser of the minor, incapacitated person, or the abuser of the other parent of the minor; and

‘(II) if a minor or a person with a legally appointed guardian is permitted by law to receive services without the parent’s or guardian’s consent, any person with a guardian may release information without additional consent;''

‘(D) by amending subparagraph (D), to read as follows:

‘(4) SURPLUSES.—Grantees and subgrantees shall—

‘(A) assist domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victims, in- cluding domestic violence shelters, faith- based organizations, and other organizations; and

‘(B) have a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

‘(2) by striking paragraph 3 of this subsection and-
subgrantees may collaborate with and provide information to Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial public officials and agencies to develop and implement policies, and disseminate Federal, State, local, tribal, or territorial legislation or model codes, designed to reduce or eliminate domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.');

(ii) by inserting at the end the following:

"Final reports of such evaluations shall be made publically available on the website of the disbursing agency."; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

"(12) DELIVERY OF LEGAL ASSISTANCE.—An agency providing legal assistance with funds awarded under this title shall comply with the eligibility requirements in section 1203(d) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-6(d))."

"(13) CIVIL RIGHTS.—

(A) NONDISCRIMINATION.—No person in any State shall be treated differently on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability be denied the assistance of, or excluded from receiving services from, a grantee or subgrantee providing legal assistance under this paragraph if a grantees or subgrantees is determined to have engaged in, or in whole or in part with funds made available under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103-322; 108 Stat. 1962-1963; 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.; division B of Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women Act 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, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, that the grantee or subgrantee has engaged in, or in whole or in part with funds made available under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103-322; 108 Stat. 1902), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women."

(B) RULE MAKING.—The Attorney General may make rules to ensure that grantees or subgrantees providing services with funds awarded under this title do not impermissibly discriminate in the provision of such services.

"(C) REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent consideration of gender or race for purposes of a program or activity described in subparagraph (A) if the grantee involved determines that gender segregation or gender-specific programs or activities is necessary to the essential operation of such program or activity. In such a case, alternative reasonable accommodations are sufficient to meet the requirements of this paragraph.

"(D) APPLICATION.—The provisions of paragraphs (2) through (4) of section 808(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3780c(d)) shall apply to violations of subparagraph (A)."

"(E) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed, interpreted, or applied to supplant, displace, preempt, or otherwise diminish the responsibilities and liabilities of grantees under other Federal or State civil rights law, whether statutory or common."

"(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 41403(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (10 U.S.C. 10302) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) the terms ‘homeless’, ‘homeless individual’, and ‘homeless person’ have the meanings given such terms in section 4002(2)(A)."

SEC. 4. ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISIONS.

(a) Requirement for DOJ Grant Applicants to Include Certain Information About the Use of Funds in DOJ Grant Applications.—Each applicant for a grant from the Department of Justice shall submit, as part of the application for the grant, the following information:

(1) A list of each Federal grant the applicant applied for during the one-year period preceding the date of submission of the application.

(2) A list of each Federal grant the applicant received during the five-year period preceding the date of submission of the application.

(b) Enhancing Grant Efficiency and Coordination.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall, to the greatest extent practicable, take actions to further the coordination of grants within the Department of Justice to increase the efficiency of such administration.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and a report containing a list of any proposal for the coordination of grants described in paragraph (1) and the progress of such actions in achieving coordination described in such paragraph.

(c) Requiring Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management Functions to Apply to VWAA Grants.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 109(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

"(3) Any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103-322; 108 Stat. 1902), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to grants awarded under this title on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) VWAA Grant Accountability.—Section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 19952) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded under this title shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

"(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2014, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall conduct audits of grantees under this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by such grantees.

"(2) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A grantee described in paragraph (1) that is found by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, to have an unresolved audit finding (as defined in paragraph (4)) shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in such paragraph.

"(3) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this title during any period in which the entity is prohibited from receiving funds under paragraph (2), the entity shall reimburse the Federal Government for a grant program under this title shall—

"(A) deposit into the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the grant funds the entity were improperly awarded to the grantee; and

"(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment from the Fund to the entity that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

"(4) UNRESOLVED AUDIT FINDING DEFINED.—

In this subsection, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding described in paragraph (1), an audit report finding, statement, or recommendation by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date of an initial notification of the finding, statement, or recommendation.

(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

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

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program under this title to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 5.0 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Office on Violence Against Women.

(7) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice or Department of Health and Human Services under this title may be used by the Attorney General, the Administrator of Health and Human Services, or by any individual or organization organization awarded grants under this title, to pay for support of attendees which the expenditures exceed $20,000, unless in the case of the Department of Justice, the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, and in the case of the Department of Health and Human Services the Deputy Secretary, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be used to host or support any expenditure for such a conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written authorization under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment costs.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General and Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved and denied during the fiscal year for which the report is submitted.

(3) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may not be...
...utilized by any grantee or subgrantee to lobby any representative of the Federal Government (including the Department of Justice or a State, local, or tribal government regarding grant funding).

(2) Penalty.—If the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable, determines that any grantee or subgrantee funds under this title has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall—

(i) prohibit the grantee or subgrantee to repay such funds in full; and

(ii) in the case of a grantee or subgrantee from receiving any funds under this title for not less than 1 year.

(9) Annual certification.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date on which subgrantees under any grant appropriated under this title have been completed and reviewed by the Assistant Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the Assistant Inspector General under paragraph (1) have

(2) in section 2001(b) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(b))—

(iii) by striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);''

(18) identifying and conducting inventories of backlogs of sexual assault evidence collection kits and developing protocols and policies for responding to and addressing such backlogs, including protocols and policies for notifying and involving victims; and

(19) with not more than 5 percent of the total amount allocated to a State for this purpose not used for developing, enhancing, or strengthening programs addressing sexual assault against men, women, and youth in correctional and detention settings; and

(20) developing and promoting State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women).

(b) STOP GRANTS.—Part P of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2001(a) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(a)), by striking “violent crimes against women” each place it appears and inserting “violent crimes that predominantly affect women in

(2) in section 2001(b) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(b))—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “equipment” and inserting “resources’’; and

(B) by inserting “for the protection and safety of victims, before “and specifically’’;

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);’’;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);;

(iv) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting “classifying,” after “identification’’;

(B) by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);’’;

(C) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (6) through (13), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);”;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting “and legal assistance” after “victim services’’;

(ii) by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);”;

(iii) by striking “including crimes” and all that follows and inserting “including crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);’’;

(G) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (6) through (13), respectively;

(H) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);”;

(I) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking “determining priority in responding to domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);’’;

(J) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking “domestic violence or sexual assault and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (crimes that predominantly affect women);’’.

(3) in section 2007 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–1)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “nonprofit nongovernmental victim services programs’’;

(B) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “(not including populations of Indian tribes);’’.

(c) in subsection (c)—

(1) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

(2) (A) the State sexual assault coalition;

(B) the State domestic violence coalition;
“(C) representatives of the law enforcement entities within the State; 
“(D) representatives of prosecution offices; 
“(E) representatives of State and local courts; 
“(F) tribal governments or tribal coalitions in those States with State or federally recognized Indian tribes; 
“(G) representatives of underserved populations, including culturally specific communities; 
“(H) representatives of victim service providers; 
“(I) representatives of population-specific organizations; and 
“(J) representatives of other entities that the State or the Attorney General identifies as necessary for the planning process;”;

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5) respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) grantees shall coordinate the State implementation plan described in paragraph (2) with the State plans described in section 207 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10407) and the plans described in the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601 et seq.) and section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289b-1); and”, and

(iv) paragraph (4), as so redesignated by clause (i)—

“(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and not less than 25 percent shall be allocated for prosecution services”;

“(B) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(i) the certifications of qualification required under subsection (c);

“(ii) proof of compliance with the requirements of the payment of forensic medical exams and judicial notification, described in section 2010; 

“(iii) proof of compliance with the requirements for fees and costs relating to domestic violence and protection order cases described in section 2011;”

“(4) in section 2011 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–3 et seq.)—

“(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

“(i) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and” after the period; 

“(ii) in paragraph (5), by inserting “and” after the period;”;

“(B) in subsection (b)—

“(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “and”; and

“(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” after the period;”;

“(C) in subsection (c),—

“(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or” after the period; 

“(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” and inserting “and”; and

“(iii) by striking paragraph (3); and

“(D) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—An application for a grant under this part shall include—

“(1) the certifications of qualification required under subsection (c);

“(2) proof of compliance with the requirements of the payment of forensic medical exams and judicial notification, described in section 2010; 

“(3) proof of compliance with the requirements for fees and costs relating to domestic violence and protection order cases described in section 2011;”

“(4) proof of compliance with the requirements of submitting polygraph examinations of victims of sexual assault described in section 2013; 

“(5) an implementation plan required under subsection (i); and

“(6) any other documentation that the Attorney General may require.”;

(E) in subsection (e)—

“(i) in paragraph (2)—

“(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “domestic violence and sexual assault” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”; and

“(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “linguistically” and “and”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) disbursing grants under this part, the Attorney General may impose reasonable conditions on grant awards disbursed after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to ensure that the States meet statutory, regulatory, and other program requirements;”;

(F) in subsection (i), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, except that, for purposes of this subsection, the costs of the projects and services or tribes for which there is an exemption under section 4002(h)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)(1)) shall not count toward the total costs of the projects;” and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.—A State applying for a grant under this part shall—

“(1) develop an implementation plan in consultation with representatives of the entities listed in subsection (c)(2), that identifies how the State will use the funds awarded under this part, including how the State will use the funds that are required to be allocated under subsection (c)(4)(C); and

“(2) submit to the Attorney General as part of the application submitted in accordance with subsection (d)—

“(A) the implementation plan developed under paragraph (1);

“(B) documentation from each member of the planning committee with respect to the member’s participation in the planning process;

“(C) documentation from the prosecution, law enforcement, court, and victim services programs to be assisted, describing—

“(i) the need for the grant funds;

“(ii) the intended use of the grant funds;

“(iii) the expected result of the grant funds; and

“(iv) the demographic characteristics of the populations to be served, including age, disability, race, ethnicity, and language background;

“(D) a description of how the State will ensure that any subgrantees will consult with victim service providers during the course of developing their grant applications to ensure that the proposed activities are designed to promote the safety, confidentiality, and economic independence of victims;

“(E) demographic data on the distribution of underserved populations within the State and a description of how the State will meet the needs of underserved populations, including the minimum allocation for population-specific services required under subsection (c)(4)(C); 

“(F) a description of how the State plans to meet the requirements pursuant to the regulations issued under subsection (2);”

“(G) goals and objectives for reducing domestic and dating violence-related homicides within the State; and

“(H) any other information requested by the Attorney General.

“(j) REALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—A State may use any returned or remaining funds for any authorized purpose under this part if—

“(1) funds from a subgrant awarded under this part are returned to the State; or

“(2) the State does not receive sufficient eligible applications to award the full funding within the allocations under subsection (c)(4);”;

“(k) in section 102 (42 U.S.C. 3796g–5(c)(1))—

“(A) by inserting “modification, enforcement, dismissal,” after “registration,” each place it appears; and

“(B) by striking “domestic violence, stalking, or sexual assault” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking”;”;

“(l) in section 101(a)(18) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3792a(18)), is amended by striking “$225,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “$225,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011”;

SEC. 102. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES AND ENFORCEMENT OF PRO-TECTION ORDERS.

“(a) in general.—Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796h), is amended by striking “$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011”;

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“SEC. 103. CLERICAL CORRECTION.
“(14) To develop and implement training programs for prosecutors and other prosecution-related personnel regarding best practices to ensure offender accountability, victim safety, and victim consultation in cases involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(15) To develop or strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and the judiciary in recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; including the appropriate treatment of victims.

“(16) To develop and promote State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; including the appropriate treatment of victims.

“(17) To develop, implement, or enhance sexual assault nurse examiner programs or sexual assault forensic examiner programs, including the hiring and training of such examiners.

“(18) To develop, implement, or enhance Sexual Assault Response Teams or similar coordinated community responses to sexual assault.

“(19) To develop and strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers and prosecutors regarding the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases; including appropriate treatment of victims of sexual assault.

“(20) To provide the following human immunodeficiency virus services for victims of sexual assault:

“(A) Testing.

“(B) Counseling.

“(C) Prophylaxis.

“(21) To develop and inventory backlogs of sexual assault evidence collection kits and to develop protocols for responding to and addressing such backlogs, including policies and protocols for notifying and involving victims.

“(22) To develop multidisciplinary high-risk teams focusing on reducing domestic violence and dating violence homicides by—

“(A) using evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of homicide and link high-risk victims to immediate crisis intervention services;

“(B) identifying and managing high-risk offenders; and

“(C) providing ongoing victim advocacy and comprehensive services including legal, housing, health care, and economic assistance.”;

“(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “except for a court,” before “certify”;

“(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

“(III) in paragraph (2), by inserting “except for a court”;

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

“(V) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5), as amended by this subparagraph, as subparagraphs (B) and (E), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

“(VI) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as redesignated by clause (v) of this subparagraph, by—

“(I) by striking the second comma; and

“(II) by striking “grantee are States” and inserting the following: “grantee are—

“(I) States;”

“(II) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition or a victim advocate that partners with a State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government that certifies that the State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government meets the requirements under paragraph (1);”;

“(C) in subsection (d)—

“(i) in paragraph (1)—

“(II) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “policy,” after “law”; and

“(II) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and the defendant is in custody or has been served with a complaint or indictment” before the semicolon;

“(d) ALLOCATION FOR TRIBAL COALITIONS.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 5 percent shall be available for grants under section 1001(a)(19) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796g(d)).

“(g) ALLOCATION FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 25 percent shall be available for projects that address sexual assault, including stranger rape, acquaintance rape, alcohol or drug-facilitated rape, and rape within the context of an intimate partner relationship.”; and

“(2) in section 2102(a) (42 U.S.C. 3796hh–1(a))—

“(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “court,” after “tribal government,”;

“(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “non-profit, private sexual assault and domestic violence programs” and inserting “victim services programs and, as appropriate, population-specific on-call services.”;

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(19) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796g–6(c)(1)) is amended—

“(1) by striking “$75,000,000” and all that follows through “2011” and inserting “$73,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”; and

“(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following:

“SEC. 103. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS.

Section 1201 of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796g–6) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)—

“(A) in the first sentence, by striking “arising as a consequence of” and inserting “relating to or arising out of”; and

“(B) in the second sentence, by inserting “or arising out of” after “relating to”;

“(2) in subsection (b)—

“(A) in the heading, by inserting “AND GRANT CONDITIONS” after “DEFINITIONS”; and

“(B) by inserting and grant conditions” after “definitions”;

“(3) in subsection (c)—

“(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “victim services organizations and inserting “victim services organizations and”; and

“(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) to implement, expand, and establish efforts and projects to provide competent, supervised pro bono legal assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”;

“(d) in subsection (d)—

“(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (c) has completed” and all that follows through the inserting the following: “this section—

“(A) has demonstrated expertise in providing legal assistance or advocacy to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(B) is partnered with an entity or person that has demonstrated expertise described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) has completed, or will complete, training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and related legal issues, including training on evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide;”;

“(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “stalking organization” and inserting “stalking victim service provider”; and

“(C) in paragraph (3)—

“(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “this section” and all that follows through the and inserting “this section $500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018;”;

“(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) the amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year, not more than 10 percent may be used for purposes described in subsection (c)(3);”.

“SEC. 104. CONSOLIDATION OF GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

“(a) in General.—Title III of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–193; 114 Stat. 1509) is amended by striking the section preceding section 1032 (42 U.S.C. 10420), as amended by section 306 of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–182; 119 Stat. 3016), and inserting the following:

“SEC. 1001. COURT TRAINING AND SUPERVISED VISITATION IMPROVEMENTS.

“(a) in General.—The Attorney General may grant to States, units of local government, courts (including juvenile courts), Indian tribal governments, non-profit organizations, legal aid organizations, and victim service providers to improve the response of all aspects of the civil and criminal justice system to families with a history of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or in cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse.

“(B) U.S. Fund.—A grant under this section may be used to—

“(1) provide supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange of children and youth by and between parents in situations involving custody disputes involving all cases of domestic violence, dating violence, child sexual abuse, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(2) develop and promote State, local, and tribal legislation, policies, and best practices for improving civil and criminal court functions, responses, practices, and procedures in cases involving a history of domestic violence or sexual assault, or in cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse, including cases in which the victim proceeds pro se;

“(3) educate court-based and court-related personnel (including custody evaluators and guardians ad litem) about the dynamics of child sexual abuse, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(4) develop and implement programs for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and the judiciary in recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; including the appropriate treatment of victims.”;

“(b) in paragraph (2)—

“(A) in the heading, by inserting “AND GRANT CONDITIONS” after “DEFINITIONS”; and

“(B) by inserting and grant conditions” after “definitions”;

“(3) in subsection (c)—

“(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “victim services organizations and inserting “victim services organizations and”; and

“(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) to implement, expand, and establish efforts and projects to provide competent, supervised pro bono legal assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”;
and stalking, including information on perpetrator behavior, evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide, and on issues relating to the needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including child sexual abuse, and stalking and ensuring necessary services dealing with the physical, health, and mental health of victims are available; 

(4) provide adequate resources in juvenile court systems to address post-resolution domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault (including child sexual abuse), and stalking and ensure necessary services dealing with the physical, health, and mental health of victims are available; 

(5) enable courts or court-based or court-related programs to develop or enhance—

(A) information-sharing among specialized courts, consolidated courts, dockets, intake centers, or interpreter services; 

(B) community-based initiatives within the court system (such as court watch programs, victim assistants, pro se victim assistance programs, or community-based supplementary services); 

(C) offender management, monitoring, and treatment; 

(D) safe and confidential information storage and information-sharing databases within and between court systems; 

(6) outreach to programs to improve community access, including enhanced access for underserved populations; and 

(7) other projects likely to improve court responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; 

(6) collect data and provide training and technical assistance, including developing State, local, and tribal model codes and policies, to improve the capacity of grantees and communities to address the civil justice needs of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking who have legal representation, who are proceeding pro se, or who are proceeding with the assistance of a legal advocate; and 

(7) improve training and education to assist judges, judicial personnel, attorneys, child welfare personnel, and legal advocates in the civil justice system regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or child abuse. 

(c) Considerations. — 

(1) in general.—In making grants for purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section (b), the Attorney General shall consider— 

(A) the number of families to be served by the proposed programs and services; 

(B) the extent to which the proposed programs and services serve underserved populations; 

(C) the extent to which the applicant demonstrates collaboration and coordination with nonprofit, nongovernmental entities in the local community with demonstrated histories of effective work on domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual abuse, or stalking, including State or tribal domestic violence coalitions, State or tribal sexual assault coalitions, local shelters, and programs for domestic violence and sexual assault victims; and 

(D) the extent to which the applicant demonstrates coordination and collaboration with other, established, and local systems, including mechanisms for communication and referral. 

(2) other grants.—In making grants under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall take into account the extent to which the grantee has expertise addressing the judicial system’s handling of family violence, child custody, and related issues; and 

(c) Reporting. —

(1) in general.—An organization that receives a grant under this section for a fiscal year shall submit to the Administrator a report regarding the use of the grant for the fiscal year, including a discussion of outcome performance measures (which shall be established by the Attorney General) to determine the effectiveness of the programs of the organization in meeting the needs of children in the child welfare system; and 

(2) financial performance measures.—For fiscal years 2007 through 2011, and for fiscal years 2012 through 2014, the Attorney General shall report on the financial performance measures required under section 19(a)(7) of the Violence Against Women Act.

Section 120 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2014 (2 U.S.C. 1446S) is amended to read as follows: 

(a) Grants Authorized. —

(1) in general.—Of the amounts appropriated under the grant program identified in paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall take 10 percent of such appropriated amounts and combine them to award grants to eligibles as described in paragraph (2) of this section to develop and implement outreach strategies targeted at adult or youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations and to provide victim services to meet the needs of adult and youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations. The requirements of the grant programs identified in paragraph (2) shall not apply to this grant program. 

(b) Eligible Entities. — 

Eligible entities under this section are— 

(1) population specific organizations that have demonstrated experience and expertise in providing population specific services in the relevant underserved communities, or population specific organizations working in partnership with a victim service provider or domestic violence or sexual assault coalition; 

(2) victim service providers offering population specific services for a specific underserved population; or 

(3) victim service providers working in partnership with a national, State, or local organization that has demonstrated experience and expertise providing population specific services in the relevant underserved populations. 

(c) Planning Grants. — 

The Attorney General may use up to 20 percent of funds available under this section to make one-time planning grants to eligible entities to support the planning and development of population specific programs and grants for adult and youth victims in one or more underserved populations, including— 

(1) identifying, building, and strengthening partnerships with potential collaborators within underserved populations, Federal, State, tribal, territorial or local government entities, and public and private organizations; and 

(2) conducting a needs assessment of the community and the targeted underserved populations.
population or populations to determine what the barriers are to service access and what factors contribute to those barriers, using input from the targeted underserved populations.

"(3) identifying promising prevention, outreach, and intervention strategies for victims from a targeted underserved population or populations; and

"(4) developing a plan, with the input of the targeted underserved population or populations,

"(A) implementing prevention, outreach, and intervention strategies to address the barriers to access services;

"(B) promoting community engagement in the provision of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the targeted underserved populations; and

"(C) evaluating the program.

"(d) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The Attorney General shall make grants to eligible entities for the purpose of providing or enhancing population specific outreach and victim services to adult and youth victims in one or more underserved populations, including—

"(1) working with Federal, State, tribal, territorial and local governments, agencies, and organizations to develop or enhance population specific victim services;

"(2) strengthening the capacity of underserved populations to provide population specific services;

"(3) strengthening the capacity of traditional victim service providers to provide population specific services;

"(4) strengthening the effectiveness of criminal and civil justice interventions by providing training for law enforcement, prosecutors, judges and other court personnel on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations; or

"(5) working in cooperation with an underserved population to develop and implement outreach, education, prevention, and intervention strategies that highlight available resources and the specific issues faced by victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking from underserved populations.

"(e) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women at such time, in such form, and in such manner as the Director may prescribe.

"(f) REPORTS.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall annually submit to the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women a report that describes the activities carried out with grant funds during the preceding fiscal year.

"(g) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—

In this section the definitions and grant conditions in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) shall apply.

"(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

In addition to the funds identified in subsection (a)(1), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 107. CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES GRANTS.

Section 121 of the Violence Against Women Act and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045(a)) is amended—

"(1) in the section heading, by striking "AND UNICONTINUTICALLY";

"(2) by striking "‘and linguistically' each place it appears;

"(3) by striking "and linguistic' each place it appears;

"(4) by amending paragraph (2) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(2) PROGRAMS COVERED.—The programs identified in this paragraph are the programs carried out under the following provisions:


(B) Section 40201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 1376gg–6) (Legal assistance for victims).


(D) Section 40802 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041a) (Enhanced training and services to end violence against women later in life).

(E) Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 1379gg–7) (Education, training, and enhanced services to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities); and

(F) Section 40272 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) (Violence Against Women in Rural Communities).

SEC. 108. REDUCTION IN RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

Section 2(c)(3) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135c)(3), is amended—

"(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking "2014" and inserting "2015"; and

"(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) for fiscal year 2014, not less than 75 percent of the grant amounts shall be awarded for purposes under subsection (a)(2) and (a)(3)."

SEC. 109. ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT TRAINING PROGRAMS.

Section 40202 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13941(c)) is amended by striking "to carry out this section' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 110. CHILD ABUSE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR JUDICIAL PERSONNEL AND PRACTITIONERS.

Section 224(a) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 13024(a)) is amended by striking "$2,500,000 and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES.

Section 41601(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043(b)) is amended—

"(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "other programs' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "other non-governmental or tribal programs and projects to assist individuals who have been victimized by sexual assault, without regard to the age of the individual.'';

"(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking "non-profit, non-governmental organizations for programs and activities' and inserting "non-governmental or tribal programs and activities';

(B) in subparagraph (C)(v), by striking "linguistically and"; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by inserting "and territory' after 'each State' and

(ii) by striking "1.50 percent" and inserting "0.75 percent' and

(b) AMENDMENT OF AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS.

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13941(f)(1)) is amended by striking "$50,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011' and inserting "$40,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018'.

SEC. 202. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT SERVICES.

Section 40204 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13971) is amended—

"(a) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by inserting 'including sexual assault forensic examiners' before the semicolon;

"(b) in subsection (a)(2)—

"(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ‘‘victim advocacy groups' and inserting ‘‘victim service providers'’;

(ii) by inserting ‘‘including developing multidisciplinary teams focusing on high-risk cases with the goal of preventing domestic and dating violence homicides'’ before the semicolon;

(iii) by paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and other long- and short-term assistance' and inserting ‘‘legal assistance, and other long- and short-term and victim service providers and population specific services';

(iv) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(v) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(D) Section 40802 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041a) (Enhanced training and services to end violence against women later in life).

SEC. 203. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN WITH DISABILITIES.

Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–7) is amended—

"(1) in subsection (a)(1)(H), by inserting ‘‘including sexual assault forensic examiners' before the semicolon;

"(2) in subsection (b)—

"(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ‘‘victim advocacy groups' and inserting ‘‘victim service providers'’;

(ii) by inserting ‘‘including developing multidisciplinary teams focusing on high-risk cases with the goal of preventing domestic and dating violence homicides'’ before the semicolon; and

(iii) by striking ‘‘and other long- and short-term assistance' and inserting ‘‘legal assistance, and other long- and short-term and victim service providers and population specific services';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and other long- and short-term assistance' and inserting ‘‘legal assistance, and other long- and short-term and victim service providers and population specific services';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) by inserting ‘‘including developing multidisciplinary teams focusing on high-risk cases with the goal of preventing domestic and dating violence homicides'’ before the semicolon;

"(iii) by paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and other long- and short-term assistance' and inserting ‘‘legal assistance, and other long- and short-term and victim service providers and population specific services';

"(iv) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

"(v) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(D) Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–7) is amended—

"(1) in subsection (b)—

"(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ‘‘(including using evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of domestic and dating violence homicides)’’ after ‘‘risk reduction’’;

"(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking ‘‘victim service organizations’’ and inserting ‘‘victim service providers'’; and

"(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ‘‘victim service organizations’’ and inserting ‘‘victim service providers'’;

"(2) in subsection (c)(1)(D), by striking ‘‘non-profit and non-governemental victim service organizations, such as a State'’ and inserting ‘‘victim service provider, such as a State or tribal'; and

"(3) in subsection (c)(2)(B), by striking ‘‘(including using evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of domestic and dating violence homicides)’’ after ‘‘risk reduction’’;
(3) in subsection (e), by striking $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 and inserting $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 304. GRANT FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN LATER LIFE.

Section 40802 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041a) is amended to read as follows:—

SEC. 40802. GRANT FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN LATER LIFE.

(a) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) The term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that —

(A) is—

(i) a State; or

(ii) a unit of local government; or

(iii) a tribal government or tribal organization;

(2) The term ‘older’ means an individual who is 60 years of age or older.

(b) Grant Program.—

(1) Grants Authorized.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in paragraph (2). In awarding such grants, the Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that the activities funded under this section are not duplicative with the activities funded under the older abuse prevention programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) Mandatory and Permissible Activities.—

(A) Mandatory Activities.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use the funds received under the grant to—

(i) provide training programs to assist law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, population specific organizations, victim service providers, victim advocates, and relevant officers in Federal, tribal, State, territorial, and local governments in recognizing and addressing instances of elder abuse;

(ii) provide or enhance services for victims of elder abuse;

(iii) establish or support multidisciplinary collaborative community responses to victims of elder abuse; and

(iv) conduct cross-training for law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, attorneys, health care providers, population specific organizations, faith-based advocates, victim service providers, and courts to better serve victims of elder abuse.

(B) Permissible Activities.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section may use the funds received under the grant to—

(i) provide training programs to assist attorneys, health care providers, faith-based leaders, and community-based organizations in recognizing and addressing instances of elder abuse; or

(ii) conduct outreach activities and awareness campaigns to ensure that victims of elder abuse receive appropriate assistance.

(3) Sunscreen Populations.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to proposals providing culturally specific or population specific services.

(4) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

TITLE II—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

SEC. 301. RAPE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION GRANT.

Section 502 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ‘‘, territorial, or tribal’’ after ‘‘crisis centers, State’’; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by inserting ‘‘and alcohol’’ after ‘‘about drugs’’; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2) by striking at the end of the section the following paragraph:

‘‘(3) FUNDING FORMULA.—Amounts provided under this section shall be allotted to each State, territory, and the District of Columbia based on population. If the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) exceed $80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking at the end of the section the following paragraph:

‘‘(3) UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to proposals providing culturally specific or population specific services.

(4) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.’’

SEC. 302. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

Subtitle L of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041c et seq.) is amended by striking sections 41201 through 41204 and inserting the following:

SEC. 41201. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

(a) Grants Authorized.—The Attorney General, in cooperation with the Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Education, shall award grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in subsection (b). An applicant for a grant under this section shall be partnered with an elementary or secondary school district, State, or national organization with demonstrated experience in addressing instances of elder abuse; and

(b) Program Purpose.—Funds provided under this section may be used for the following program purpose areas:

(1) Services to Advocate for and Respond to Youth.—To develop, expand, and strengthen programs or services that target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Services may include victim education, support, referrals, and prevention and intervention programs for youth who are at high risk of domestic violence or dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(c) Eligible Applicants.—

(1) In General.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—

(A) a victim service provider, tribal non-profit organization, population specific organization, or community-based organization that provides comprehensive, victim-centered services and case management to youth and adults who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; or

(b) a victim service provider that is partnered with an entity that has a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth, including runaway or homeless youth, who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(d) Services to Advocate for and Respond to Youth.—To expand, develop, and strengthen programs or services that target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Services may include victim education, support, referrals, and prevention and intervention programs for youth who are at high risk of domestic violence or dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(2) Partnerships.—

(A) Education.—To be eligible to receive a grant for the purposes described in subsection (b), an entity described in paragraph (1) shall be partnered with an elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), charter school (as defined in section 5210 of such Act), a school that is operated or
supported by the Bureau of Indian Education, or a legally operating private school, a school administered by the Department of Defense under section 2169 of title 10, United States Code, or section 1602 of the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1973, a group of such schools, a local educational agency (as defined in section 9111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), or an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965).

(2) OTHER PARTNERSHIPS.—All applicants under this section are encouraged to work in partnership with organizations and agencies that serve at-risk youth and relevant youth populations. Such entities may include—

(i) a State, tribe, unit of local government, or territory;

(ii) a population specific or community-based organization;

(iii) batterer intervention programs or sex offender treatment programs with special knowledge and experience working with youth offenders; or

(iv) any other agencies or nonprofit, non-governmental organizations with the capacity to provide assistance to the adult, youth, and child victims served by the partnership.

(3) GRIEVE REQUIREMENTS.—Applicants for grants under this section shall establish and implement policies, practices, and procedures that—

(A) are transparent and include appropriate referral systems for child and youth victims;

(B) protect the confidentiality and privacy of child and youth victim information, particularly in the context of parental or third-party involvement and consent, mandatory reporting duties, and working with other service providers with priority on victim safety and discipline;

(C) ensure that all individuals providing intervention or prevention programs to children or youth through a program funded under this section have completed, or will complete, sufficient training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(D) ensure that parents are informed of the programs funded under this program that are being offered at their child’s school.

(4) FOR EDUCATIONALLY DETERIORATED PROGRAMS.—Any educational programming, training, or public awareness communications regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are funded under this section shall be evidence-based.

(5) PRIORITY.—The Attorney General shall prioritize grant applications under this section that coordinate with prevention programs in the community.

(6) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section, the definitions and grant conditions provided for in section 40002 shall apply.

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2018.

(8) ALLOTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 50 percent of the total amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be used for the purposes described in subsection (b)(1).

(B) INDIAN TRIBES.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be made available for grants under the program authorized by section 205 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796g-10)."

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

Section 303(a) of the Violence Against Women Act (20 U.S.C. 1404b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “and” after “stalking on campuses,”;

(ii) by striking “crimes against women on” and inserting “crimes on”;

and (iii) by inserting “, and to develop and strengthen prevention education and awareness programs” before the period; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking $500,000 and inserting $300,000;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “, strengthen,” after “To develop”;

and (ii) by striking “assault and stalking,” and inserting “assault, and stalking, including the use of technology to commit these crimes,”;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting “and population specific services” after “strengthen victim services programs”;

(ii) by striking “entities carrying out” and all that follows through “stalking victim services programs” and inserting “victim service providers”; and

(iii) by inserting “, regardless of whether the services provided by such program are provided prior to, or in coordination with community victim service providers” before the period at the end; and

(C) by adding the following:

“(9) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(10) To develop or adapt population specific strategies and projects for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(11) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(12) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(13) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(14) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(15) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(16) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(17) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(18) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(19) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(20) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(21) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(22) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(23) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(24) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus;

“(25) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking from underserved populations on campus.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking $12,000,000 and all that follows through the period and inserting “$12,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2018.”;

(4) in subsection (b), by striking the second paragraph and inserting the following:

“(b) CAMPUS SAFETY STUDY, REPORT, AND ACTION.

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to examine—

(A) the incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that were reported to campus security or local police by students and employees of institutions of higher education during academic years 2010–2011, 2011–2012, and 2012–2013;

(B) the response by campus security or local police to the incidents described in subparagraph (A); (C) the extent to which such incidents occurred more or less frequently on campuses of institutions of higher education than in the communities surrounding such campuses;

(D) the procedures institutions of higher education have in place to respond to reports of incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual assault, and stalking, including procedures to follow up with students involved and disciplinary privacy policies for students and employees;

(E) the policies institutions of higher education have in place to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including programs, classes, and employee training;

(F) the challenges faced by institutions of higher education with respect to reports of and collection of data on incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking on campuses;

(G) the possible disciplinary actions institutions of higher education face under Federal law for the occurrence of, or for failure to properly respond to, incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(H) the coordination of programs and policies by institutions of higher education with respect to the campus safety requirements of the Department of Education, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report the result of the study required under paragraph (1), including any recommendations for changes to Federal laws and policies related to campus safety, to Congress, the Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(3) AGENCY RESPONSE AND REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after receipt of the report required under paragraph (2)—

(A) the Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, to the extent authorized, revise policies and regulations related to campus safety in accordance with the recommendations reported under paragraph (2); and

(B) the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Attorney General and the
Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall report to Congress, any recommendations for changes to Federal law related to campus safety, including changes to section 485(f) of title 20, United States Code (20 U.S.C. 1092(f)) and other appropriate laws.

(c) Definitions.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) Academic year.—The term “academic year” has the meaning given such term in section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088).

(2) Institution of higher education.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a)(1)), except that such term does not include institutions described in subparagraph (C) of such section.

(3) Domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.—The terms “domestic violence”, “dating violence”, “sexual assault”, and “stalking” have the meanings given such terms in section 102(a)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13912(a)).

TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES

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

Section 402(c) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b–4) is amended by striking “$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2018.”

SEC. 402. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION VARIANTS.

(a) SMART PREVENTION.—Section 41303 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14053d–2) is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 41303. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION (SMART PREVENTION).

“(a) Grants Authorized.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, is authorized to award grants for the purpose of preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by taking a comprehensive approach that focuses on youth, children exposed to violence, and influencers of social norms.

“(b) Use of Funds.—Funds provided under this section may be used for the following purposes:

“(1) Teen dating violence awareness and prevention.—To develop, maintain, or enhance programs that change attitudes and behaviors around the acceptability of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by taking a comprehensive approach that focuses on youth, children exposed to violence, and influencers of social norms.

“(2) Policy development targeted to prevention, including school-based policies and protocols.

“(3) Children exposed to violence and addressing the unique needs of children that enhance programs designed to prevent future incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by preventing, reducing, and responding to children’s exposure to violence in the home. Such programs may include:

“(A) providing services for children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, including direct counseling or advocacy, and support for the non-abusing parent; and

“(B) training and coordination for educational, after-school, and childcare programs on how to safely and confidentially identify children and families experiencing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and properly refer children exposed and their families to services and violence prevention programs.

“(4) Engaging men as leaders and role models.—To develop, maintain or enhance programs that work with men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to serve as role models and social influencers of other men and youth at the individual, school, community or statewide levels.

“(5) Eligibility.—An entity shall be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be:

“(1) a victim service provider, community-based organization, tribe or tribal organization, or other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and expertise in the specific area for which they are applying for funds; or

“(2) a partnership between a victim service provider, community-based organization, tribe or tribal organization, or other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and at least one of the following that has expertise in serving children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking prevention, or engaging men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(A) A public, charter, tribal, or nationally accredited private middle or high school, a school administered by the Department of Defense under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code or section 1402 of the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978, a group of schools, or a school district.

“(B) A local community-based organization, population-specific organization, or faith-based organization that has established expertise in providing services to youth.

“(C) A community-based organization, population-specific organization, or faith-based organization that has established expertise in providing services to youth.

“(D) A nonprofit, nongovernmental entity providing services for runaway or homeless youth affected by domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(E) Health care entities eligible for reimbursement under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, including providers that target the special needs of children and youth.

“(F) Any other agencies, population-specific organizations, or nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with the capacity to provide appropriate expertise to meet the goals of the program.

“(6) Grantee requirements.—

“(1) In general.—Applicants for grants under this section shall prepare and submit to the Director an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require that demonstrates the capacity of the applicant and partnering organizations to undertake the project.

“(2) Policies and procedures.—Applicants under this section shall establish and implement policies, practices, and procedures that are consistent with the best practices developed under section 402 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b–4) and—

“(A) include appropriate referral systems to direct any victim identified during program activities to highly qualified follow-up care;

“(B) protect the confidentiality and privacy of adult and youth victim information, particularly in the context of parental or third-party involvement and consent, mandatory reporting duties, and working with other service providers;

“(C) ensure that all individuals providing prevention programming through a program funded under this section are trained or will complete sufficient training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking; and

“(D) document how program activities are coordinated with service programs in the community.

“(3) Preference.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to applicants that:

“(A) include outcome-based evaluation; and

“(B) identify any other community, school, or State-based efforts that are working on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking prevention and explain how the grantee or partnership will add value, coordinate with other programs, and not duplicate existing efforts.

“(4) Definitions and Grant Conditions.—In this section, the definitions and grant conditions provided for in section 40002 shall apply.

“(E) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

“(F) Authorization—

“(1) in general.—Not less than 25 percent of the total amounts appropriated under this section in each fiscal year shall be used for grants to, or grants described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b);

“(2) Indian Tribes.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amounts appropriated under this section in each fiscal year shall be made available for grants to Indian tribes or tribal organizations.

“(G) Repeal.—The following provisions are repealed:


“(2) Section 41303 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14054c).

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

SEC. 501. CONSOLIDATION OF GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM’S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) Grants.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall establish and implement a program to provide grants to public health service agencies for the purpose of providing services for children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and counseling or advocacy, and support for the non-abusing parent; and

(b) Repeal.—The following provisions are repealed:


“(2) Section 41303 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14054c).
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants for—

(1) the development or enhancement and implementation of interdisciplinary training for health professionals, public health staff, and allied health professionals;

(2) the development or enhancement and implementation of education programs for medical, nursing, and dental professionals and residents to respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(3) the development or enhancement and implementation of comprehensive state strategies to improve the response of clinics, public health facilities, hospitals, and other health settings (including behavioral and mental health programs) to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) REQUIRED USES.—Amounts provided under a grant under this section shall be used to—

(A) fund interdisciplinary training and education programs under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) that—

(i) are designed to train medical, psychology, dentistry, social work, nursing, and other health profession students, interns, residents, fellows, or current health care providers to identify and provide health care services (including mental or behavioral health services and referrals to appropriate community services) to individuals who are or who have been victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(ii) plan and develop clinical training components for integration into approved internship, residency, fellowship training or continuing medical or other health education training that address physical, mental, and behavioral health issues, including protective factors, related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and other forms of violence and abuse, focus on reducing health disparities and prevent violence and abuse, and include the privacy of victim safety and confidentiality; and

(B) design and implement comprehensive strategies to respond to the health care system to domestic or sexual violence in clinical and public health settings, hospitals, clinics, and other health settings (including mental and behavioral health, under subsection (a)(3) through—

(i) the implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of policies and procedures to guide health professionals and public health staff in identifying and responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including strategies to ensure that health care providers address and address the behavior in a manner that protects the patient’s privacy and safety, and safely use health information technology to improve documentation, identification, assessment, treatment, and follow-up care;

(ii) the development of on-site access to services to address the safety, medical, and mental health needs of patients by increasing the capacity of existing health care professionals and public health staff to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by contracting with or hiring domestic or sexual assault advocates to provide such services or to model other services appropriate to the geographic and cultural needs of the area; and

(iii) the development of measures and methods for the evaluation of the practice of identification, intervention, and documentation regarding victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including the development and testing of quality improvement approaches and strategies—

(A) the provision of training and followup technical assistance to health care professionals, and public health staff, and allied health professionals to assess, treat, and refer clients who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including using tools and training materials already developed.

(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—

(A) CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE.—To the extent consistent with this section, a grantee may use amounts received under this section to address, as part of a comprehensive programmatic approach implemented under this grant, issues relating to child or elder abuse.

(B) RURAL AREAS.—Grants funded under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) may be used to offer to rural areas community-based training opportunities (which may include the use of distance learning networks and other available technologies needed to reach rural areas), an accredited health education, nursing, and other health profession students and residents on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and, as appropriate, other forms of violence and abuse.

(C) OTHER USES.—Grants funded under subsection (a)(3) may be used for—

(i) the development, expansion, and implementation of sexual assault forensic medical examination and sexual assault nurse examiner programs;

(ii) the inclusion of the health effects of lifetime exposure to violence and abuse as well as related protective factors and behavioral risk factors in health professional training programs, including medical, dental, nursing, social work, and mental and behavioral health curricula, and which includes at least one of each of—

(A) health professions schools and national resource repositories for materials on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(B) Subsection (a)(3) GRANTEES.—An entity desiring a grant under subsection (a)(3) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

(i) documentation that all training, education, screening, assessment, services, treatment, and any other approach to patient care will be informed by an understanding of violence and abuse victimization and trauma-specific approaches that will be shared and coordinated, intervention, and treatment activities;

(ii) strategies for the development and implementation of protocols and materials that address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking over the lifespan in health care settings;

(iii) a plan for consulting with State and tribal domestic violence or sexual assault coalitions, national nonprofit victim advocacy organizations, State or tribal law enforcement task forces or other similar state and local victim service providers, to respond appropriately to and make correct referrals for individuals who disclose that they are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and to address other types of violence, and documentation provided by the grantee of an ongoing collaborative relationship with a local victim service provider,

(iv) with respect to an application for a grant under which the grantee will have contact with patients, a plan, developed in collaboration with local victim service providers, to respond appropriately to and make correct referrals for individuals who disclose that they are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and to address other types of violence, and documentation provided by the grantee of an ongoing collaborative relationship with a local victim service provider,

(B) ADVANCE NOTICE OF INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.—Grantees under this section shall provide to patients advance notice about any confidentiality or nondisclosure agreements or nonrelease of information that may be disclosed, as required by general hospital, and shall give patients the option to receive information and referrals without affirmatively disclosing abuse.

(2) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A grantee shall use not more than 10 percent of the amount of the grant under this section for administrative expenses.

(3) PRIORITY.—In selecting grants to strengthen the public health system to address domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants based on the strength of their evaluation strategies, with priority given to outcome-based evaluation approaches.

(4) APPLICATION.—

(A) SUBSECTION (a)(1) AND (2) GRANTEES.—An application for a grant under paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

(i) documentation that the applicant represents a team of entities working collaboratively to strengthen the response of the health care system to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and which includes at least one of—

(A) a health care facility or system; or

(B) a government or nonprofit entity with a history of effective work in the fields of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(ii) strategies for the dissemination and sharing of curricula and other educational materials developed under the grant, if any.

(B) SUBSECTION (a)(3) GRANTEES.—An entity desiring a grant under subsection (a)(3) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

(i) documentation that all training, education, screening, assessment, services, treatment, and any other approach to patient care will be informed by an understanding of violence and abuse victimization and trauma-specific approaches that will be shared and coordinated, intervention, and treatment activities;

(ii) strategies for the development and implementation of protocols and materials that address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking over the lifespan in health care settings;

(iii) a plan for consulting with State and tribal domestic violence or sexual assault coalitions, national nonprofit victim advocacy organizations, State or tribal law enforcement task forces or other similar state and local victim service providers, to respond appropriately to and make correct referrals for individuals who disclose that they are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and to address other types of violence, and documentation provided by the grantee of an ongoing collaborative relationship with a local victim service provider,
adhere to the guidelines set forth by the Attorney General.

``(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

``(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive funding under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), an entity shall be—

``(A) a nonprofit organization with a history of effective work in the field of training health professionals with an understanding of, and clinical skills pertinent to, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and lifetime exposure to violence and abuse; or

``(B) an accredited school of allopathic or osteopathic medicine, psychology, nursing, dentistry, social work, or allied health;

``(C) a provider membership or professional organization, or a health care system; or

``(D) a State, tribal, territorial, or local entity.

``(2) SUBSECTION (a)(3) GRANTEES.—To be eligible to receive funding under subsection (a)(3), an entity shall be—

``(A) a State department (or other division) of health, a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition or victim service provider, or any other nonprofit or nongovernmental organization with a history of effective work in the fields of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and health care, including physical health care; or

``(B) a local victim service provider, a local department (or other division) of health, a local health clinic, hospital, or health system, or any other community-based organization with a history of effective work in the field of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual assault, or stalking, and health care, including physical or mental health care.

``(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

``(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants or enter into contracts to provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program, activity, or service carried out pursuant to this section. Not more than 8 percent of the funds appropriated under this section in each fiscal year may be used to fund technical assistance.

``(2) AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall make publicly available materials developed by grantees under this section, including materials on training, best practices, and research and evaluation.

``(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall publish a biennial report on—

``(A) the distribution of funds under this section; and

``(B) the programs and activities supported by such funds.

``(f) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

``(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may use not more than 20 percent for grants or enter into a contract for research and evaluation of—

``(A) grants awarded under this section; and

``(B) other training for health professionals and effective interventions in the health care setting that prevent domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault across the lifespan, prevent the health effects of such violence, and improve the safety and health of individuals who are currently being victimized.

``(2) RESEARCH.—Research authorized in paragraph (1) may include—

``(A) research on the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and child maltreatment on exposure to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, families, and populations, including underserved populations; and

``(B) research to determine effective health care interventions to respond to and prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

``(C) research on the impact of domestic, dating, and sexual violence, childhood exposure on the set of risk factors for the health care system, health care utilization, health care costs, and health status; and

``(D) research on the impact of adverse childhood experiences and lived experience with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and adult health outcomes. The Secretary shall not count the impact of adverse childhood experiences through the health care setting.

``(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

``(h) DEFINITIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the definitions in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 apply to this section.

``(i) REPEAL.—The following provisions are repealed:

``(1) Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (relating to research on effective interventions to prevent domestic violence; 42 U.S.C. 13973; as added by section 505 of Public Law 109–162 (119 Stat. 3028)).

``(2) Section 121 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294h)."

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

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

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043 et seq.) is amended—

``(1) by inserting after the subtitle heading the following:

``CHAPTER 1—GRANT PROGRAMS:

``(2) in section 4102 (42 U.S.C. 14043–1), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "and" and inserting "and inserting"; and

``(3) in section 4103 (42 U.S.C. 14043–2), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "subsection "chapter" and inserting "subsection "chapter;

``(4) by adding at the end the following:

``CHAPTER 2—HOUSING RIGHTS

SEC. 4111. HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

``(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this chapter:

``(1) AFFILIATED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'affiliated individual' means, with respect to an individual—

``(A) a spouse, parent, brother, sister, or child of that individual, or an individual to whom that individual stands in loco parentis; or

``(B) an individual, tenant, or lawful occupant living in the household of that individual.

``(2) APPROPRIATE AGENCY.—The term 'appropriate agency' means an agency responsible for providing financial, legal, or other assistance to a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in a timely manner.

``(3) COVERED HOUSING PROGRAM.—The term 'covered housing program' means—

``(A) the program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1961 (42 U.S.C. 1437q); and

``(B) the program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

``(4) COVERED HOUSING PROGRAM EVICTION.—The term 'covered housing program eviction' means—

``(A) the program under subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12301 et seq.);

``(D) each of the programs under title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.); and

``(E) the program under subtitle A of title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12741 et seq.);

``(F) the program under paragraph (3) of section 221(d) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–4) for insurance of mortgages that bear interest at a rate determined under the proviso under paragraph (5) of such section 221(d).

``(G) the program under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1); and

``(H) the programs under sections 6 and 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1934 (42 U.S.C. 1437d and 1437f).

``(i) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—If a public housing program assisted under a covered housing program may not be denied admission to, denied assistance under, terminated from participation in, or evicted from a covered housing program or housing on the basis that the applicant or tenant is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is engaged in by a person who is an individual of the tenant is the victim or associate of the tenant otherwise qualifies for admission, assistance, participation, or occupancy.

``(j) CONSTRUCTION OF LEASE TERMS.—An individual, as a result of actual or threatened domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking shall not be construed as—

``(A) a serious or repeated violation of a lease or of housing assistance or of a covered housing program by the victim or threatened victim of such incident; or

``(B) good cause for terminating the assistance, occupancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program of the victim or threatened victim of such incident;

``(k) TERMINATION ON THE BASIS OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.—

``(A) DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE, TENANCY, AND OCCUPANCY RIGHTS.—No person may deny assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program to a tenant solely on the basis of a criminal activity directly related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is engaged in by a member of the household of the tenant or an agent or employee of the control of the tenant, if the tenant or an affiliated individual of the tenant is the victim or threatened victim of such domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

``(B) BIFURCATION.—

``(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (A), a public housing agency or owner of housing assisted under a covered housing program may bifurcate a lease for the housing in order to evict, remove, or terminate assistance to any individual who is a tenant or lawful occupant of the housing and who engages in criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking for an affiliated individual, without evicting, removing, terminating assistance to, or otherwise penalizing a victim of such criminal activity who is an individual of the tenant or lawful occupant of the housing.

``(ii) EFFECT OF EVICTION ON OTHER TENANTS.—If a public housing agency or owner of housing assisted under a covered housing program evicts, removes, or terminates assistance to an individual under
clause (i), and the individual is the sole tenant eligible to receive assistance under a covered housing program, the public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program shall provide any remaining tenant an opportunity to establish eligibility for the covered housing program. If a tenant described in the preceding sentence does not establish eligibility, the public housing agency or owner or manager of the housing shall provide the tenant a reasonable time, as determined by the agency or owner or manager of the housing, to find new housing or to establish eligibility for housing under another covered housing program.

```
(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (a) shall be construed—
```

```
(i) to limit the authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to—
```

```
(I) deny admission by the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or
```

```
(ii) to require a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to—
```

```
(I) allow tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to relocate or transfer to another dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program and retain their status as tenants under the covered housing program if—
```

```
(A) the tenant expressly requests to move; or
```

```
(B) 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) to limit the authority to terminate assistance to a tenant or evict a tenant from housing assisted under a covered housing program if—
```

```
(i) the rights of access to or control of property, including civil protection orders issued to protect a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or
```

```
(ii) the distribution or possession of property among members of a household in a case;
```

```
(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to—
```

```
(I) deny admission by the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or
```

```
(iii) to vary any otherwise available standard that is the ground for protection under subsection (b); or
```

```
(iv) to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
```

```
(d) NOTIFICATION.—
```

```
(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop a notice of the rights of individuals under this section, including the right to confidentiality and the limits thereof, and include such notice in documents required by law to be provided to tenants assisted under a covered housing program.
```

```
(2) PROVISION.—The applicable public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program shall—
```

```
(A) at the discretion of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program, a statement or other evidence provided by an applicant or tenant;
```

```
(4) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Any information submitted to a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program, including the fact that an individual is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, shall be maintained in confidence by the public housing agency or owner or manager and may not be entered into any shared database or disclosed to any other individual, except to the extent that the disclosure is—
```

```
(A) requested or consented to by the individual in writing; or
```

```
(B) required for use in an eviction proceeding under subsection (b); or
```

```
(C) otherwise required by applicable law.
```

```
(6) DOCUMENTATION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to request that an individual submit documentation of the status of the individual as a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
```

```
(B) COMPLIANCE NOT SUFFICIENT TO CONSTITUTE EVIDENCE OF UNREASONABLE ACT.—Compliance with subsection (b) by a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program based on documentation received under this subsection, shall not be sufficient to constitute evidence of an unreasonable act committed by an agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program.
```

```
(7) RESPONSE TO CONFLICTING CERTIFICATION.—If a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program receives documentation under this subsection that contains conflicting information, the public housing agency or owner or manager may require an applicant or tenant to submit third-party documentation, as described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (3).
```

```
(8) PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preempt any provision of any Federal, State, or local law that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
```

```
(4) NOTIFICATION.—
```

```
(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop a notice of the rights of individuals under this section, including the right to confidentiality and the limits thereof, and include such notice in documents required by law to be provided to tenants assisted under a covered housing program.
```

```
(2) PROVISION.—The applicable public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program shall—
```

```
(A) at the time the applicant is denied residency in a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program;
```

```
(B) at the time the individual is admitted to a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program and
```

```
(C) in multiple languages, consistent with guidance issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in accordance with Executive Order No. 13166 (42 U.S.C. 2004d-1 note; relating to access to services for persons with limited English proficiency).
```

```
(e) EMERGENCY RELOCATION AND TRANSFER.—Each appropriate agency shall develop a model emergency relocation and transfer plan for voluntary use by public housing agencies and owners or managers of housing assisted under a covered housing program that—
```

```
(1) allows tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to relocate to another available and suitable dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program and
```

```
(B) at the time the individual is admitted to the dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program; and
```

```
(B) at the time the individual is admitted to the dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program and
```

```
(C) in multiple languages, consistent with guidance issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in accordance with Executive Order No. 13166 (42 U.S.C. 2004d-1 note; relating to access to services for persons with limited English proficiency).
```

```
(6) DOCUMENTATION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to request that an individual submit documentation of the status of the individual as a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
```

```
(B) COMPLIANCE NOT SUFFICIENT TO CONSTITUTE EVIDENCE OF UNREASONABLE ACT.—Compliance with subsection (b) by a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program based on documentation received under this subsection, shall not be sufficient to constitute evidence of an unreasonable act committed by an agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program.
```

```
(7) RESPONSE TO CONFLICTING CERTIFICATION.—If a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program receives documentation under this subsection that contains conflicting information, the public housing agency or owner or manager may require an applicant or tenant to submit third-party documentation, as described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (3).
```

```
(8) PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preempt any provision of any Federal, State, or local law that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
```

```
(4) NOTIFICATION.—
```

```
(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop a notice of the rights of individuals under this section, including the right to confidentiality and the limits thereof, and include such notice in documents required by law to be provided to tenants assisted under a covered housing program.
```

```
(2) PROVISION.—The applicable public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program shall—
```

```
(A) at the time the applicant is denied residency in a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program;
```

```
(B) at the time the individual is admitted to a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program; and
```

```
(C) in multiple languages, consistent with guidance issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in accordance with Executive Order No. 13166 (42 U.S.C. 2004d-1 note; relating to access to services for persons with limited English proficiency).
```

```
(e) EMERGENCY RELOCATION AND TRANSFER.—Each appropriate agency shall develop a model emergency relocation and transfer plan for voluntary use by public housing agencies and owners or managers of housing assisted under a covered housing program that—
```

```
(1) allows tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to relocate to another available and suitable dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program and
(3) describes how the appropriate agency will coordinate relocation or transfers between dwelling units assisted under a covered housing program;

(4) takes into consideration the existing rules and regulations of the covered housing program;

(5) is tailored to the specific type of the covered housing program based on the volume and availability of dwelling units under the control or management of the public housing agency, owner, or manager; and

(6) provides guidance for use in situations in which it is not feasible for an individual public housing agency, owner, or manager to effectuate a transfer.

(1) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY TRANSFER.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall establish policies and procedures under which a victim requesting an emergency transfer under subsection (e) may receive, subject to the availability of tenant protection vouchers for assistance under section 8(o)(16) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437(o)(16)), assistance under such section.

(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—The appropriate agency with respect to each covered housing program shall implement this section, as this section applies to the covered housing program—

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 6.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking ‘‘; and that an incident’’ and all that follows through ‘‘victim of such violence’’; and

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking ‘‘; except that’’ and all that follows through ‘‘stalking’’;

(iii) by striking subsection (u).

(2) SECTION 8.—Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437l) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (9);

(B) in subsection (d)(1) by inserting “in subparagraph (A), by striking ‘‘and that an applicant’’ and all that follows through ‘‘assistance or admission’’; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘; and that an incident’’ and all that follows through ‘‘victim of such violence’’; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking ‘‘; except that’’ and all that follows through ‘‘stalking’’;

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (6), by adding “‘add’ at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (7), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11);

(D) in subsection (o)—

(i) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking the last sentence;

(ii) in paragraph (7)—

(I) in subparagraph (C), by striking ‘‘and that an incident’’ and all that follows through ‘‘victim of such violence’’; and

(II) by redesigning ‘‘; except that’’ and all that follows through ‘‘stalking’’;

(iii) by striking paragraph (20); and

(iv) by striking subsection (ee).

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to limit the rights or remedies available to any person under section 6 or 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d and 1437l), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) to limit any right, remedy, or procedure otherwise available under any provision of part 5, 9, 11, and 32 (49 U.S.C. 593, 596, 603, 606, 981, 983, 984, 985, 961, 963, 966, 982, or 983 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, that—

(1) was issued under the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 2930) or an amendment made by that Act; and

(2) provides greater protection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking than this Act or the amendments made by this Act; or

(C) to displace, or other individual from participating in or receiving the benefits of the low-income housing tax credit program under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 because of noncompliance with the provisions of this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 602. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.


(1) in the heading, by striking ‘‘CHILD VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, OR SEXUAL ASSAULT’’ and inserting ‘‘VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING’’; and

(2) in section 60293 (42 U.S.C. 13975–6 (90)), in the heading, by striking ‘‘(A)’’ and inserting ‘‘(A)’’; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ‘‘(C)’’ and inserting ‘‘(B)’’.

SEC. 603. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14046 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 14046(1) (42 U.S.C. 14043e–3(1)), by striking ‘‘$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011’’ and inserting ‘‘$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018’’; and

(2) in section 14046(2) (42 U.S.C. 14043e–4(2)), by striking ‘‘$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011’’ and inserting ‘‘$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018’’.

TITLED—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

SEC. 701. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

Section 4501(c) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14046(c)) is amended by striking ‘‘2011’’ and inserting ‘‘2014’’.

TITLED—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. CLARIFICATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO VISAS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR NONIMMIGRANT STATUS.—Section 101(a)(15)(U)(I) of the and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)(I)) is amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful’’ and inserting the following—

‘‘is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful’’; and

(2) by inserting ‘‘and has complied with any reasonable request for assistance in the Federal, State, or local investigation or prosecution of the criminal activity before’’; and

‘‘or’’ is being helpful’’; and

(b) CLARIFICATION OF CONTENT OF CERTIFICATION.—Section 214(p)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1116A(p)(1)) is amended by striking ‘‘shall state that the alien ‘has been helpful, is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful’ in the investigation or prosecution’’ and inserting—

‘‘and shall state that the alien ‘has been helpful, or is being helpful’ in the investigation or prosecution’’.

SEC. 802. PROTECTIONS FOR A FIANCE ´ E OR FIANC ´ E OF A CITIZEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1116A) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘crime.’’ and inserting—

‘‘crime described in paragraph (3)(B) and information on any permanent protection or restraining order issued against the petitioner related to any specified crime described in paragraph (3)(B)(1);’’; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)(1), by striking ‘‘abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime’’; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘crime.’’ and inserting—

‘‘crime described in paragraph (3)(B) and information on any permanent protection or restraining order issued against the petitioner related to any specified crime described in subsection (5)(B)(1);’’; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(B)(1), by striking ‘‘abuse, stalking, and inserting—‘‘abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime’’.

PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO K NONIMMIGRANTS.—Section 833 of the International Marriage Broker Regulations Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1397a–5) is amended in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking ‘‘or after ‘orders’ and inserting ‘‘and’’.

SEC. 803. REGULATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKERS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKER ACT OF 2005.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report that includes the number of prosecutions for violations of section 833 of the International Marriage Broker Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1397a–5) that have occurred since the date of enactment of that Act.

(b) REGULATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKERS.—Section 833 of the International Marriage Broker Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1397a–5) is amended as follows:
107(c)(3) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(3)) during the preceding fiscal year.

(5) A description of any actions being taken to reduce the adjudication and processing time, while ensuring the safe and competent processing, of an application described in paragraph (1) or a request for continued presence referred to in paragraph (4).

(6) The actions being taken to combat fraud and to ensure program integrity.

(7) Each type of criminal activity by reason of which an alien was denied nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(a)(15)(U)) during the preceding fiscal year and the number of occurrences of that criminal activity that resulted in such aliens receiving such status.

SEC. 806. PROTECTION FOR CHILDREN OF VAWA SELF-PETITIONERS.

Section 204(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ‘‘or’’ at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

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

‘‘(F) a child of an alien who filed a pending or approved petition for classification or application for adjustment of status or other benefit specified in section 101(a)(51) as a VAWA self-petitioner;’’.

SEC. 807. PUBLIC CHARGE.

Section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED ALIEN VICTIMS.—Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) shall not apply to an alien who—

‘‘(i) is a VAWA self-petitioner; or

‘‘(ii) is an applicant for, or is granted, nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U); or

‘‘(iii) is a qualified alien described in section 431(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1641(c)).’’.

SEC. 808. AGE-OUT PROTECTION FOR U Visa APPLICANTS.

Section 214(p) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(7) AGE DETERMINATIONS.—

‘‘(A) CHILDREN.—An unmarried alien who seeks to accompany, or follow to join, a parent to whom the alien is related follows:

‘‘(1) who has been granted nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U)(i), and who was under 21 years of age on the date on which such parent petitioned for such status, shall continue to be classified as a child for purposes of section 101(a)(15)(U)(i), if the alien attains 21 years of age after such parent’s petition was filed but while it was pending.

‘‘(B) PRINCIPAL ALIENS.—An alien described in clause (1) of section 101(a)(15)(U) shall continue to be treated as an alien described in clause (1) of section 101(a)(15)(U) so long as the alien attains 21 years of age after the alien’s application for status under such clause (1) is filed but while it is pending.

SEC. 809. HARDSHIP WAIVERS.

Section 216(c)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘(1), or’’ and inserting ‘‘(1), or’’;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon and ‘‘or’’;

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

‘‘(D) the alien meets the requirements under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I)(aa)(BB) and

following the marriage ceremony was battered by or subjected to extreme cruelty perpetrated by the alien’s intended spouse and was not at fault in failing to meet the requirements for a hardship waiver;’’.

SEC. 810. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSE.

(a) INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 384(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ‘‘Secretary of Homeland Security or the’’ before ‘‘Attorney General may’’; and

(B) by inserting ‘‘Secretary’s or the’’ before ‘‘Attorney General’s discretion’’;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ‘‘Secretary of Homeland Security or the’’ before ‘‘Attorney General may’’;

(B) by inserting ‘‘Secretary or the’’ before ‘‘Attorney General for’’; and

(C) by inserting ‘‘in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information’’ after ‘‘law enforcement purpose’’;

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking ‘‘ Attorney General’’ and ‘‘Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General are’’; and

(4) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

‘‘(8) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may disclose in the ordinary course to such Secretary or the Attorney General for the disclosure of information to national security officials to be used solely for a national security purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.’’.

(b) GUIDELINES.—Subsection (d) (as added by section 417(4) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005) of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)) is amended by inserting ‘‘and severe forms of trafficking in persons or criminal activity listed in section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)) after ‘‘domestic violence’’.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the guidance required by section 384(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)) is amended by inserting ‘‘and severe forms of trafficking in persons or criminal activity listed in section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)) after ‘‘domestic violence’’.

(d) AMENDMENT.—Section 384(a)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 is amended by striking ‘‘24(a)(3)’’ in the matter following subparagraph (F) and inserting ‘‘237(a)(2)’’.

SEC. 811. CONSIDERATION OF OTHER EVIDENCE.

Section 237(a)(2)(E)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229b(a)(2)(E)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘If the conviction records do not conclusively establish whether a crime of domestic violence constitutes a crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code), the Attorney General may consider other evidence related to the conviction that clearly establishes that the conduct for which the alien was engaged constitutes a crime of violence.’’. TITLe IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN SEC. 901. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.

Section 201(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ‘‘sex trafficking,’’ after ‘‘sexual assault,’’;
(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “sexual assault,”; 
(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “and stalking” and all that follows and inserting “sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking;”; 
(4) in paragraph (7)—
   (A) by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “sexual assault,” each place it appears; and 
   (B) by striking the period at the end; 
(5) in paragraph (8)—
   (A) by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “stalking,”; and 
   (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and 
(6) by adding at the end the following:
   “(9) provides services to address the needs of young women who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, or stalking and the needs of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including support for the nonabusing parent or the caretaker of the child; and 
(10) develop and promote legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.”; and

SEC. 903. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS OR.”
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(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “sexual assault,”; 
(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “and stalking” and all that follows and inserting “sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking;”; 
(4) in paragraph (7)—
   (A) by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “sexual assault,” each place it appears; and 
   (B) by striking the period at the end; 
(5) in paragraph (8)—
   (A) by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “stalking,”; and 
   (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and 
(6) by adding at the end the following:
   “(9) provides services to address the needs of young women who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, or stalking and the needs of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including support for the nonabusing parent or the caretaker of the child; and 
(10) develop and promote legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.”; and

SEC. 903. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS OR.”
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to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States, and Federal, State, or tribal governments, including—

(a) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: " or "; and

(b) by adding at the end the following:

"2257. Special domestic violence jurisdiction

For purposes of this chapter, an Indian tribe that is exercising special domestic violence jurisdiction under section 204 of Public Law 93-344 shall be considered a State.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 153 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the last entry relating to section 2256 the following:

2257. Special domestic violence jurisdiction—"

SEC. 904. CONSULTATION.

Section 903 of the Violence Against Women Act and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14054d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking " and the Violence Against Women Act of 2000" and inserting ", the Violence Against Women Act of 2000"; and

(B) by inserting "; and " and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013" before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of the Interior,"; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking " and stalking" and inserting "stalking, and sex trafficking"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

ANNUAL REPORT.—The Attorney General shall submit to Congress an annual report on the annual consultations required under subsection (a) that—

(1) contains the recommendations made under subsection (b) by Indian tribes during the year covered by the report;

(2) describes actions taken during the year under the recommendations made under subsection (b) during the year or a previous year;

(3) describes how the Attorney General worked in coordination with Indian tribes, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of the Interior to address the recommendations made under subsection (b);

(4) contains information compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on an annual basis and by Field Division, regarding the types of crimes alleged; the statuses of the accused as Indians or non-Indians; the type of judicial order issued; the number of convictions and sentences, including the length of each; the number and type of indigent defense counsel appointed; and the number of judicial, law enforcement, and support services

and other Federal law enforcement agencies, including—

(A) the types of crimes alleged;

(B) the statues of the convicted Indians or non-Indians; and

(C) the statues of the victims as Indians or non-Indians; and

(D) the reasons for deciding against referring the investigation for prosecution.

(5) contains information compiled by each United States Attorney, and by the Federal Judicial Council, regarding declinations of alleged violations of Federal criminal law that occurred in Indian country that were referred for prosecution by law enforcement agencies, including—

(A) the types of crimes alleged;

(B) the statues of the accused Indians or non-Indians; and

(C) the statues of the victims as Indians or non-Indians; and

(D) the reasons for deciding against referring the investigation for prosecution.

(6) The annual report shall be made available on the Internet to the public.

(7) The Attorney General shall submit a report to the Congress on the activities conducted under section 903, consisting of—

(A) the types of crimes alleged; and

(B) the statistics of the convicted Indians or non-Indians; and

(C) the statistics of the victims as Indians or non-Indians; and

(D) the reasons for deciding against referring the investigation for prosecution.
"(D) the reasons for deciding against referring the investigation for prosecution.

"(d) NOTICE.—Not later than 120 days before the date of a consultation under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall notify tribal leaders of the date, time, and location of the consultation.

SEC. 905. ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIAN WOMEN, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 904(a) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 2041 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "The National" and inserting "Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the National";

and

(b) by inserting "and in Native villages (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (44 U.S.C. 1602))" before the period at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and";

and

(3) by addition of the following: "(vi) sex trafficking; "; (vii) domestic violence; (viii) dating violence; (ix) sexual assault; and (x) stalking.

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking "this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008" and inserting "this subsection $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015";

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 904(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 2041 note) is amended by striking "fiscal years 2007 through 2011" and inserting "fiscal years 2014 through 2018".

SEC. 906. ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TRIBAL LIAISON.

Section 11(b) of the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act (25 U.S.C. 3210(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

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

"(9) Serving as domestic violence tribal liaison by doing the following: 

(A) participating in and assisting in arrests and Federal prosecution for crimes, including misdemeanor crimes, of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that occur in Indian country.

(B) Conducting training sessions for tribal law enforcement officers and other individuals and entities responsible for responding to crimes in Indian country to ensure that such officers, individuals, and entities understand their arrest authority over non-Indian offenders.

(C) Developing multidisciplinary teams to combat domestic and sexual violence offenses against Indians by non-Indians.

(D) Connecting and coordinating with tribal justice officials and victims’ advocates to address any backlog in the prosecution of crimes, including misdemeanor crimes, of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that occur in Indian country.

(E) Developing working relationships and maintaining coordination with tribal leaders, tribal community and victims’ advocates, and tribal justice officials to gather information from, and share appropriate information with, tribal justice officials.

(F) Special Attorneys.

Section 543(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "15, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) By inserting the following: "The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(C) APPLICABILITY TO DETENTION FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) The requirements established by section 905(b) of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 1001. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.

TITLE X.—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1002. CRIMINAL PROVISION RELATING TO STALKING INCLUDING CYBERSTALKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2261A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) By inserting the following: "The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(3) COMPLIANCE.—In adopting standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall give due consideration to the national standards provided by the Commission under section 9(e).

SEC. 1002. CRIMINAL PROVISION RELATING TO STALKING INCLUDING CYBERSTALKING

"(b) By inserting the following: "The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(C) APPLICABILITY TO DETENTION FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) The requirements established by section 905(b) of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Homeland Security.

"(D) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Homeland Security.

"(E) SPECIAL ATTORNEYS.

Section 543(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "15, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) By inserting the following: "The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(C) APPLICABILITY TO CUSTOMARY FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

"(2) By inserting the following: "The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(D) APPLICABILITY TO CUSTODIAL FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

SEC. 1002. CRIMINAL PROVISION RELATING TO STALKING INCLUDING CYBERSTALKING

"(b) By inserting the following: "The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(C) APPLICABILITY TO DETENTION FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) The requirements established by section 905(b) of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(A) assess compliance with the standards adopted under paragraph (1) on a regular basis; and

(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities completed by the Department of Homeland Security.
Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the controlling objective here is that, if we reject the substitute and, instead, adopt the bipartisan and comprehensive Senate bill, the bill will go directly to the President for his signature. So I rise in strong opposition to the substitute and in support of the Senate bill, the Violence Against Women Act of 2013.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, in a letter written by our friend and colleague TOM COLE, a Member of Congress, he says that he does not support the House substitute to VAWA because it does not adequately recognize sovereignty or give them the tools that they need to combat violence against women.

Mr. CONYERS. I urge its adoption.

Mr. CONYERS. I trust the tribes to understand their needs best, and that is why I will vote against the substitute.
Unfortunately, in the last Congress, we weren’t able to agree on a bill, and the authorization was allowed to lapse. This month, the Senate took the unique opportunity to pass strong bipartisan legislation by a vote of 78–22—with all of the women in the Senate. It incorporates years of analysis of the problem and the solutions proposed by law enforcement and victim service providers. In my judgment, it is much stronger.

I urge my colleagues to join with me, the Speaker, the President, and the more than 1,300 organizations in supporting S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

**National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women**, February 28, 2013

**Dear House Leaders**: We, the undersigned local, state, tribal, and national organizations, represent and support millions of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking throughout the United States. As Americans Indian Tribal lands and U.S. Territories. On behalf of the victims we represent, and the professionals who serve them and the communities that sustain them, we ask that you support the Violence Against Women Act’s (VAWA) reauthorization by bringing the recently-passed bipartisan Senate VAWA (S.47) to the House floor as a bill is speedily as possible. As you know, VAWA passed the Senate on Tuesday, February 12 with a resounding bipartisan vote of 78-22, in favor of an all-embracing bill that advances to address violence for all victims in communities, homes, campuses and workplaces all around the country. VAWA’s programs support national, state, tribal, territorial, and local efforts to address the pervasive and insidious crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. These programs have made great progress towards reducing the violence, helping victims to be healthy and feel safe and holding perpetrators accountable. This critical legislation must be reauthorized to ensure a continued response to these crimes.

Since its original passage in 1994, VAWA has dramatically enhanced our national response to violence against girls and women, boys and men. More victims report domestic violence to the police and the rate of nonfatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by 64%. The sexual assault services program in VAWA helps rape crisis centers keep their doors open to provide the front-line response to victims of rape. VAWA provides for a coordinated community approach, improving collaboration between law enforcement and victim services programs to better meet the needs of victims. These comprehensive and cost-effective programs not only save lives, they also save money. In fact, VAWA saved nearly $26 billion in prevented social costs in just its first six years.

VAWA has unquestionably improved the national response to these terrible crimes. Nonetheless, much work remains to be done to address unmet needs and enhance access to protections and services for all victims, including housing, campus security, and addressing issues of racial and ethnic communities, tribal, immigrant and LGBTQ victims. We urge you work with your colleagues in both parties as we all work to build upon VAWA’s successes, continue to enhance our nation’s ability to promote an end to this violence, to hold perpetrators accountable and to keep victims and their families safe from future harm. Thank you.

Sincerely,

**National Organizations**

1. DVAs, LLC
2. Stoll
3. Abortion Care Network
4. AFGE Women’s Fair Practices Departments
5. AFL-CIO
6. African Action on AIDS
7. AFSCME
8. After The Trauma
9. Alliance—National Latino Alliance for the Elimination of Domestic Violence
10. Alliant International University
11. American Association of University Women (AAUW)
12. American Baptist Women’s Ministries, ABCUSA
13. American College Health Association
14. American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
15. American Dance Therapy Association
16. American Federation of Government Employees, AFGE-CIO
17. American Federation of Labor–Congress of Industrial Organizations
18. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
19. American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
20. American Humanist Association
21. American Postal Workers Union
22. American Psychiatric Association
23. American Psychological Association
24. American Trades Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC)
25. Americans for Immigrant Justice, Americans Overseas Domestic Violence Crisis Center
26. Amnesty International USA
27. Anti-Defamation League
28. Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum
29. Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence
30. Asian American Justice Center, member of the Asian American Center for Advancing Justice
31. Asian Pacific American Bar Association
32. Asian/Pacific Islander Domestic Violence Resource Project
33. ASISTA Immigration Assistance
34. Association of Jewish Family & Children’s Agencies
35. Association of Physicians of Pakistani Descent in N. America (APPNA)
36. Bah’ai’s of the United States
37. battered Mothers Custody Conference
38. Black Women’s Health Imperative
39. Black Women’s Roundtable
40. Break the Cycle
41. Business and Professional Women’s Foundation
42. Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities
43. Casa Esperanza
44. Center for Family Policy and Practice
45. Center for Partnership Studies
46. Center for Reproductive Rights
47. Center for Women Policy Studies
48. Central Conference of American Rabbis
49. Choice USA
50. Children United
51. Circle of 6 App
52. Clan Star
53. Clery Center for Security on Campus
54. Coalition of Labor Union Women
55. Coalition on Human Needs
56. Communications Workers of America
57. Communications Workers of America (CWA)
58. Community Action Partnership
59. cultureID
60. CWA National Women’s Committee
61. Daughters of Penelope
62. Delta Sigma Theta Sorority
63. Dialogue on Diversity
64. Disciples Justice Action Network
65. Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs
66. Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project (DV LEAP)
67. Elder Justice Coalition
68. Episcopal Church
69. Episcopal Women’s Caucus
70. Expert Panel on violence, American Academy of Nursing
71. Faith Trust Institute
72. Falling Walls
73. Family Equality Council
74. Federally Employed Women (F EW)
75. Feminist Agenda Network
76. Feminist Majority
77. Feminist Peace Network
78. Freedom from Hunger
79. Friends Committee on National Legislation
80. Friends of Nabeela
81. Futures Without Violence
82. Gay & Lesbian Medical Association
83. General Board of Church & Society, United Methodist Church
84. General Federation of Women’s Clubs
85. George Washington University Law School
86. Girls Inc.
87. GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBT Equality
88. GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network)
89. Hadassah, The Women’s Zionist Organization of America, Inc.
90. HIAS (Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society)
91. Hisp American Seva Communities
92. Human Rights Campaign
93. Indian Law Resource Center
94. Inspire Action for Social Change
95. Institute for Interfaith Action
96. Institute for Science and Human Values
97. Institute on Domestic Violence in the African American Community
98. IOFA
99. Jewish Council for Public Affairs
100. Jewish Labor Committee
101. Jewish Women International
102. Joe Torre Safe at Home Foundation
103. Labor Council for Latin American Advancement
104. League of United Latin American Citizens
105. Legal Momentum
106. LiveYourDream.org
107. Log Cabin Republicans
108. Media Equity Collaborative
109. Men Can Stop Rape
110. Men’s Resource International
111. Men’s Resources International
112. Methodist/Catholic
113. Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
114. Migrant Clinicians Network
115. MomsRising
116. Ms. Foundation for Women
117. Muslim American Society
118. Muslim Bar Association
119. Muslim Public Affairs Council
120. Muslimes for Progressive Values
121. NAFTA
122. NAAPFASA
123. National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd
124. National Alliance to End Sexual Violence
125. National Asian Pacific American Bar Association (NAPABA)
126. National Association of Commissions for Women (NACCV)
127. National Association of Hispanic Organizations
128. National Association of School Psychologists
| 1. Alabama Coalition Against Domestic Violence |
| 2. Alabama—NOW |
| 3. St. Vincent's Hospital |
| 4. The Hispanic Interest Coalition of Alabama (HICA) |

| 1. Arizona Bridge to Independent Living |
| 2. Arizona Coalition Against Domestic Violence |
| 3. Arizona NOW |
| 4. Arizona State University |
| 5. Child Crisis Center Foundation |
| 6. Community Alliance Against Family Abuse |
| 7. Family LAW CASA |
| 8. Hopi-Tewa Women's Coalition to End Abuse |
| 9. Jewish Community Relations Council (Tucson) |
| 11. National Organization for Women—AZ |
| 12. Phoenix/Scottsdale NOW |
| 13. Protecting Arizona's Family Coalition (PAFCO) |
| 14. Southern Arizona Center Against Sexual Assault |
| 15. Southwest Indigenous Women's Coalition |
| 16. Yavapai Family Advocacy Center |
| 17. Yup'ik Women's Coalition |

| 1. Arkansas Coalition Against Domestic Violence |
| 2. Arkansas Coalition Against Sexual Assault |

| 1. Bay Area |
| 2. California Coalition Against Sexual Assault |
| 3. California NOW |
| 4. AAUW, Big Bear Valley Branch |
| 5. Alliance Against Family Violence and Sexual Assault |
| 6. Alliant International University |
| 7. Asian Pacific American Legal Center, California |
| 8. Asian Law Caucus |
| 9. Asia Pacific Cultural Center |
| 10. Asian Pacific American Legal Center, Member of Asian American Center for Advancing Justice |
| 11. Bay Area Turning Point, Inc. |
| 12. Bay Area Women's Center |
| 13. CA Rural Indian Health Board, Inc. |
| 14. California Coalition Against Sexual Assault |
| 15. California Latinas for Reproductive Justice |
| 16. California Native Organization for Women |
| 17. California Protective Parents Association |
| 18. California School of Professional Psychology |
| 19. California School of Professional Psychology at Al |
| 20. California Women Lawyers |
| 21. CARECEN Los Angeles |
| 22. Catalyst Domestic Violence Services |
| 23. Catalyst Domestic Violence Services |
26. Center For A Non Violent Community
27. Center for the Pacific Asian Family
28. Central CA Coalition of Labor Union Women
29. Children's Institute, Inc.
30. Choices Domestic Violence Solutions
31. Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice, Los Angeles
32. Community Overcoming Relationship Abuse
33. County of Sacramento, Native American Caucus
34. C—VISA, Coachella Valley Immigration Service and Assistance
35. Domestic Abuse Center
36. Domestic Violence Solutions for Santa Barbara County
37. DOVES in Hatchetches, LA
38. DOVES of Big Bear Lake, Inc.
39. End DV Counseling and Consulting
40. Episcolal Women's Caucus
41. Family Services of Tulare County
42. Forward Together
43. Freshwater Haven
44. Good Shepherd Shelter
45. Haven Hill, Inc
46. Haven Women's Center of Stan Islaus
47. Hollywood Chapter of the National Organization for Women
48. House of Ruth, Inc.
49. Humboldt County Domestic Violence Coordinating Council
50. Immigration Services of Mountain View
51. Institute for Multicultural Counseling and Education Services (IMCES)
52. Instituto Para La Mujer
53. Inter-Tribal Council of California, Inc.
54. Lone Band of Miwok Indians
55. Jaffi Law Firm
56. Jewish Community Relations Council
57. Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles
58. Jewish Federation of the Sacramento Region
59. L.A. Gay & Lesbian Center
60. La Casa de las Madres
61. La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians
62. Law Students for Reproductive Justice
63. Marjaree Mason Center
64. Maya Chilam Foundation
65. MINDS—Medical Network Devoted to Service
66. Miracle Mile LA NOW
67. Monterey County Rape Crisis Center
68. MORONGO BASIN UNITY HOME
69. Mountain View Crisis Services, Inc.
70. National Coalition of 100 Black Women, San Francisco Chapter
71. National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Silicon Valley Chapter
72. National Council of Jewish Women, Sacramento Section
73. National Hispanic Media Coalition
74. Oakland County Coordinating Council against Domestic Violence
75. O-PCC
76. Option House, Inc.
77. Project: Peacemakers, Inc.
78. Rainbow Community Cares
79. Rainbow Services, Ltd.
80. Sacramento Native American Health Center
81. Safe Alternatives to Violent Environments (SAVE)
82. Santa Fe Natl. Organization for Women
83. Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence Center
84. Shasta Women's Refuge
85. Shelly For the Storm
86. Sojourn Services For Battered Women And Their Children
87. South Asian Network (SAN)
88. Southern Indian Health Council, Inc.
89. STAND! for Families Free of Violence
90. Strong Hearted Native Women's Coalition, Inc.
91. The Good Shepherd Shelter
92. Tri-Valley Haven
93. Valley Crisis Center
94. Victim Compensation and Government Claim Board
95. Violence Intervention Program
96. Wild Iris Women's Service in Bishop, Inc.
97. WOMAN, Inc.
98. Women's and Children's Crisis Shelter, Inc.
99. Women's Center-High Desert, Inc.
100. Women's Crisis support—Defensa de Mujeres
101. WordsMatter, Episcopal Expansive Language Project
102. YWCA Glendale, CA
103. YWCA Greater Los Angeles
104. YWCA San Diego County
105. 1.905 Colorado
106. 2. Advocate Safehouse Project
107. 3. Advocates Crisis Support services
108. 4. Advocates for a Violence-Free Community
109. 5. Advocates for Victims of Assault
110. 6. Alamosa County Sheriff's Office
111. 7. Alamosa Victim Response Unit
112. 8. Alternatives to Violence, Inc.
113. 9. Archuleta County Victim Assistance Program
114. 10. Catholic Charities Diocese of Pueblo
115. 11. Center on Domestic Violence
116. 12. Colorado Anti-Violence Program
117. 13. Colorado Coalition Against Domestic Violence
118. 14. Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault
119. 15. Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CCASA)
120. 16. Colorado Mesa University Association of Feminists
121. 17. Colorado Sexual Assault & Domestic Violence Center
122. 18. Deaf Overcoming Violence through Empowerment
123. 19. Domestic Safety Resource Center
125. 21. Dove Advocacy Services for Assaulted Deaf Women and Children
126. 22. Gateway Battered Women's Services
127. 23. Gay-Straight Alliance, Colorado Mesa University
128. 24. Gunnison County Law Enforcement Crime Victim Services
129. 25. Gunnison County Sheriff's Office
130. 26. Immigrant Legal Center of Boulder County
131. 27. Justice & Mercy Legal Aid Clinic
132. 28. Latina Safehouse
133. 29. Moving to End Sexual Assault (MESA)
134. 30. NEWSED C.D.C.
135. 31. NOW Colorado
136. 32. Park County Sheriff's Office, Victim Services
137. 33. Pueblo Rape Crisis Services
138. 34. Rape Assistance and Awareness Program
139. 35. RESPONSE: Help for Survivors of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
140. 36. Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network
141. 37. Rose Forensic & Treatment Services, LLC (Denver, CO)
142. 38. San Luis Valley Immigrant Resource Center
143. 39. San Luis Valley Victim Response Unit (Alamosa)
144. 40. Servicios de La Raza
145. 41. Sexual Assault Victim Advocate Center
146. 42. SLV Regional Medical Center
147. 43. TESSA of Colorado Springs
148. 44. The Latina Safehouse
149. 45. Tu Casa, Inc.
150. Connecticut
151. 1. Beth El Temple Sisterhood
152. 2. Betty Gallo & Company
153. 3. Bridgeport Public Education Fund
154. 4. Center for Women and Families—Bridgeport, CT
155. 5. Center for Women and Families of Eastern Fairfield County Connecticut
156. 6. Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence
157. 7. Connecticut Sexual Assault Crisis Services
158. 8. CT NOW
159. 9. Hartford GYN Center
160. 10. Local 330
161. 11. Meriden-Wallingford Chrysalis, Inc.
162. 12. New Haven Legal Assistance Association
163. 13. Quinnipiac University
164. 14. Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury
165. 15. Sexual Assault Crisis Center of Eastern Connecticut
166. 16. Susan B. Anthony Project, Inc.
167. 17. The Center for Sexual Assault Crisis Counseling and Education
168. 18. Clara Luper Center for Women and Families of Eastern Fairfield County
169. 19. United Services, Inc.
170. 20. Women and Families Center
171. 21. Women's Center of Greater Danbury, Inc.
172. 22. YWCA Darien-Norwalk
173. 23. YWCA Greenwich
174. 24. YWCA Hartford Region
175. 25. YWCA New Britain
176. District of Columbia
177. 1. Ayuda
178. 2. Sist State NOW
179. 3. Community Action Partnership
180. 4. DC Coalition Against Domestic Violence
181. 5. District Alliance for Safe Housing (DASH)
182. 6. Family Place
183. 7. Freedom House
184. 8. George Washington University Law School
185. 9. Hispanic Federation
186. 10. Human Rights Campaign
187. 11. Lutheran Social Services
188. 12. My Sister's Place DC
189. 13. National Capital Area Women Union Retirees
191. 15. Ramona's Way
192. 16. Safe Haven Ministries
193. 17. SAGE Metro DC
194. 18. Solutions Center
195. 19. Survivors and Advocates for Empowerment (SAFE), Inc.
196. 20. The Family Place
197. 21. Turning Angry Into Change
198. 22. William Kellibrew Foundation
199. 23. Women's Information Network
200. 24. YWCA National Capital Area
201. Delaware
202. 1. ContactLifeline, Inc.
203. 2. DE Coalition Against Domestic Violence
204. 3. Delaware NOW
205. 4. Delaware Opportunities, Safe Against Violence
206. 5. Domestic Abuse Project of Delaware County
207. 6. HelpLine of Delaware and Morrow County
208. 7. National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Delaware Chapter
209. 8. Sexual Assault Network of Delaware
210. 9. Women's Resources of Monroe County, Inc.
211. Florida
212. 1. Americans for Immigrant Justice, formerly Florida Immigrant Advocacy Center
213. 2. Betty Griffin House
214. 3. Chain of Lake Achievers, Inc.
215. 4. Children's Advocacy Center for Volusia and Flagler Counties
216. 5. Community Action Stops Abuse
217. 6. Democratic Women's Club of Northeast Broward
218. 7. Doves, Lake County
219. 8. Empowerment Christian Community Corp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1. 9to5 Atlanta 2. 9to5 Atlanta Working Women 3. Atlanta Recovery &amp; Spirituality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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16. NJ Coalition for Battered Women
17. NJ State Industrial Union Council
18. Partners for Women and Justice
19. Safe in Hunterdon
20. South Jersey NOW—Alice Paul Chapter
21. St. Francis Counseling Service
22. UFCW, Local 888
23. Unchained At Last
24. Womanspace, Inc.
25. Women of Color and Allies Essex County NOW Chapter
26. YWCA Bergen Development Clinic
27. YWCA Bergen County
28. YWCA Central New Jersey
29. YWCA Eastern Union County
30. YWCA Princeton
31. YWCA Trenton

NEW YORK
1. Arise Sexual Assault Services
2. Center for Nonviolent Communication
3. Center of Protective Environment, Inc. (COPE)
4. Coalition to Stop Violence Against Native Women, Albuquerque
5. Community Against Violence, Inc.
6. Enlace Comunitario
7. Gila Regional Medical Center SANE
8. New Mexico Asian Family Center
9. New Mexico Coalition Against Domestic Violence
10. New Mexico Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs, Inc.
11. New Mexico NOW
12. New Mexico Voices for Children
13. New Mexico Women’s Agenda
14. SANE of Otero & Lincoln County
15. Sexual Assault Services of NW New Mexico
16. Silver Regional Sexual Assault Support Services
17. Solace Crisis Treatment Center
18. Southern New Mexico Human Development, Inc.
19. Southwest Counseling Center
20. TACE SANE at Holy Cross Hospital
21. Twua Women United, Santa Cruz
22. Valencia Counseling Service Inc.

NEW YORK
1. African Services Committee
2. Albany Law School
3. Arab American Association of New York
4. BIBLE FELLOWSHIP PENTECOSTAL ASSEMBLY OF NY INC.
5. Catholic Charities of Chenango County
6. Citizen Action of New York
7. Committee on the Status of Women
8. CSSO (COUNCIL OF PEOPLE ORGANIZATION)
9. Crime Victim and Sexual Violence Center
10. Crime Victim Center of Erie County
11. CWA 1032
12. Domestic Harmony
13. Fordham Prep School
14. Hispanic United of Buffalo
15. In Our Own Voices
16. Legal Aid Society of Rochester, Inc.
17. Liberty House of Albany, Inc.
18. Local 301
19. Los Ninos Services INC
20. National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Long Island Chapter
22. Nassau County Coalition Against Domestic Violence
23. Nassau County Council of Jewish Women NY
25. National Organization for Women—New York City
27. National Organization for Women, Greater Rochester Chapter
29. New York Board of Rabbis
30. New York City Anti-Violence Project
31. New York State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
32. New York State Coalition Against Sexual Assault
33. Safe Homes of Orange County
34. SAFER—Survivors Advocating For Effective Reform
35. Sanctuary for Families
36. SEPA Mujer
37. Sojourner House
38. The Family Center
39. Turning Point for Women and Families
40. Unity House of Troy
41. Vera House, Inc.
42. VIBS Family Violence and Rape Crisis Center
43. Victim Resource Center of the Finger Lakes, Inc.
44. Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk
45. Violence Intervention Program
46. Women In Need
47. Wyckoff Heights Medical Center—Violence Intervention and Treatment Program
48. YWCA Adirondack Potholes
49. YWCA Binghamton & Broome County
50. YWCA Brooklyn
51. YWCA City of New York
52. YWCA Cortland
53. YWCA Elmira & The Twin Tiers
54. YWCA Genesee County
55. YWCA Jamestown
56. YWCA Mohawk Valley
57. YWCA New York City
58. YWCA Niagara
59. YWCA Orange County
60. YWCA Queens
61. YWCA Rochester & Monroe County
62. YWCA Schenectady
63. YWCA Syracuse & Onondaga County
64. YWCA Tonawandas
65. YWCA Troy-Cohoes
66. YWCA Ulster County
67. YWCA Western New York
68. YWCA White Plains/Westchester
69. YWCA Yonkers

NORTH CAROLINA
1. Charlotte NOW
2. Chrystas Network
3. Crisis Council, Inc.
4. Families Living Violence Free
5. Family Crisis Council
6. Family Service of the Piedmont
7. Mitchell County SafePlace Inc.
8. Muslim American Society of Charlotte
11. National Organization for Women, Raleigh Chapter
12. NC Coalition Against Sexual Assault
13. North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence
14. OASIS, Inc.
15. YWCA Central Carolinas

NORTH DAKOTA
1. First Nations Women’s Alliance
2. ND Council on Abused Women’s Services
3. Spirit Lake Victim Assistance

OHIO
1. Abuse & Rape Crisis Center, Warren County
2. Abuse Prevention Council
3. Artemis Center
4. Asha-Ray of Hope
5. Belmont Community Hospital
6. Cleveland Rape Crisis Center
7. COMPASS Rape Crisis
8. Every Woman’s House
9. Forbes House
10. Islamic Center of Greater Columbus
11. Islamic Education Council
12. Muslim Carmel Crime & Trauma Assistance Program
13. Muslim Mothers Against Violence
14. National Coalition of 100 Black Women
15. Nirvana Now!
16. Ohio NOW
17. Ohio Alliance to End Sexual Violence
18. Ohio Domestic Violence Network
19. OhioHealth
20. Open Arms Domestic Violence and Rape Crisis Services
21. Otterbein University
22. ProgressOhio
23. Rape Crisis Center of Medina and Summit Counties
24. Salaam Cleveland
25. Sexual Abuse Prevention Awareness
26. Sexual Assault Response Network of Central Ohio
27. Sinclair Community College—Domestic Violence Task Force
28. Someplace Safe
29. The Domestic Violence Shelter, Inc.
30. The SAAFE Center (rape crisis center)
31. The Sexual Assault Response Network of Central Ohio
32. Trumbull County Democratic Women’s Caucus
33. Upper Ohio Valley Sexual Assault Help Center
34. Violence Free Coalition
35. West Ohio Annual Conference Team on Domestic Violence & Human Trafficking
36. WomenSafe
37. YWCA Dayton
38. YWCA Greater Cincinnati
39. YWCA Hamilton
40. YWCA Youngstown

OKLAHOMA
1. Community Crisis Center of Northeast Oklahoma
2. Family Crisis & Counseling Center, Inc.
3. Family Shelter of Southern Oklahoma
4. Native Alliance Against Violence, Oklahoma City
5. OK Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
6. Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
7. Tulsa Immigrant Resource Network, University of Tulsa College of Law
8. Univ. of Tulsa College of Law
9. YWCA Oklahoma City
10. YWCA Tulsa

OREGON
1. Clackamas Women’s Services
2. Jackson County SAAFS
3. Mary’s Place Supervised Visitaiton & Safe Exchange Center
4. OADSV
5. Oregon Action
6. Portland Store Fixtures
7. Saving Grace
8. VOA Oregon—Home Free

PENNSYLVANIA
1. Alice Paul House
2. Alle-Kiski Area HOPE Center, Inc.
3. Alliance Against Domestic Abuse
4. Berks Women in Crisis
5. Bloomsburg University
6. Bucks County NOW
7. Bucks County Women’s Advocacy Coalition
8. Business & Professional Women’s Federation of Pennsylvania
9. CAPSEA, Inc.
10. Centre Co., Women’s Resource Center
11. Clinton County Women’s Center
12. Crime Victims Center of Fayet County
14. Domestic Violence Center of Chester County
15. Franklin/Fulton Women In Need
16. HIS Paxton
17. International Association of Counselors & Therapists
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18. Just Harvest
19. Keystone Progress
20. Laurel-House
21. Libertae, Inc.
22. Ni-Ti-Ta-Nee NOW
23. Northeast Williamsport NOW
24. Pa Democratic State Committee, Elect-
ed Member
25. PA Immigrant & Refugee Women’s Net-
work (PAIRWNY)
26. PathWays PA
27. PCADY
28. Penn Action
29. Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domest-
ic Violence
30. Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape
31. Pennsylvania Council of Churches
32. Pennsylvania NOW
33. Philadelphia Coalition of Labor Union
Women
34. Philadelphia Women’s Center
35. Safehouse Crisis Center, Inc.
36. Soroptimist International of Bucks County
37. Squirrel Hill NOW
38. Survivors Inc
39. Susquehanna County Victim Services
40. The Abuse Network
41. The Women’s Center, Inc. of Columbia/
Montour Counties
42. Victim Services Inc.
43. Wise Options/YWCA Northcentral PA
44. Women Against Abuse
45. Women In Transition
46. Women Services Inc.
47. Women’s Law Project
48. Women’s Resource Center
49. Women’s Services, Inc
50. WOMEN’S WAY
51. YWCA Bradford
52. YWCA Dutchess County
53. YWCA Lancaster
54. YWCA Northcentral PA-Wise Options
55. YWCA Victims’ Resource Center
56. YWCA York

RHODE ISLAND

1. DVRCSC
2. National Council of Women RI
3. Ocean State Action
4. Olneyville Neighborhood Association
5. Rhode Island Coalition Against Domest-
ic Violence
6. Rhode Island NOW
7. The Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health
8. Turning Point
9. Women’s Medical Center of Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Applesseed Legal Justice Center
2. Safe Harbor
3. Sexual Assault Counseling and Information Service
4. South Carolina Coalition Against Do-
menstic Violence and Sexual Assault

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. South Dakota Coalition Ending Domest-
ic & Sexual Violence
2. Native American Community Board
Lake Andes
3. Native Women’s Society of the Great Plains, Timber Lake
4. White Buffalo Calf Woman Society, Mis-
mission
5. Wiconi Wawokya, Inc., Fort Thompson
6. Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate
7. Ogila Sioux Tribe Victim Services

TENNESSEE

1. Abuse Alternatives, Inc.
2. Local 365
3. Muslim Community of Knoxville
4. National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Chattanooga Chapter
5. Tennessee Citizen Action
6. Tennessee Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
7. United South and Eastern Tribes, Inc.

TEXAS

1. American Gateway
2. Artemis Justice Center
3. Casa de Esperanza
4. Casa de Proyecto Libertad
5. Catholic Charities of Dallas
6. Citizens Against Violence, Inc.
7. Concho Valley Rape Crisis Center
8. Daya Inc.
9. Fort Bend County Women’s Center
10. Harris County Domestic Violence Co-
dinating Council
11. Hospitality House, INC.
13. Islamic Association of the Mid-Cities
14. Montrose Counseling Center
16. New Beginning Center
17. North Dallas Chapter of the National Organization for Women
18. Our Lady. Of the Lake University
19. Promise House, Inc.
20. Refugio del Rio Grande
21. SafePlace
22. Sam Houston State University
23. Sexual Assault Resource Center of the Brazos Valley
24. Sun City Democratic Club
25. Sun City-West Valley NOW
26. Texas Council on Family Violence
27. Texas Muslim Women’s Foundation
28. The Family Place, Dallas TX
29. Travis County Attorney’s Office
30. TX Association Against Sexual Assault
31. Women’s Shelter of South Texas
32. YWCA Fort Worth & Tarrant County

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

1. Women’s Coalition of St. Croix
2. Virgin Islands Coalition Against Sexual
Abuse, Inc.

UTAH

1. Enriching Utah Coalition
2. Holy Cross Ministries
3. Icarus Group
4. Latin American Chamber of Commerce of Salt Lake City
5. National Council of Jewish Women Utah

State Policy Advocacy Chair
6. NCJW, Utah Section
7. PERRETTA LAW OFFICE
8. Salt Lake Family Health Center
9. Utah Assistive Technology Foundation
10. Utah Coalition Against Sexual Assault
11. Utah Domestic Violence Council
12. Utah Women’s Lobby
13. West Valley City Victim Services
14. YWCA Salt Lake City

VERMONT

1. Circle—VT
2. Clarina Howard Nichols Center
3. Finding Our Voices
4. RUII2 Community Center
5. Vermont Center for Independent Living
6. Vermont Council on Domestic Violence
7. Vermont Legal Aid, Inc.
8. Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
9. Voices Against Violence/Laurie’s House

VIRGINIA

1. American Postal Workers Union
2. Center For Behavioral Change, P.C.
3. Domestic Violence Action Center
4. DOVE/ES of Big Bear Valley, Inc
5. Dream Project
6. Fredericksburg NOW
7. Healthy Mothers Healthy Babies
8. NARAL Pro-Choice Virginia
9. National Organization for Women, Alex-
dria, VA Chapter
10. National Organization for Women, Vir-
ginia Chapter
11. Prince George’s Crime Victim’s Fund
13. Transitions

WASHINGTON

1. African Communities Network
2. ALLYSHIP
3. API Chaya
4. Cambodian Women Networking Associa-
tion
5. Compass Housing Alliance
6. CIELO Project
7. King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence
8. LGO Consulting
9. Local 242
10. Lummi Nation Victims of Crime Pro-
gram
11. National Council of Jewish Women, Se-
attle Section
12. National Council of Jewish Women,
Washington State Policy Advocacy Chair
13. Navos Mental Health Solutions
14. NCJW Seattle section
15. New Beginnings
16. Northwest Immigrant Rights Project
17. Seattle NOW
18. Support, Advocacy & Resource Center
19. Tacoma Women of Vision NGO
20. WA State National Organization for
Women
21. Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault
Programs
22. Washington Community Action Net-
work
23. Washington State Coalition Against
Domestic Violence
24. Women Spirit Coalition, Olympia
25. YWCA Bellingham
26. YWCA Clark County
27. YWCA Kitsap County
28. YWCA Pierce County
29. YWCA Seattle/King/Snohomish
30. YWCA Spokane
31. YWCA Walla Walla
32. YWCA Yakima
33. Zonta Club of Yakima Valley

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Branches Domestic Violence Shelter, Inc.
2. CHANGE Inc. The Lighthouse
3. CONTACT Huntington
4. Direct Action Welfare Group (DAWG)
5. Family Crisis Intervention Center
6. Family Refuge Center
7. Kanawha County Victim Services Center
8. Northern West Virginia Center for Inde-
pendent Living
9. Rape & Domestic Violence Information
Center, Inc.
10. Rape and Domestic Violence Informa-
tion Center
11. Shenandoah Women’s Center, Inc.
12. West Virginia Citizen Action Group
13. West Virginia Coalition Against Domes-
tic Violence
14. West Virginia Foundation for Rape Infor-
mation and Services
15. Women’s Aid in Crisis
16. WV Coalition Against Domestic Vio-
ence
17. WV NOW
18. YWCA Charleston WV
19. YWCA Wheeling

WISCONSIN

1. Stot Milwaukee
2. American Indians Against Abuse
3. Asha Family Services, Inc.
4. Beloit Domestic Violence Center
5. Bolton Refuge House, Inc.
6. Bridge to Hope
7. Center Against Sexual & Domestic Abuse, Inc.
Every now and then here in the House to vote "yes" on it as well.

I know there are many in this House who believe that there is not a Federal nexus on this issue. However, let's talk about the times that we might have to protect all victims. We must protect the victims of tribal violence as well, and I believe the House version is superior to the Senate version in that area as well.

Madam Speaker, this is a very, very important issue, and I urge my colleagues to follow along and, again, to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the former chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution on the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York, JERRY NADLER. Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this bill is about women. It is about our sisters and daughters. It is about combating violence that no human being should ever face—rape, assault, sexual assault, homicide.

By offering an amendment that will further delay and even endanger the passage of the bill, Republicans are not just standing up for the men who abuse immigrants or for the men who rape Native American women; they are calling for justice and counseling and health care and protection for everyone. The Republican amendment would roll back protections for immigrants who are victims of domestic abuse by making it harder to obtain U visas. The new restrictions would deter undocumented immigrants from reporting assaults and from cooperating with police, leaving victims vulnerable.

The bipartisan Senate bill would add sexual orientation and gender identity to the eligibility for grant programs under VAWA, and it would include sexual orientation and gender identity as classes. The Republican amendment, by deleting these provisions, appears to hate LGBT persons or heterosexuals, and it is the Republican idea of equality in the 21st century.

Approval of the Republican amendment would delay the bill for weeks or months, or even kill the bill altogether, as it did in the last Congress. I hope that is not the true motive behind the amendment. However, the fact that Republicans in Congress have been waging a war on women from the moment they took control of the House does make you wonder.

It is time to reject this cynical ploy and pass the Senate's bipartisan Violence Against Women Act reauthorization now without amendment. I ask my colleagues to call for the votes to defeat the Republican amendment and for the Senate bill. We don't need a retrogressive House bill that goes back on existing protections and endangers passage of any bill. The Senate did a fine job on a bipartisan basis. We should pass its bill without delay and not engage in partisan retrogressive conduct.
The Republican leadership’s proposal leaves out updates to VAWA that protect college students, American Indians, LGBT people, and other underserved groups vulnerable to domestic violence. Victims advocates flat-out reject this proposal.

Even in today’s polarized political climate, we still need to be at least as wise as when we send our daughters and sons to college, they should be protected from stalking, violence, date rape, and sexual assault; that confidence of tribal women who have seen the victims of rape or domestic abuse should have equal access to justice no matter where the perpetrator lives; that domestic violence is still violence with no regard to gender identity or sexual orientation. The House should stop holding victims hostage.

It’s time for the House to stop playing politics with victims’ lives and pass the Senate version of VAWA.

The Republican leadership’s proposal leaves out updates to VAWA that protect college students, American Indians, LGBT people, and other underserved groups vulnerable to domestic violence. Victims advocates flat-out reject this proposal.

Even in today’s polarized political climate, we still need to be at least as wise as when we send our daughters and sons to college, they should be protected from stalking, violence, date rape, and sexual assault; that confidence of tribal women who have seen the victims of rape or domestic abuse should have equal access to justice no matter where the perpetrator lives; that domestic violence is still violence with no regard to gender identity or sexual orientation. The House should stop holding victims hostage.

It’s time for the House to stop playing politics with victims’ lives and pass the Senate version of VAWA.

(House of Representatives)
approach to address a serious epidemic of un- 

certified domestic abuse on Indian reser- 

vations. NCAI released a statement in opposi-

tion to the proposed House language this past 

Friday.

The solution is simple. We need tribal lead-

ers and advocates to make their voices heard 

that ‘Sovereignty is the solution; not the prob- 

lem’ and that tribes simply need jurisdiction to 

protect women. Also, tell them—if a House 

committee is summarily adopting the sensi-

tible solution that is H.R. 780, which was recently introduced by Congres- 

sman Darrell Issa (R-CA49) and ap- 

propriately balances defendants’ rights 

the urgent need to protect Native women 

from unfettered violence (See Sensible Solu-

tion for House Leadership section below for 

more H.R. 780).

THE HOUSE LEADERSHIP BILL ROLLS BACK 

CURRENT LAW

The recently proposed language from the 

House would roll back current law regarding 

tribal courts’ protection order jurisdiction. 

Currently, this is the only local and effective 

recurso Native women victims of violence 

arguably have against non-Indian perpetra-

tors. The 2000 VAWA Reauthorization included 

language which made it clear that every In-

dian tribe’s sovereignty need not be re-

stricted this jurisdiction significantly. Tribes 

would need to seek certification through the 

Attorney General to exercise this 

civil authority, and then the tribe would 

only retain the authority to issue protection 

orders over non-Indians if: they live or work 

on the reservation; or if they are, or have 

been, in an intimate relationship with a trib-

al member. This last requirement adds an 

unjust and unnecessary burden of proof to 

victims seeking immediate assistance from 

their local courts.

Also, the law—as drafted—would subject 

Indian tribes to federal statutes meant to 

apply to States, including numerous proc-

esses and procedures, which would apply on 

top of the tribal courts own practices and 

procedures (for specific examples, see discus-

sion below). This additional layer of proc-

esses and procedures will inevitably serve to 

frustrate justice in tribal courts, which are 

already subject to a strong and proven fed-

eral framework: the Indian Civil Rights Act of 

1968.

THE PROPOSED HOUSE SPECIAL DOMESTIC VIO-

LENCE JURISDICTION IS UNWORKABLE AND 

WOULD FRUSTRATE JUSTICE IN TRIBAL 

COURTS

Further, while the Senate bill recognizes 

an Indian tribe’s self-governance authority 

to protect Native women victims of violence, 

it adds additional protections for non-Indian 

defendants. Unfortunately, while the House 

bill offers unworkable federal oversight of 

tribal courts.

The recently proposed House legislation 

would add:

An interlocutory appeal process, as well as 

a direct review of the final judgment;

A right for tribes to be sued, which will 

provide even more opportunities for per-

petrators to avoid the tribal court system; and

A duty for the Attorney General to appoint 

not less than 10 qualified tribal prosecutors 

as special prosecutors, with a preference 

given to Indians not exercising this special domestic violence jurisdiction.

Time and time again, Indian tribes have 

proven that they are most efficient when they 

operate their sovereign jurisdiction. The cur-
ent Administration has continued a strong 
policy towards self-determination and self-

governance, and Congress should not allow 

from this policy.

THE SENSIBLE SOLUTION FOR HOUSE 

LEADERSHIP

Two weeks ago, Congressman Darrell Issa 

(R-CA49) introduced H.R. 780, which is a sensi-
tible solution to the concerns expressed by 

House Leadership. Currently, this bill con-

tinues to receive support from House mem-

bership. This bill would take the bipartisan-

passed Senate bill, which provides a full pan-

oply of protections for defendants, and add 

one additional measure—the right for the de-

fendant to remove his case to federal court 

upon a showing that the tribal court violated 

one of these protections.

In this manner, the Indian tribe retains ju-

risdiction, pledges to carry out justice in a 
manner consistent with tribal sovereignty, 

and avoid undue judicial delay in administering 

justice for Native women victims of violence.

This Issa-Cole bill is the sensible solution 

because its begins with the question: if it 

does Congress protect Native women?” and 

answers it in a sensible manner; rather than 

before the question of how will we protect 

alleged domestic abusers that evade prosecution 

because they abuse Indians on the reservation?”

Please call your representatives in Con-

gress and tell them you oppose the proposed 

House substitute for S. 47 and urge them to 

support H.R. 780 as the House compromise 

to the Senate bill. It is the sensible approach 

that recognizes tribal self-governance and 

protects Native women, while appropriately 

balancing defendants’ rights.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Madam Speaker, 

I reserve my time.

Mr. Issa. Madam Speaker, I’m pleased to 
yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the 

University of Virginia was murdered by 

her boyfriend. And so in the bill that 

we have passed, we have protected for Native American women, many of 

which is happening to her, how she 

is being held hostage because of her im-

migrant or non-immigrant status.

I say to you that every 9 seconds a wife 

is beaten in the United States. 1,000 to 

1,600 women die at the hands of their male 

partners even though we’ve made great strides in 

improving it under the Violence Against 

Women Act. One in five women have been 

raped in their lifetime. Four women have been the victim of severe 

physical violence.

We need the Senate compromise. We 

need the Senate bipartisan bill. Don’t 

vote for fuzzy legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the 

Republican Substitute for S. 47, the so-called 

Violence Against Women’s Reauthorization 

put forth by my House colleagues on the 

other side.

This is an essentially a closed-rule on a bill 

that for nearly two decades has been bipartisan 

and non-controversial. Today, the majority 

stands ready to ram a stripped-down version 

of VAWA down the throats of the American 

people. Unfortunately, the bipartisan version 

passed by the Senate with a vote of 78-22, 

including all of the women in the Senate, will 

not even see a vote in this body.

It would have been logical, expedient, and 
sensible if the Majority had simply taken up 

the bipartisan version. Ms. Jackson Lee’s 

VAWA amendment, which is a comprehensive 

update to the successful law which offers 

protections for all victims of violence. Out 

amendment is the Senate-passed version which on 

behavior of Congressmen CONVERS and many of 

my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, 

I put forth the case to take up this Senate 

version.

Over the last 18 years, VAWA has provided 

life-saving assistance to hundreds of thou-

sands of women, men, and children. Originally 

passed by Congress in 1993 as part of the 

Violence Against Women and Law Enforcement 

Act of 1994, this landmark bipartisan legisla-

tion was enacted in response to the preva-

lence of domestic and sexual violence and the
significant impact that such violence has on the lives of women.

Today, as I stand on the Floor of the House, I realize that the majority has made some changes to the Senate-passed bill—that point to a disturbing pattern since the tenor, tone, and overall thrust of this bill looks like a repeat of H.R. 4970, which we passed last year.

This Act offered a comprehensive approach to reducing this violence and marked a national commitment to reverse the legacy of laws and social norms that served to excuse, and even legitimize, violence against women.

Originally championed by then-Senator JOSEPH BIDEN and Judiciary Committee Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr., the original VAWA was supported by a broad coalition of experts and advocates including law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, victim services providers, faith leaders, health care professionals, and survivors. The law has since been reauthorized two times—in 2000 and 2005—with strong bipartisan approval in Congress and with overwhelming support from states and local communities.

If I were a commentator looking in, I’d be pressed to ask what Frankenstei...
I urge my colleagues to reject this flawed bill and call upon this body to work with the Senate to pass bipartisan legislation that helps women—and does not go back on decades of work.

VAWA was created because Congress recognized the significant value of being used as a weapon by abusers. S. 47 would return that weapon to abusers. H.R. 4970 would roll back years of progress and bi-partisan commitment on the part of Congress to protect vulnerable immigrant victims of domestic violence, stalking, and sex crimes. The provision in H.R. 4970 would allow the government to remove immigrants if they have a record of domestic violence. The provision would be one of the most Draconian measures to ever pass the House. It is an affront to basic fairness, due process, and the promise of a future free from violence.

In short, H.R. 4970 denies victims protection and even helps perpetrate the very abuse from which they are seeking to escape.

S. 47 would place immigrant victims of domestic violence who seek lawful status in the U.S. at risk. VAWA “self-petitioning” was created in 1994 to assist immigrant victims of domestic violence and provided them with a means to continue their protected status and help law enforcement agencies determine the safety of our communities.

Second, under S. 47, a victim of domestic violence would have to prove that the abuse was committed by a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident. H.R. 4970 would remove this provision and allow the government to deport the victim and the perpetrator even if the victim has already sought safety in this country for years.

S. 47 creates a more complex and burdensome process for obtaining a U-visa. H.R. 4970 would require that the victim prove that the abuse was committed by a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident and that the immigrant victim is the victim of a crime on the part of the perpetrator that resulted in a sentence of one year or longer. H.R. 4970 would also require that the victim prove that the abuse was committed by a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident and that the immigrant victim is the victim of a crime on the part of the perpetrator that resulted in a sentence of one year or longer.

S. 47 would deny victims the opportunity to apply for a green card. In 2000, the “U” Visa was created as part of VAWA to encourage vulnerable victims of particularly serious crimes to come forward and report those crimes by removing the fear that they, rather than the perpetrator, would wind up in immigration detention or deportation. When victims of crimes are afraid to go to the police, we are all less safe. H.R. 4970 would undermine the U-process by making the U-visa only temporary, with no eligibility to apply for future lawful permanent residence status.

The S. 47 Republican substitute retains a few of the helpful provisions included in S. 1925. These include:

- Permitting children of VAWA self-petitioners to obtain derivative status if the petitioner passes away during the application process;

- Eliminating the public charge ground of inadmissibility for VAWA self-petitioners and U-visa holders;

- Age-out protections for children of U-visa holders who were under 21 at the time that the parent applied for U-visa status and age-out protections for U-visa holders who were minors at the time of application for U-visa status so that their relatives can still join them.

I call on the Members of the House to vote down this nefarious, ill-conceived piece of legislation.
abuse, further complicate the maze of injustice that exists on Indian lands, and exacerbate the epidemic of violence against Native women.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handcuffs the local tribal judicial systems, including some non-Native exceptions, target Indian reservations for their crimes, and hide behind these loopholes in federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

The result: nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped or assaulted at least once in their lifetime, and more than 1 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates in Indian lands has haunted Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. This bipartisan Senate-passed bill, which takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority. Conversely, the House Substitute would cut back on existing protections for Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. This bipartisan Senate-passed bill, which takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority. Conversely, the House Substitute would cut back on existing protections for Native women.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handcuffs the local tribal judicial system. As a result, some non-Native men, target Indian reservations for their crimes, and hide behind these loopholes in federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

The result: nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped or assaulted at least once in their lifetime, and more than 1 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found that, on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 also provides the full range of constitutional protections to abuse suspects who would be subject to the authority of tribal courts.

The House VAWA Substitute rejects the bipartisan and narrowly tailored approach adopted by the Senate. The most offensive provision in the House Substitute would reverse the only tool currently available to tribal governments: the ability to issue and enforce civil orders of protection against non-Native men who abuse Indian women. The House Substitute irresponsibly cuts back on this existing authority.
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DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND CRAPO: The American Probation and Parole Association (APPa) represents over 35,000 pretrial, probation, parole and community corrections professionals working in the criminal and juvenile justice systems nationally and come from federal, state, local and tribal jurisdictions. On behalf of our membership and constituents we wholeheartedly support your efforts to have the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) reauthorized.

The VAWA initiatives have supported state, local and tribal efforts to effectively address the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. These efforts have shown great progress and promise towards keeping victims safe and holding perpetrators accountable. The reauthorization of VAWA is critical to maintaining the progress of current initiatives and ensuring comprehensive and effective responses to these crimes in the future for the protection of all victims, without consideration of race, ethnicity or sexual orientation.

Domestic violence perpetrators represent a significant proportion of the total population on community supervision. In 2008 there were nearly 86,000 adults on probation for a domestic violence offense in United States, and data from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation states that in 2011 approximately 90% of adults convicted of felony domestic violence offenses in that state were sentenced to a period of probation, either alone or concurrent with incarceration. Domestic violence offenders are among the most dangerous offenders on community supervision caseloads, and in order to supervise domestic violence offenders effectively, community corrections professionals must receive adequate training.

Since its original passage in 1994, VAWA has been instrumental in increasing our constituents’ attention to and understanding of these crimes as well as providing significant assistance in humanizing their responsiveness to victims and improving their practices related to accountability and intervention with perpetrators of these crimes. VAWA has without question been instrumental in developing community supervision practices that keep offenders and their victims safe from future harm and improved compliance and behavioral change for perpetrators.

We stand ready to assist you throughout the reauthorization process. If you have any questions or require further information or assistance, please feel free to contact me at cwicklund@csg.org or 859-244-8216.

Sincerely,

CARL WICKLUND, Executive Director,

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE, Baltimore, MD, February 1, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY, U.S. Senator, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO, U.S. Senator, Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO:

On behalf of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS), the national organization that established LIRS in 1954 on behalf of Lutheran churches in the United States to welcome immigrants and refugees, thank you for reintroducing the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) (S. 47).

As you are aware, there are many cases in which immigration status is used as a tool for abuse, leading victims to remain in abusive relationships and contributing to the underreporting of serious crimes to local enforcement officials. The creation of the U visa in 2000 by Congress to encourage migrant victims to report criminal offenses to officials has been extremely helpful in advancing assistance to victims of human trafficking and other crimes. However, the need for U visas is significant. In 2012, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ran out of available U visas over a month prior to the end of the fiscal year. Therefore, the lack of a vital increase in the number of available U visas in S. 47 is extremely disappointing. However, I am encouraged by your commitment to increase the cap on U visas as part of immigration reform legislation.

While I applaud efforts to swiftly move VAWA through both chambers of Congress, I caution against any use of VAWA as a means to expand immigration enforcement provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. These changes would be detrimental to the central purpose of VAWA—to address the critical issues of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and human trafficking—and should remain outside of the VAWA debate.

LIRS commends your leadership in advancing this bill and we are excited to continue our efforts to ensure the inclusion of provisions to protect vulnerable migrant victims in upcoming legislation. Please contact Brittney Nystrom, LIRS Director for Advocacy, at 202-626-7943 or via email at bnystrom@lirs.org with any questions.

Yours in faith,

LINDA J. HARTKE, President and CEO, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, Chicago, IL, January 30, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY, Russell Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL D. CRAPO, Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND CRAPO:

On behalf of the American Bar Association (ABA), which represents half of the American Bar Association (ABA), I commend your leadership in bringing both chambers of Congress to the understanding that the legal profession is committed by non-Indian perpetrators."

August 2012: urging Congress “to strengthen tribal jurisdiction to address crimes of gender-based violence on tribal lands that are committed by non-Indian perpetrators.”

VAWA reauthorization was a legislative priority for the association during the 112th Congress and a focus of our annual grass-roots lobbying event, ABA Day 2012, when ABA, state, local, and specialty bar leaders from all 50 states met with members of Congress of both parties on this issue.

VAWA reauthorization remains a priority for the American Bar Association during the 113th Congress. We appreciate your leadership and look forward to working with you to ensure passage of this legislation.

Sincerely,

LAUREL G. BELLows.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD a number of letters from advocacy and nonprofit groups in opposition to the House substitute and in support of the Senate-passed bill.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZA-
TION ACT OF 2013 HAS BROAD NATIONAL SUP-
PORT

More than 1400 local, state, tribal, and national organizations have expressed their strong support for passage of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2011 (S. 47), including national service providers and victim advocates, law enforcement organizations, and faith-based organizations.

VICTIM SERVICES PROVIDERS AND ADVOCATES

9 15, National Association of Working Women

Alianza-National Latino Alliance to End Domestic Violence

Alternatives to family Violence

American Bar Association

American Bar Association Commission on Domestic Violence

American Medical Association

Americans Overseas Domestic Crisis Center

Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence

AsISTA Immigration Assistance Association of Jewish Family and Children’s Agencies

Break the Cycle

Casa de Esperanza: National Latino Network for Healthy Families and Communities

Daughters of Penelope

Earle Futures Without Violence (formerly the Family Violence Project)

Gay Men’s Domestic Violence Project

Institute on Domestic Violence in the African-American Community

Jewish Women International

Legal Momentum

Men Can Stop Rape

Men’s Resources International

National Association of VOGA Assistance Administrators

National-Alliance to End Sexual Violence

National Center for Victims of Crime

In recent years, the ABA has adopted policies that specifically address VAWA reauthorization, including some of the more challenging issues that ultimately proved to be barriers to reauthorization during the last Congress:

February 2010: urging reauthorization and highlighting the need for legislation that promotes justice for underserved and vulnerable victims of violence, including children and youth who are victims or witnesses to family violence, and victims who are disabled, elderly, immigrant, trafficked, LGBT and/or Indian."

H786

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
National Association of Hispanic Organizations.
National Association of Human Rights Workers.
National Association of Social Workers.
National Association of State Head Injury Administrators.
National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators.
National Black Justice Coalition.
National Center for Lesbian Rights.
National Center for Transgender Equality.
National Center for Victims of Crime.
National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence.
National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women.
National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development.
National Coalition for LGBT Health.
National Coalition of 100 Black Women.
National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP).
National Coalition on Black Civic Participation.
National Committee for the Prevention of Elder Abuse.
National Community Reinvestment Coalition.
National Congress of American Indians.
National Congress of American Indians.
National Council of Churches, USA.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA.
National Council of Women's Organizations.
National Council on Independent Living.
National Domestic Violence Hotline.
National Education Association.
National Employment Law Project.
National Fair Housing Alliance.
National Family Justice Center Alliance.
National Focus on Gender Education.
National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Action Fund.
National Health Law Program.
National Hispanic Council on Aging.
National Housing Law Project.
National Immigration Law Center.
National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.
National Latino/a Psychological Association.
National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty.
National Legal Aid and Defender Association.
National Low Income Housing Coalition.
National Network to End Domestic Violence.
National Organization for Women (NOW).
National Organization for Women, Miracle Mile LA chapter.
National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.
National Partnership for Women and Families.
National Research Center for Women & Families.
National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.
National Stonewall Democrats.
National Urban League.
National WIC Association.
National Women's Law Center.
National Women's Political Caucus.
National Women's Health Network.
National Women's Law Center.
National Women's Political Caucus.
NCJW Seattle section.
NCJUV Utah.
NETWORK A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby.
NLPA.
Nursing Network on Violence against Women International.
NVC Academy.
Ohio NOW.
One Woman's Voice.
Our Bodies Ourselves.
Peaceful Families Project.
People for the American Way.
PFLAC National.
Planned Parenthood Federation of America.
Rape Crisis Services.
Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN).
Reformed Church in America.
Refugee Women's Network.
Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice.
Rural Women's Health Project.
Rural Womyn Zone.
Ryan Immigration Law.
Safe Nation Collaborative.
Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law.
Sauti Yeta.
School and College Organization for Prevention Educators.
Seattle Chapter National Organization for Women.
Secular Woman.
Self Empowerment Strategies.
SERS-Jobs for Progress National Inc.
Share Time Wisely Consulting Services.
Shore Area NOW.
Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault.
Sisters of Mercy Institute Justice Team.
Sojourners.
South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT).
Southern Poverty Law Center.
Spittin' Out the Pitts.
SuhailWebb.com.
Survivors In Service.
Ta'hirah Justice Center.
Take Back The Night.
The Episcopal Church.
The Jewish Federations of North America.
The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.
The Leadership Council on Civil and Human Rights.
The Line Campaign.
The National Council on Independent Living.
The National Resource Center Against Domestic Violence.
The Sentencing Project.
The United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society.
The Voice of Midlife and Older Women.
Transgender Law Center.
U.S. National Committee for UN Women.
UAW Union for Reform Judaism.
Union Veterans Council, AFL-CIO.
Unitarian Universalist Association.
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries.
United Food and Commercial Workers International Union.
United States Hispanic Leadership Institute.
United Steelworkers.
UniteWomen.org.
US National Committee for UN Women.
US women Connect.
USAction.
V-Day.
Veteran Feminists of America.
Victim Rights Law Center.
Vital Voices Global Partnership.
We Are Woman.
West Pinellas National Organization for Women.
Wild Iris Family Counseling and Crisis Center.
Winning Strategies.
Witnes Justice.
Women Enabled, Inc.
Women of Color Network.
Women of Reform Judaism.
Women, Action & the Media.
Women's Environment and Development Organization.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
U.S. Section.
Women's Action for New Directions.
Women's Business Development Center.
Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press.
W Nope: International League for Peace and Freedom.
Women's Media Center.
Woodhull Sexual Freedom Alliance.
YWCA USA.
STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS.
51st State NOW.
9065 Atlanta.
9065 Atlanta Working Women.
9065 Bay Area.
9065 California.
9065 Colorado.
9065 Los Angeles.
9065 Milwaukee.
A Safe Place.
A Safe Place Domestic Violence Shelter.
A Woman's Place.
AAUW, Big Bear Valley Branch.
AAUW, Honolulu women's coalition, others.
Abuse & Rape Crisis Shelter, Warren County.
Abuse Alternatives, Inc.
Abuse Prevention Council.
ACCESS Social Services.
ADRCGNS, Inc.
ADV & SAS.
Advocacy Resource Center.
Advocacy Resource Center.
Advocate Safehouse Project.
Advocates Crisis Support services.
Advocates for a Violence-Free Community.
Advocates for Victims of Assault.
African Services Committee.
After The Trauma, Inc.
Aging Resources.
Alabama-NOW.
Alamosa County Sheriff's Office.
Alamosa Victim Response Unit.
Albany Law School.
Alice Paul House.
ALIVE Alliance of Leaders in Violence Elimination.
Allie-KisLei Area HOPE Center, Inc.
Alliance Against Domestic Abuse.
Alliance Against Family Violence and Sexual Assault.
Alliant International University.
ALLYSHIP.
Alumni for Social Responsibility.
Alumni for Social Responsibility.
American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Hawaii Section.
American Gateways.
American Indians Against Abuse.
Angels Recovery & Spirituality.
Anna Marie's Alliance.
Anne Arundel County NOW.
API Chaya.
Apa Ghar, Inc. ("Our Home").
Arab American Association of New York.
Arab American Family Service.
Archuleta County Victim Assistance Program.
Shasta Women’s Refuge
Shelter from the Storm
Shenandoah Women’s Center, Inc.
Silver Regional Sexual Assault Support Services
Sinclair Comm College
Sinclair Community College—Domestic Violence Task Force
SKIL Resource Center Inc.
SLV Regional Medical Center
Sojourn Services For Battered Women And Their Children
Sojourn Shelter & Services, Inc
Sojourner Family Peace Center
Sojourner House
Sojourners House
Solaris Crisis Treatment Center
SourceCenter
Sophia Safe
South Asian Association (SAN)
South Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
South Dakota Coalition Ending Domestic & Sexual Violence
South Jersey NOW—Alice Paul Chapter
South Peninsula Haven House
South Suburban Family Shelter
Southern Suburbs Family Violence Programs
Southern Arizona Center Against Sexual Assault
Southern New Mexico Human Development, INC
Southwest Counseling Center
SpeakOut Georgia LGTB Anti-Violence
Squirrel Hill NOW
St Vincent’s Hospital
St. Agnes Hospital Domestic Violence Program
WAND! for Families Free of Violence
Starting Point: Services for Victims of Domestic & Sexual Violence
StoneWall Democratic Club
Streamwood Police Department
Strong Hearted Native Women’s Coalition, Inc
Sun City Democratic Club
Sun City-West Valley NOW
Support Center at Burch House
Support in Abusive Family Emergencies, Inc (S.A.F.E.)
Susan B. Anthony Project, Inc.
Susquehanna County Victim Services
Tacoma Women of Vision NGO
Tahiri Justice Center
Taos SANE at Holy Cross Hospital
Tennessee Citizen Action
Tennessee Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
Tessa of Colorado Springs
Tewa Women United
Texas Council on Family Violence
Texas Muslim Women’s Foundation
The Break Away Group
The Bridge to Hope
The Center for Prevention of Abuse
The Center for Sexual Assault Crisis Counseling and Education
The Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health
The Center for Women and Families
The Center for Women and Families of Eastern Fairfield County
The Center for Women in Transition
The Domestic Violence Shelter, Inc. Richland County, Ohio
The Family Center
The Family Place
The Family Place, Dallas TX
The Good Shepard Shelter
The Haven of RCS
The Hispanic Interest Coalition of Alabama (HICA)
The Latina Safehouse
The Mary Byron Project
The Network/Le Red
The People’s Press Project
The SAAPE Center
The Second Step
The Sexual Assault Prevention Program
The Sexual Assault Response Network of Central Ohio
The Underground Railroad, Inc.
The Women’s Center, Inc.
Three Rivers Defense
Transitions
Travis County Attorney’s Office
Tri-County Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Inc.
Tri-County Mental Health and Counseling
Trinity Episcopal Church
Tri-Valley Haven
Tu Casa, Inc.
Tulsa Immigrant Resource Network, University of Tulsa College of Law
Turning Point
Turning Point for Women and Families
Turning Point, Inc.
TX Network Against Sexual Assault
Uncharted At Last
Underground Railroad (URR)
UNIDOS Against Domestic Violence
United Action for Idaho
United Migrant Opportunity Services
United Services, Inc.
Uniting Three Fires Against Violence
University of Tulsa College of Law
University of Louisville PEACC Program
University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic
UNO Immigration Ministry
UoM-Dearborn Student Philanthropy Council
Upper Ohio Valley Sexual Assault Help Center
Utah Assistive Technology Foundation
Utah Domestic Violence Council
Utah Women’s Lobby
Valencia Counseling Service Inc.
Valley Crisis Center
Vera House, Inc.
Vermillion County Rape Crisis Center
Vermont Center for Independent Living
Vermont Council on Domestic Violence
Vermont Legal Aid, Inc.
Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
Victim Resource Center of the Finger Lakes, Inc.
Victim Services Inc.
Victim Services South Georgia Judicial Circuit
Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk Victims Resource Center
Victim-Witness Assistance Services
Violence Free Coalition
Violence Intervention Program
Violence Intervention Project, Inc.
Violence Prevention Center of Southeastern IL
Violence Prevention Center of Southwestern Illinois
Virginia Anti-Violence Project
Virginia NOW
Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action Alliance
VOA Home Free
VOA Oregon—Home Free
VOICE Sexual Assault Services
Voices Against Violence
Voices Against Violence/Laurie’s House
VOICES DV Stephenson County
Voices of Hope
Volunteer at first step Detroit
Volunteer Attorneys for Rural Nevadans
Volunteer Lawyers Network
VSF & P, LLC
WA State National Organization for Women
Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs
Washington Community Action Network
Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Wayne County Chapter, National Organization for Women
Additional Organizations
Given the nature of the organizations listed, they generally focus on providing support and services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and other forms of abuse. These organizations range from legal support and counseling to physical shelters and advocacy groups. They operate across various regions, including rural, urban, and metropolitan areas, and collaborate with other organizations to prevent and address violence. Their efforts are crucial in creating safer environments and providing necessary resources for those affected by domestic and sexual violence.
West Ohio Annual Conference Team on Domestic Violence & Human Trafficking
West Valley City Victim Services
West Virginia Citizen Action Group
West Virginia Coalition Against Domestic Violence
West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information and Services
Wild Iris Women's Service in Bishop, Inc.
William Kellibrew Foundation
WIN
WINDOW Victim Services
WINGS Program, Inc.
WIRC-CAA Victim Services
WIRC-CAA Victim Services
Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault
Wisconsin Coalition of Independent Living Centers
Wisconsin Community Fund
Wisconsin NOW
WOMAN, Inc.
WOMAN'S PLACE
Womanspace, Inc.
Women Against Abuse
Women and Children's Horizons
Women and Families Center
Women Helping Women Lanai
Women In Need
WOMEN IN SAFE HOME, INC
Women In Transition
Women of Color and Allies Essex County
NOW Chapter
Women Services Inc.
Women's Aid in Crisis
Women's Aid Service, Inc.
Women's and Children's Crisis Shelter, Inc.
Women's Business Development Center
Women's Center of Greater Danbury, Inc.
Women's Center of Jacksonville
Women's Center of the Desert, Inc.
Women's Coalition of St. Croix
Women's Crisis Center
Women’s Crisis Support-Defensa de Mujeres
Women's Information Network
Women's Law Project
Women’s Medical Center of Rhode Island
Women’s Resource Center for the Grand Traverse Area
Women’s Resources of Monroe County, Inc.
Women’s Services
Women’s Services Inc
Women's Shelter of South Texas
WOMEN’S WAY
WomenSafe
WordsMatter.Episcopal Expansive Language Project
WV Coalition Against Domestic Violence
WV NOW
Wyckoff Heights Medical Center—Violence Intervention and Treatment Program
Wyoming Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
Yavapai Family Advocacy Center
Your Community Connection Family Crisis Center
Youth Development Clinic
YWCA Adirondack Foothills
YWCA Alaska
YWCA Bellingham
YWCA Bergen County
YWCA Binghamton & Broome County
YWCA Bradford
YWCA Brooklyn
YWCA Central Carolinas
YWCA Central New Jersey
YWCA Central Virginia
YWCA Charleston WV
YWCA City of New York
YWCA Clark County
YWCA Cortland
YWCA Darin-Norwalk
YWCA Dayton
YWCA Dutchess County

YWCA DVPC
YWCA Eastern Union County
YWCA Elgin
YWCA Elmira & The Twin Tiers
YWCA Evanston North Shore
YWCA Fort Worth & Tarrant County
YWCA Genesee County
YWCA GLA
YWCA Glendale, CA
YWCA Greater Baltimore
YWCA Greater Cincinnati
YWCA Greater Flint
YWCA Greater Harrisburg
YWCA Greater Milwaukee
YWCA Green Bay
YWCA Greenbook
YWCA Hamilton
YWCA Hartford Region
YWCA Jamestown
YWCA Kalama
YWCA Kankakee
YWCA Kauai
YWCA Kitsap County
YWCA Lancaster
YWCA Madison
YWCA McLean County
YWCA MI
YWCA Metropolitan Chicago
YWCA Missoula
YWCA Mohawk Valley
YWCA Nashville & Middle Tennessee
YWCA National Capital Area
YWCA New Britain
YWCA New York City
YWCA Niagara
YWCA Northcentral PA/Wise Options
YWCA O'ahu
YWCA Oklahoma City
YWCA Orange County
YWCA Palm Beach County
YWCA Pierce County
YWCA Princeton
YWCA Queens
YWCA Rochester & Monroe County
YWCA Rock County
YWCA Rockford
YWCA Salt Lake City
YWCA San Diego County
YWCA Sauk Valley
YWCA Schenectady
YWCA Seattle/King/Snohomish
YWCA Southeast Wisconsin
YWCA Spokane
YWCA St. Joseph (MO)
YWCA Syracuse & Onondaga County
YWCA Tocumanas
YWCA Trenton
YWCA Troy-Cohoes
YWCA Tulsa
YWCA Ulster County
YWCA Victims' Resource Center
YWCA Walla Walla
YWCA West Central Michigan
YWCA Western MA
YWCA Western New York
YWCA Wheeling
YWCA White Plains/Westchester
YWCA Yakima
YWCA Yankees
YWCA York
YWCA Youngstown
YWCA SARF
Zacharias Sexual Abuse Center
TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS
Samish Indian Nation
Alaska Federation of Natives
Sealaska Heritage Institute
Advocacy Resource Center
American Indian Task Force on DV/SA & Vulnerable Populations, Inc.
Fort Belknap Indian Community
Great Plains Tribal Chairmen’s Association
Hoopa Valley Tribe
Kene Me-Wa, American Indian DV/SA Program
Muscogee (Creek) Nation

Pechanga Indian Reservation
Pueblo of Tesuque
Samish Indian Nation
Sault Sainte Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians
Sault tribe Advocacy Resource Center
Susanville Indian Rancheria
Save Wyiaphi Project
Uniting Three Fires Against Violence

Mrs. MCORRIS RODGERS. I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. CONYERS. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN- son), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.
Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Today, Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this hyperpartisan and inhumane House substitute version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. This version is inhumane and cynical because it removes certain classes of individuals from the protections of the act as guaranteed by the Senate version.
This inhumane House version removes all references to gender identity and sexual orientation, ignoring evidence that domestic and sexual violence also affects LGBT victims at equal or greater levels than the rest of the population.
It also limits protections for Native American women and omits some protections for immigrant women. Why would we want to exclude these populations from coverage? Vote “no” on the House substitute.

Mrs. MCORRIS RODGERS. I continue to reserve.
Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, to close the debate on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Ms. CHU. I rise to oppose the House amendment. For nearly 20 years, Congress worked on a bipartisan basis to expand and improve the Violence Against Women Act. On three separate occasions, we found common purpose in protecting survivors of domestic violence. Today, we will try again.
The Senate bill protects immigrant, LGBT, and Native American victims. The amendment takes this all away.
Right now, an immigrant woman who fears deportation could be terrorized by a violent state. She would have no choice but to continue to live every day in fear. The Senate bill fixes this by giving this immigrant woman a legal means by which to save her life. This amendment would deny that protection.
The point of this law is to protect the vulnerable, not to cherry-pick who matters. It’s time to return to bipartisanship and protect victims. It’s time for the House to pass the Senate VAWA bill as is. We must oppose this amendment.

Mrs. MCORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina
(Mr. GOWDY) to close, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOWDY. Liz Chesterman was an honors graduate from Hollins University in Virginia. Then she got her Ph.D. in molecular biology. Then she became a patent agent with the largest law firm in the Carolinas. And she still isn’t done. At night, she would sit in the kitchen and study for the LSAT. She was going to go to law school. She wanted to be a doctor and a lawyer. But her greatest accomplishment was her character. She was smart, hard-working, a source of joy and inspiration in the lives of everyone who worked with her and knew her.

And with just a little bit of luck, Madam Speaker, Liz Chesterman could be speaking to you from the floor of the House of Representatives. With just a little bit of luck, she would be representing South Carolina in Congress. But she’s not in the House of Representatives. She’s working in Fort Washington, Maryland. Her husband couldn’t stand her success, so he abused her. She tried to escape, and she almost made it. She made it to the back door, where he met her with a shovel, and he broke every single bone in her face. And then he nearly decapitated her, leaving her in a pool of blood in the kitchen where she used to study for the LSAT.

I run into her mom from time to time, Madam Speaker, in South Carolina. She comes back for a victims right service. She’s just like Liz, warm and compassionate. And she always asks: What can I do to help? Imagine that, a mother who lost a daughter in such a horrific way wants to help.

And that got me wondering, well, maybe we should be asking what we can do to help because we really can help. We can provide women a safe harbor. We can provide the means to leave abusive relationships. We can provide women the counseling that they need. We can accelerate the prosecution of sexual assault cases so women don’t have to wait and wonder and worry about whether or not they’re going to be abused again before the case gets to trial. We can do all of that; but, I think, Madam Speaker, we can do more.

When my daughter was little, she would ask me to look under her bed for monsters, and I did. But as our little girls grow into women, we realize the monsters are not under the bed. The monsters are in the bed and in the den and in the kitchen and on the college campus. Madam Speaker, the halls of law schools and on the computer and on the phone. And for some women, especially today, the monster is this broken political system that we have, a broken political system which manufactures reasons to oppose otherwise good bills just to deny one side a victory.

The House version protects every single American, period, but it will not get a single Democrat vote because it is our version. Welcome to our broken political system. I never ask a victim if she is a Republican or a Democrat. I never ask a police officer if he or she is a Republican or a Democrat. I never ask a counselor if she is a Republican or a Democrat. I never ask an insurance company if they are a Republican or a Democrat. I never ask a prosecutor if they are a Republican or a Democrat. I never ask a judge if they are a Republican or a Democrat. I never ask a queue of a victim if they are a Republican or a Democrat because there are some things that ought to be bigger than politics, and protecting people who cannot protect themselves ought to be one of them.

And I had hoped that the House bill would allow us, Madam Speaker, to join arms and walk on a common journey of protecting people who are innocent and cannot protect themselves. And I had hoped, Madam Speaker, that this fractured body could possibly be healed by something that ought to be nonpartisan, like protecting women against violence. And I had hoped, Madam Speaker, that just for 1 day, just for 1 day, that we could put aside the political points against each other and try to score political points for other people. And I had hoped, Madam Speaker, that just for 1 day this body could speak with one clear, strong voice for all the women who are too tired and too scared and too hurt and too dead to speak for themselves. I had hoped that today would be the day.

Maybe next time, Madam Speaker, maybe next time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this comprehensive Violence Against Women Act reauthorization that passed the Senate by an overwhelming 78–22 bipartisan majority. Today is a victory for America’s women—and for the possibility of bipartisanship on important matters before the U.S. Congress.

This reauthorization strengthens the Violence Against Women Act by protecting all victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and human trafficking. It authorizes vital funding for law enforcement to investigate and prosecute these abuses, and it includes provisions to make college campuses safer and to reduce the current rape kit backlog.

Madam Speaker, the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act is endorsed by over 1500 organizations nationwide and was supported by every Democrat, every woman senator, and a majority of Senate Republicans. We should enact it without any further delay.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Madam Speaker, I stand here today to urge my colleagues to bring the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act—a bill that would provide critical services to all victims of domestic abuse—to the House floor.

We are in agreement with two versions of this bill—a GOP House bill that waters down protections and a Senate bill that provides equal protections.

As for the altered House version, which clearly rejects the equal protections outlined in the Senate version . . . it is unfair, unjust, and unacceptable.

The House substitute removes all references to “gender identity” and “sexual orientation,” despite clear evidence revealing that domestic and sexual violence affects LGBT victims at equal or greater levels than the rest of the population.

Rather than give tribes the authority they need to protect Indian women, the House substitute limits tribes to charging an abuser with misdemeanor punishable by no more than 1 year in prison and $10,000 for a crime of domestic violence, committed rape, a vicious assault, or another serious violent crime.

Unlike the Senate bill, the House bill jeopardizes domestic abuse survivors by including legislation that would make Indian reservation judges to use unreliable evidence to deport persons who have been convicted of domestic violence charges.

I urge the rejection of the GOP House bill and the reauthorization of the Senate version of VAWA. The Senate version will make sure our LGBT brothers and sisters receive appropriate care when they are victimized; it will assure that immigrants, striving proudly toward citizenship, will not have to hide behind their abusers in fear of deportation; and, we can make sure that the three out of five American Indian women who will experience domestic violence in their lifetime can have the peace of mind to know that their abusers will not be given a way out of prosecution.

Equal protection should never be open to political gamesmanship. Equal protection is simply the right thing to do.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, during my service in Congress representing Central Washington, I have always voted to renew the Violence Against Women Act. As a husband, a father, and a grandfather, I strongly support equal protection for all women against domestic violence a duty and a priority. Yet I am deeply dismayed by the manner in which the current reauthorization of this legislation (S. 47), which has long been a simple grant program, has been hijacked in order to pursue unrelated political agendas in very harsh politicalized terms. To be blunt, the bill is simply unconstitutional.

The Indian tribal provisions of S. 47 are the first time in the history of our country that Congress will give tribes greater authority over non-Indians. The provisions, found in sections 904 and 905, declare that a tribe’s power of self-government includes the “inherent” power of that tribe to exercise jurisdiction over all persons, including non-Indians.

As I’ve said, these provisions are unconstitutional and contradict over two centuries of law.

There are three fundamental principles underlying how Congress may deal with Indian tribes. First, the Indian Commerce Clause, as interpreted by the Supreme Court and the Constitution, give Congress what the Supreme Court has said is “plenary” power over Indian affairs. Second, tribes are defined by the Indian status of their members. Third, when tribes were brought under the jurisdiction of the United States through act, treaties, and Executive Orders, they have been recognized for the purpose of self-government over their internal affairs and members. Congress may recognize, or terminate, tribes.

With these principles in mind, it is clear that the Indian tribal provisions of the Senate bill are both unconstitutional and violate the rights of all American citizens—on American soil—under the criminal jurisdiction of a political entity to which the individual, because of his
race, may not consent. It violates the founding principle of this Republic, which is a government only at the consent of the governed.

The bill overturns all precedents set by Congress and the Supreme Court through its extension of a unique, self-governing power over internal affairs of a race of people, into a territorial matter everywhere. Supreme Court has long held that because tribes are not parties to the Constitution, the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, do not apply to tribes.

In tribal court, an individual only has something called the Indian Civil Rights Act. This provides a set of similar—but not identical—rights as the Bill of Rights. They may be amended or repealed by mere Act of Congress. Even if the rights were meaningful, however, the Supreme Court in 1978 said these statutory rights are unenforceable in federal court.

Does S. 47 provide a defendant with the right to appeal a tribal judgment and conviction in federal court? No, it does not.

Section 904 of S. 47 openly allows discrimination against an individual based on race, sex, age, or if he’s an Indian, who he’s related to. Where the person’s an American citizen, can be expelled from their home and may not have any right to appeal a claim in an impartial federal court.

As a result, enactment of Section 904 will be the first time that Congress has purposefully removed a U.S. citizen’s constitutional rights while on American soil so that a political entity defined according to ethnic ancestry may arrest, try, and punish the citizen.

If there were not sound familiar to all, it will be to those who have studied the pertinent case law and Supreme Court precedent from the 18th century to present.

Beginning in modern times with Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, the Supreme Court held that tribes lack inherent jurisdiction over non-Indians. Congress cannot recognize and affirm an inherent—that is to say a pre-existing and continuing—power in a tribe when the Supreme Court ruled the tribe never had it.

There’s Duro v. Reina, in which the High Court held that Indian tribes lack jurisdiction over non-member Indians.

In the 19th century, the Supreme Court in United States v. Kagama declared there are only two sovereigns in the geographical limits of the United States, and tribes are not one of them.

Case law, statutes, treaties, and historic dealings with Indian tribes support the sole purpose of federal Indian law and policy: to permit a racially defined group of people who were here first to continue their unique way of life according to their own customs, without interference from others.

This is an honorable and morally correct policy, one which I respect and uphold. This is why I cosponsored legislation to exempt tribes from a federal law permitting compulsory union work places on the reservation and supported enactment of Indian tribes in the Department of the Interior’s onerous hydraulic frac-turing rule, a rule that could devastate the economies of historically impoverished tribes.

For further clarification, let us examine the work of the distinguished former Democrat Chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, the late Lloyd Meeds of Washington.

Chairman Meeds wrote that tribal powers “have over and again been labeled self-governing and not sovereignty. It is one thing for the Congress to permit tribal Indians to govern themselves and not be subject to Federal constitutional limitations and general Federal supervision. It is quite another thing for Congress to permit Indian tribes to function as general governmental entities not subject to Federal constitutional limitations and general Federal supervision.” (Separate Dissenting Views of Congressman Lloyd Meeds, D–Washington, Vice Chairman of the American Indian Policy Review Commission, Final Report, p. 579)

“The American people have not surrendered to Indians the power of general government; Indians are given only a power of self-government. They have the power to regulate only their members and the property of their members. They have some governmental powers because and to the extent that such powers are appropriate to the Federal policy of allowing Indian peoples to control their own affairs. But there is no Federal policy of allowing Indian peoples to control the liberty and property of non-members. Tribal powers of self-government are limited by their purpose.” (Ibid, p. 585).

Our Nation has appropriately recognized Indian tribes’ right of self-government. Tribal self-government over Indians and their internal affairs is important and should be respected. Yet self-government does not and should not permit Indian tribal actions to trump the Constitution or violate individual rights of non-Indians.

With the precedent being set under S. 47, tribes will return to Congress for more, expanded power over non-Indians. There would be no reason to deny granting such power, especially if the Constitution continues to be viewed as an obstacle to addressing crime.

It is important to be clear about the scope of a tribe’s criminal jurisdiction granted under S. 47. It affects non-Indians who live, work, or travel on 56 million acres of U.S. soil that happen to be called Indian Country. In other words, the bill makes 56 million acres of land in our nation “Constitution-Free Zones” where Due Process and Equal Protection rights—as interpreted and enforced in U.S. courts—do not exist.

What are these areas? There is a misconception that Indian Country is just tribal trust land. In fact, the term Indian Country has a precise meaning under Title 18 of the U.S. Code.

Indian Country includes not just land under tribal jurisdiction, but all private lands and rights-of-way within the limits of every Indian reservation under non-Indian jurisdiction. Homes, farms, schools, businesses. Interstate highways and the roads. All private, non-Indian lands in Indian Country under the Senate bill are Constitution-Free Zones.

There are incorporated non-Indian cities and towns in many reservations and Indian Country. Like Wapato and Toppenish on the Yakama Reservation in my district. Take the Puyallup Indian Reservation in Washington state encompassing parts of Tacoma and Fife. With one of the busiest highways in the nation, Interstate 5, crossing the reservation, the ancient reservation is inhabited primarily by non-Indians working, living, and going to school on mostly non-Indian land under the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the State. Under the Senate bill, this region is Indian Country on which the tribe may exercise criminal jurisdiction with no Due Process and Equal Protection rights guaranteed to the people living there.

Under a land claim settlement, taxpayers paid $162 million to the tribe in exchange for the tribe ceding most authority over its reservation. As of now the “nonwithstanding any other provision of law” language in the Senate bill trumps and overrides the land claim agreement.

Take the Coachella Valley in the State of California, with a number of checker-boarded Indian reservations containing non-Indian populations. Tribes in this Valley will get criminal jurisdiction over residents in towns and cities such as Palm Springs for offenses described in Section 904 of the Senate bill. In tribal court, the residents of the Coachella Valley will not have their Due Process and Equal Protection rights.

Take the Oneida Reservation in New York that encompasses about 300,000 acres, 99 percent of which is non-Indian land with non-Indian towns and farms. Under the Senate bill, the tribe will have full powers to arrest, prosecute, and jail residents of Madison and Oneida counties for the offenses described in this bill, with no Due Process or Equal Protection rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

The validity of sections 904 and 905 of S. 47 has been thoroughly examined by the Supreme Court. When this happens, it won’t be a question of whether these provisions are struck down, but how many other tribal powers will be rolled back, and how many domestic violence offenders will be set free because of the misapplied legislation before us.

Some will say that critics of the Senate bill are interested only in the rights of criminal defendants. Then answer these questions: If Congress can justly stripping a citizen of their constitutional rights when accused of a crime, why can’t it be justified for other classes of crime, like theft, felony assault, and murder? Why limit the suspension of the Constitution to Indian Country as defined under this bill? Why not create new Indian reservations so there are more Constitution-Free Zones where the Bill of Rights is not an impediment to law and order?

While the House Substitute would delegate criminal jurisdiction to an Indian tribe over non-Indians, it at least guarantees that enforceable constitutional protections are built in so that it might pass muster in Court.

The timing of the consideration of S. 47 is interesting. While proponents say that people have nothing to fear in tribal court, there is at least one tribe in the State of Oklahoma embroiled in litigation over its denial of tribal citizenship to descendents of the African slaves the tribe’s 19th-century members owned. There are also entire families of Indians in California dis-enrolled by their tribe in a dispute over large cash per capita dividends from the tribe’s casino, who cannot get a federal court to review their Equal Protection claims.

These cases are merely the latest example of several tribes wielding sovereign immunity to escape any liability for alleged harm caused by possibly depriving individuals—including their own members and ex-members—their constitutional rights.

On the one hand, Indian tribes want criminal jurisdiction over individuals like the Freedmen of the Five Civilized Tribes or the dis-enrolled
Pechangas. On the other hand, they want to forbid these individuals from participating in the tribes’ government.

S. 47 makes more U.S. citizens like the disenfranchised Indians in California and the Freedmen of the Five Civilized Tribes. It gives tribes the power to try non-Indians, but that power was a right that tribes exercised long ago. Congress has never—until today—allowed a tribe to claim power over a non-Indian.

The scope and nature of a tribe’s jurisdiction was delineated in Kagama: “Indians are within the geographical limits of the United States. The soil and the people within these limits are under the political control of the Government of the United States or of the States of the Union. There exist within the broad domain of sovereignty but these two.” (United States v. Kagama, 118 U.S. 375, 379 (1886)).

Tribal self-government is therefore not a general government power equivalent to that of a state, but a federal policy governed by Congress for the promotion of Indian self-determination and to preserve and advance their way of life.

TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER INDIVIDUALS

The reason why the tribal provisions of S. 47 should, I believe, be struck down is best described by the Supreme Court:

“...the effort by Indian tribal courts to exercise jurisdiction over non-Indians, however, is a relatively new phenomenon. And where the effort has been made in the past, it has been held that the jurisdiction did not exist.” Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 435 U.S. 191 (1978).

“A tribe’s additional authority comes from the consent of its members, and so, in the criminal sphere, membership marks the bounds of tribal authority.” (Duro v. Reina, 495 U.S. 676 (1990)).

“Reliance on a historical jurisdiction of [tribes] over members is accepted by our precedents and justified by the voluntary character of tribal membership and the concomitant right of participation in a tribal government, the authority of which rests on consent... With respect to nonmembers, the tribes are left with broad freedom not enjoyed by any other governmental authority in this country... This is all the more reason to reject an extension of tribal authority over those who have not given the consent of the government that provides a fundamental basis for power within our constitutional system.” (Ibid).

Proponents of Section 904 of S. 47 argue that tribal jurisdiction over non-Indians who cannot participate in tribal government is reasonable because it covers only a narrow class of domestic violence crimes, and it includes measures designed to protect a defendant’s rights. These do nothing, however, to address the fact this scheme violates the Constitution. As pointed out in dissenting views filed in the Senate last year of previous tribal provisions (S. 1925 in the 112th Congress), “While the present bill’s jurisdiction is limited to domestic-violence offenses, once such an extension of jurisdiction were established, there would be no principled reason not to extend it to other offenses.”

In seeking to repeal Oliphant, advocates of the Senate language repeatedly rejected offers to increase law enforcement resources in Indian Country, including law enforcement personnel, funding, training, certification, cross-deputizing, and other tools for tribes, U.S. Attorneys, and State law enforcement agencies to arrest and prosecute men who harm Indian women in Indian Country. When the Supreme Court strikes down this bill, how will Indian women be protected given the rejection of law enforcement resources?

This begs a question: since there has been a pressing need to address terrible domestic violence across Indian Country for many years, why did no Member of Congress or U.S. President propose to reverse Oliphant for 33 years? The circumstances in 2011, right after the House Democrats lost their majority in a landslide to Republicans, and a year before a presidential election where a political message often called the “War on Women” was developed?

Is the proposed repeal of Oliphant a serious attempt to help Indian women who have been victimized? If it were, then Congress would not have let 35 years go by without proposing a jurisdictional change, including spans of time when advocates were in control of the White House and the Congress.

It is abundantly clear the unconstitutional Oliphant reversal is not aimed at helping vulnerable Indian women. It is a political means to an ideological end, one that will ultimately backfire when it is struck down by the High Court, leaving it unpunished because the advocates had rejected offers of increased federal and tribal law enforcement resources in Indian Country.

It is abundantly clear the unconstitutional Oliphant reversal is not aimed at helping vulnerable Indian women. It is a political means to an ideological end, one that will ultimately backfire when it is struck down by the High Court, leaving it unpunished because the advocates had rejected offers of increased federal and tribal law enforcement resources in Indian Country.

The tribal jurisdictional provisions must be rejected. Because of the historic policy change the House is poised to make today, it is necessary to elaborate on why the tribal provisions of S. 47 are unconstitutional and contrary to all precedent, if not common sense, in the United States’ administration of federal Indian relations.

INHERENT SOVEREIGNTY

For moral and public policy reasons, Congress rightfully recognizes Indian tribes as possessing powers of self-government over their internal affairs and members. Not being parties to the Constitution, Congress has tolerated—perhaps far too long—the power of a tribe to deprive its members’ civil rights guaranteed in our country’s supreme law. Because of this, Congress has enacted hundreds of laws since 1789 to protect Indians’ unique status as Indians. At the time, Congress has never—until today—allowed a tribe to claim power over a non-Indian.

The Supreme Court was whether Billy Jo Lara, an Indian convicted by a tribal court for a tribal crime, was entitled to invoke the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses prohibit tribes from prosecuting a nonmember citizen of the United States” (Ibid).

The reason why was because, as Anthony Kennedy have separate and distinct. His opinion stresses, “The proper occasion to test the legitimacy of the tribe’s authority, that is, whether Congress had the power to do what it sought to do, was in the first, tribal proceeding. There, however, Lara made no objection to the tribe’s authority to try him.” (Kennedy concurring opinion).

Those who say the Supreme Court holding in Oliphant have not been put twice in jeopardy because the Court declared it unconstitutional and will be tied up in court challenges for years. Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 47, the Senate’s bipartisan, comprehensive reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act that passed 78–22.

I look forward to the House passing this crucial bill later today and sending it to the President.

The House Republicans delay in bringing this bill forward is inexcusable. It should have been the law of the land last year.

Why did they delay it? In no small part because of their concern over recognizing tribal authority to protect Native American victims of domestic violence, even though Native women are victimized at a rate that is more than twice the national average.

I stand with the National Congress of American Indians, the oldest and largest tribal organization in the country, in opposing the Republican substitute amendment and supporting the Senate version. It is well past time that Congress recognizes the inherent power of tribal nations to protect their own and hold criminal offenders, regardless of race, accountable.

Indeed, I stand with all women of this country to say “no more.” No more delay in reauthorizing this bill. No more escape for those who attack women. No more violence against women.
Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Madam Speaker, legislation that is passed here needs to be more than just a title that sounds good in the press. I understand that when most in this country hear the "Violence Against Women Act," they think, "of course I don't support violence against women. This must be a great law." When I was a high school teacher, I used to tell my English students that you can't judge a book by its cover. Well, maybe we should learn here in Congress that you can't judge a bill by its title.

The gruesome and oftentimes cruel experience of domestic violence should not happen to anyone. It shouldn't matter what race or ethnicity you are. It shouldn't matter your religion, your sexual orientation, age, immigration status or economic standing. And it shouldn't matter your gender. No one should feel unsafe at home.

Unfortunately, this bill doesn't do that. This bill segregates people into groups, making gendered designations that assume a feminization of victimhood. We live in a fallen world in which all kinds of people are capable of horrific and deplorable behavior. Every victim of domestic violence should receive protection and support regardless of their circumstances. I wish this bill simply dealt with domestic violence instead of gender stereotypes.

Furthermore, the Tenth Amendment exists and we must respect it. Each State already has criminal statutes targeting domestic violence. If more laws are needed, there is no reason why each state can't pass stronger laws. I understand that there are cases where Washington can help, that's why I support the SAFE Act, which will end the needlessly backlogged rape kits, leaving too many sexual predators still at large. I wish we were voting on that today and I hope we can do so as soon as possible.

Laws should be passed that don't place people into groups. My constituents sent me to Washington to vote for sound policy, not for titles that just sound good in the media. For these reasons, I cannot support this bill.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill which aims to protect all Americans from domestic and sexual abuse.

I thank Speaker BOEHNER for bringing S. 47 to the House floor for a vote. This bill passed in the Senate earlier this month by a vote of 78-22. Altogether, 23 Republican senators voted for this bill, including every Republican woman senator. Madam Speaker, this bill, introduced by Senator PATRICK LEAHY, a Democrat, and Senator MIKE CRAPO, a Republican, is not only bipartisan, but it is also a comprehensive and inclusive solution to the domestic and sexual violence plaguing American society.

While I fully support reauthorization of this law which, since 1994, has been an essential tool to protect victims of domestic and sexual violence, I do, however, have major concerns with the GOP version of this bill. Unlike S. 47, the substitute offers a lesser form of protection for Indian women abused on tribal land.

The House version requires that Native American tribes consult with the U.S. Department of Justice before they are able to prosecute non-Native offenders on tribal land. Madam Speaker, this doesn't make any sense. A sovereign tribe should not have to willingly hand over part of their sovereignty to prosecute these offenders. Ultimately, the House version falls short of protecting Native American women.

However, today the House has an opportunity to pass S. 47 which is supported by those who have been at the forefront all along for the Native American community. S. 47 offers comprehensive protection for all of our people, not just some.

Madam Speaker, unfortunately, domestic and sexual crimes have been on the rise in the U.S. including my district of American Samoa. And like the rest of the States, almost always, the perpetrator is a family member or close neighbor. Furthermore, these crimes often go unreport due to fear of authorities or shame. It is the fear to come forward that allows abusers to continue their abuse. But when laws are in place to offer full support and protection for victims, we can ensure that more and more of these victims will come forth and their abusers are brought to justice.

Through this inclusive legislation, S. 47, we take one more step forward to reinforce support even for the most marginalized communities. Today the House has the opportunity to pass this bill to protect all people, whether they are from the inner city or a tribal reservation, whether they are immigrants who would otherwise be afraid to speak up for fear whether they are part of the LGBT community.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the House amendment and to pass S. 47, a bill to protect all people, because that, Madam Speaker, is what America is all about.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Madam Speaker, this day has been entirely about women. This is the day that America celebrated the first woman to address this body from within the well. This is the day that America celebrated the one woman in the House floor that has volunteered to fly the flag of our country for those who have fought for America.

This day was an extraordinary day because it was the day that we celebrated women and mothers. The lives of women and mothers are the most important lives that we as a body must celebrate.
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from violence or sexual assault. In this dismal scenario, college students, Native Americans, LGBT individuals, and others are left to fend for themselves against their attackers. In this future, perpetrators may remain confident that the strain on limited law enforcement resources will preclude their being prosecuted and that those who commit gross violations of the law. This is not the future that I would want to envision for these victims of violence.

Madam Speaker, the Senate-passed version of the VAWA reauthorization is the result of extensive deliberation and consultation with real victims of violence, law enforcement, the private sector, and, outside organizations that specialize in combating domestic violence and abuse. This Congress must vote to pass S. 47 immediately if we are to stand behind the women of this Nation, and send a strong message that these acts will not be tolerated. Every victim of domestic violence in America deserves equal protection under the law, and the House substitute to VAWA does not acknowledge the pervasiveness and severity of the violence that women must face each and every day.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act. According to the US Department of Justice, in 2007 intimate partners committed 14 percent of all the homicides in the United States.

In 2007, of all the deaths caused by Intimate Partner Violence, 70 percent were females and 30% were males.

In 2008, females age 12 or older experienced about 552,000 nonfatal violent victimizations. 40% was intimate partner violence.

From 1994 to 2010, about 4 in 5 victims of intimate partner violence were female.

All those numbers are all real. And so are the tragedies behind them. The body count is indisputable. The pain—the suffering—the loss—are hard to bear even in our imaginings. And the damaging effect on the children that witnessed such acts of violence—lingers into future generations—spreading its toxic effects. Grimm facts like these are why the Violence Against Women Act was originally passed: Women were dying—disproportionately—from intimate partner violence. Women were the ones being beaten. Women were the ones being raped. And the ordinary efforts of law enforcement at the time—were simply not able to keep them safe.

More needed to be done to stop the plague of violence. And that is why the Violence Against Women Act was passed with strong bi-partisan support. And was re-authorized—again—with strong bi-partisan support. And yet something tragic in this sad new world of partisan politics and endless rancor—the simple reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act has become a political football. A way—not to save lives—or keep women and children safe—but to score points—to win a game.

But this is not about politics—this is about the single most fundamental task that we require of our government—keep it’s citizens safe from violent assault.

That is what the Violence Against Women Act is about—keep people safe—people who are facing a life-threatening risk.

And in America—we have long stood by the principle that the protections of the law are not meant just for some—not just for those who may be in greater favor or hold greater sway. But the law should be there to keep all people safe. Period.

And yet—our Republican colleagues have seen fit to weaken the Violence Against Women Act and strip from the Senate version of the bill—numerous protections for populations that we know best—dispute have been victimized by intimate partner violence—and are in need of protection.

We know that long-standing protections put these populations at risk. We know that without the specific protection of the law—they will continue to be victims. And yet these protections have been stripped.

And we know beyond question—there are estimates that hundreds of thousands of rape kits are sitting on shelves un-tested—and that each and everyone of those rape kits may hold the information that will solve a violent crime—and bring some closure to a traumatized victim.

And yet our Republican colleagues weakened the bill and ripped from the VAWA a provision which I sponsored, that would help state and local jurisdictions audit those rape kits with no new spending.

The SAFER Act (H.R. 354) would also have provided a measure of open government and public accountability, by requiring audit grants to issue regular public reports that detail the progress they have made in clearing the rape kit backlog.

Additionally, it would have allowed the National Institute of Justice to publish a set of non-binding protocols and practices to provide guidance in cases that include DNA evidence. And yet the Republicans chose to weaken the bill and took that out.

We also know that recent studies have shown that 1 in 5 women will be sexually assaulted during her college years.

That grim statistic is made even worse by the fact that a study of sexual assaults on campuses, showed that even though victims may be profoundly traumatized, the students deemed ‘responsible’ for the sexual assaults typically faced little in the way of real consequences.

How then, could Republican’s in the House also strip from the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act, The Campus Save Act (H.R. 812), another provision I offered that would increase the obligations of colleges to keep students safe and informed about policies on sexual assault?

To keep your daughters safer, the bill would also have required colleges to collect and disclose information about sexual assault; and to update and expand existing domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking services on their campuses. And yet Republicans chose again—to weaken the bill—and to take that out.

To turn a blind eye to such a fundamental obligation of government—to simply keep it’s citizens safe from sexual assault—is to throw up your hands and surrender to a level of savagery that is unworthy of a great nation.

Let’s RENEW VAWA TODAY (By Carolyn Maloney)

Today, Congress has an historic opportunity to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). It has been more than 500 days since VAWA expired and women have gone without critically important protections. Despite the fact that last year the Senate voted on a large bipartisan basis to renew VAWA, the House Republican leadership blocked a vote on that bill and instead pursued a highly partisan plan that actually narrowed VAWA’s protections.

Last week, the Senate passed a bipartisan bill (S. 47) to reauthorize VAWA and today my colleagues and I in the House may finally get the vote we have been waiting for. This bill restores VAWA’s protections and also includes several new provisions I have been pushing for years to help rape victims, reduce violence on college campuses, and assist human trafficking victims.

The facts are indisputable and they are grim: men are far more likely to be the victims of domestic violence. Women are the ones being raped. Without VAWA, the federal government is extremely limited in what it can do help combat this plague of violence.

I was proud to be an original cosponsor of the Violence Against Women Act when Congress passed it in 1994, and was proud to support the previous renewals in 2000 and 2005. These bills always enjoyed large, bipartisan support.

Yet somehow in this sad new world of partisan politics and endless rancor, even the Violence Against Women Act has become a political football. But this is not about politics. But this is not about politics. But this is not about politics. But this is not about politics. But this is not about politics.

America, we have long stood by the principle that the protections of the law are not meant just for some. The law should be there to keep all people safe. That is why I support the Senate bill’s expansion of VAWA to protect vulnerable populations such as Native American victims, LGBT victims, and immigrant victims.

We know that long-standing protections put these populations at risk. We know that without the specific protection of the law, they will continue to suffer. We cannot let these protections fall by the wayside.
When the House considers the Violence Against Women Act later today I will urge my colleagues to pass the Senate bill with the same overwhelming bipartisan support it received in the Senate. We cannot turn a blind eye to such a fundamental obligation of government, keeping its citizens safe. With today’s vote on VAWA, the House has a responsibility to renew our commitment to do everything we can to protect our sisters, daughters, nieces, mothers, and grandmothers from violence. I hope we take it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the satisfaction I have that we have finally renewed the Violence Against Women Act is tempered by how hard it was to get the acceptance of two critically important provisions. Why should there be any question about respect for Native Americans’ sovereignty in their own territory to protect their own female citizens? Arguments to the contrary are bogus and demeaning. It was also critical that protection be extended to people regardless of their sexual orientation.

This victory is a small sign of the shifts in the House where Democrats are united in supporting core values and a majority number of Republicans, increasing in number, are willing to buck their leadership and the Tea Party majority. It would be nice if this could carry forward to other critical issues of the day.

Mr. PASCARELL. Madam Speaker, while I’m glad that we will have the opportunity to vote on Senate passed version of the Violence Against Women Act today, I can’t believe that we have to stand here playing partisan political games with legislation meant to protect the most vulnerable among us.

Since the Violence Against Women Act first passed in 1994, it has had strong bipartisan support. Instead of passing the bipartisan Senate bill, a bill that received 77 bipartisan votes, including the vote of every woman Senator, the majority has decided instead to turn women’s safety and security into another partisan political fight by offering their substitute. The statistics tell the chilling story. According to the CDC 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, on average 24 people per minute are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in the United States. In New Jersey alone, there were 70,311 domestic violence offenses reported by the police in 2011.

The Violence Against Women Act has made great strides when it comes criminal justice and community-based responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking in the United States. It shouldn’t matter if a woman is an immigrant, or a member of the LGBT community, or a Native American. All women deserve the protections provided by VAWA.

Instead of strengthening the Senate language, the Majority’s substitute waters down protection under the reauthorized VAWA.

Far too many of us have been touched by domestic violence in one way or another. Maybe it was a mother, a sister, a college roommate, or co-worker, who was forced to suffer in silence following an attack. Domestic violence is a real and troubling problem in our communities, and the need for these protections continues to grow. In my district, Turning Points, the only domestic violence intervention program in Prince William County served 6,000 clients last year. In neighboring Fairfax County, there were more than 8,000 cases of domestic violence reported, and we have seen a 40% increase in domestic violence.

This vital legislation will renew our successful partnerships with local non-profits and law enforcement agencies. It will expand protections for underserved communities, particularly immigrants and victims of human trafficking. It will expand housing assistance for victims and provide support regardless of sexual orientation. These victim protections were first adopted in a bipartisan fashion 19 years ago, reporting of domestic violence has increased as much as 51% as more victims are coming forward. Today’s legislation will ensure more women, children and families receive this lifesaving assistance so they can finally move from a situation of crisis to one of stability.

Again, I commend my Republican colleagues for compromising on this important legislation. This is yet another example of the tremendous work we can achieve for our constituents when we work together, and I hope we continue in that spirit as we turn to the devastating cuts of sequestration and the budget for the rest of this fiscal year, which will affect these new victim protections among our many other priorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCGRORRIS ROGERS). The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MCGRORRIS ROGERS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 166, nays 257, not voting 8, as follows:

[Vote Roll No. 54]

YEAES—166

Aderholt, Collins (NY)  
Alexander, Mascarin  
Amash, Cramer  
Amodei, Crawford  
Anode, Crenshaw  
Bachmann, Davis, Rodney  
Bachus, DeSaulnier  
Baila, Duffy  
Barton, Hillman  
Besh, Fleischman  
Bentivolio, Fleming  
Bilirakis, Joyce  
Bonny, Kelly  
Black, King (IN)  
Blackburn, King (NY)  
Bongino, Foxx  
Boushistant, Frank (AZ)  
Bourne, Faunia  
Brooke, Gary (GA)  
Brooks (IN), Goodlatte  
Brooks (TX), Graves (GA)  
Burgess, Griffuri (AR)  
Cantor, Griffith (VA)  
Cardin, Guthrie  
Cas acad, Hall  
Chabot, Harper  
Chaffetz, Harris  
Collins (GA), Hartley  
Dems—Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Jenkins  
Johns (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latham  
Latta  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummers  
Marino  
Massie
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Not voting—8

Cuban
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Marchant
Miller, Gary

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 286, noes 138, not voting 7, as follows:

(Roll No. 55)
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Rohby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roe
Ross
Ross
Ross
Rothfus
Salmon
Scailee
Schwartzkof

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Whitman
Williamson
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Wagner
Yoho

NOT VOTING—1

Mr. STEWART changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 54 and “aye” on rollcall vote 55.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Feinstein,传达了一项请求，要法案的第二财政年度拨款。

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H. RES. 88

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors from H. Res. 88.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Texas, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last vote of the day will be no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, the House is not in session.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions on Monday and Tuesday, a complete list of which will be announced at the appropriate time. On March 7, 2013, we has the Office of the Clerk announced that the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SMITH, the Chair of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. ROHRABACHER, the Ranking Member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHWARTZKOF, and Mr. MILLER, the Clerk pro tempore.

Yesterday, we had the honor of dedicating and accepting a statue in memory of Rosa Louise Parks. Rosa Parks, of course, is known in many respects as the mother of the civil rights movement. I thank the majority leader for his leadership in this effort. I also thank the gentleman for yielding; and I would like to highlight the Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage occurring this Friday through Sunday in Alabama, led by Congressman John Lewis—a true American hero and champion of civil rights. A bipartisan delegation of Members will participate in the 3-day journey through Alabama, concluding with the commemoration of the 1965 civil rights march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma.

Alongside the Democratic whip, I am honored to participate in this pilgrimage and to reflect on the sacrifice that shaped the greater democracy we live in today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information. I also thank him for his reference to the march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge from Selma to Montgomery, which we will commemorate. That march occurred on March 7, 1965.

Yesterday, we had the honor of dedicating and accepting a statue in memory of Rosa Louise Parks. Rosa Parks, of course, is known in many respects as the mother of the civil rights movement. I also thank the gentleman for his leadership in this effort. I also thank the gentleman for his leadership in the field of public health security and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.


Mr. PoE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors from H. Res. 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 54 and “aye” on rollcall vote 55.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Feinstein,传达了一项请求，要法案的第二财政年度拨款。
Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Let me only observe that the bills which the gentleman has now discussed for 3 weeks running, on which we’ve had colloquies, are no longer available in either the Senate or the House, that they were in the last Congress, and they died in the last Congress. There has been no legislation in the 59 days that we’ve been here, put on this floor, and only the majority leader can put legislation on the floor, no legislation which would have an alternative to the sequester.

And, in fact, notwithstanding some of the representations that have been made, Mr. Speaker, there was a bill on this floor on July 19, 2011, which was called cut, cap, and balance: 229 Republicans voted for that bill. That bill had as its fallback, if the objectives of the bill were not reached, sequester. That was substantially before—many days before—the President, and through the person who was talked about as being the author of that, now being the Secretary of the Treasury, that a result of that action of coming so close to defaulting on the national debt, and for the first time, not only since I’ve been serving in the Congress, some 32 years, but for all time, the event substantially hurt our economy. Mr. Speaker, the inability to get to agreement on the sequester is hurting the economy. And I will tell my friend that we’ve offered three times to have a bill considered as an alternative to sequester which cuts spending, increases some additional revenue—and I know the gentleman is going to give me a lecture about raising taxes. I understand that.

But I would urge the gentleman, let a vote happen on this floor. Let the House, as you said in 2010, work its will. That’s what, the Speaker said he wanted to do. Let us vote on an alternative, not just blindly go down this road of sequester, not blindly go down this road that the gentleman has just agreed with me, and we agree together, I think, Speaker, the sequester is irrational. It should not happen. In fact, it was put in the bill on the theory that surely we wouldn’t let it happen. But in 59 days, we’ve had no bill on this floor. All the gentleman talks about is a bill that is dead and gone, and buried that we can’t consider, that won’t make a difference, that will not in any way ameliorate the sequester. And I regret that, Mr. Leader, because I think we can.

Frankly, next week we can put alternatives on the floor. If you have an alternative, put it on the floor. I may vote against it, but that’s what the American people expect. They expect us to try to solve problems, and they sent us here to vote on policy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee, has asked three times, Mr. Leader, to bring an amendment to this floor to provide an alternative. That seems strange that when both of us agree that sequester is wrong, irrational, will have adverse effects, and Ben Bernanke says it will substantially hurt the economy, that we don’t provide an alternative, all we talk about is something that we yesterday—actually, 3 or 4 months ago—that is dead and gone. We need to do something now, and we need to come together on a bipartisan basis.

I might say to the leader, we’ve had four major bills signed into law in this Congress by the President. Every one of those bills was passed in a bipartisan basis with an average of 168 Democrats voting for it, and an average of 124 Republicans voting for it. We saw a per-fect, as the gentleman would say, a perfect example of how to do it; we had a vote on the floor today of making very good policy. How did we do it? We did it in a bipartisan vote. I suggest to my friend, the majority leader, that we could do that as it relates to the sequester if we would bring this bill to a vote on it; and in my view in a bipartisan fashion, we could in fact set aside this irrational, negative sequester, and move on to a rational fiscal policy.

I would be glad to yield to my friend if he wants to make his comments on it, Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

First of all, there would not be a bipartisan vote on the Democratic suggestion on how to deal with the sequester. As the gentleman rightfully suggests, that measure will include tax increases. You know, we’ve heard a lot talk about balance, that we need to approach the situation in a balanced way. Well, the President has enacted $149.7 billion worth of tax increases, proceeds to this fiscal year. Sequestration results in $85.3 billion worth of spending reductions.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the balance is clearly in favor of tax increases, taking people’s money and then allowing Washington to decide how to spend it when most people realize the government is never the best one to spend and allocate someone else’s dollars, which is why we insist on having a limited government, providing the necessary support and roles that it should, and not continuing to take other people’s money and deciding how we spend it.

Now, I’d say to the gentleman, he knows as well as I do that the Senate laments the fact that the sequester is in place. They have refused again and again. So we’ve got a real problem that somehow one House does its work. Twice this House went and passed bills with alternative measures to address sequestration, and a significant portion of both of those bills, one of which I sponsored, were provisions taken out of the President’s own budget, not the tax increases, but actually spending reductions that the President says are okay, but yet still the Senate failed to take them up.

So there’s a meeting tomorrow at the White House, Mr. Speaker, and I know the gentleman shares the desire to perhaps have that meeting, the Senator from Iowa. That’s what we need to have. The House does its work. The House can produce a plan, and has, twice, to replace this sequester.

Now, I’d say to the gentleman, he’s concerned about the economy, and so are we, very concerned about the economy. We’re concerned about the rating agencies’ outlook on our fiscal situation as well, as the gentleman suggests. But, I’d like to remind the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the warnings from these rating agencies are not warnings that are wholly addressed by just coming to some deal. Those warnings from the rating agencies are directed at our doing something about the underlying fiscal problem this Federal Government has, the mountains of debt caused by the growth and the unfunded liabilities in our entitlement programs. And, as the gentleman knows, we failed to come to agreement in 2011 as to how to deal with those unfunded liabilities, which is why the sequestration is in place.

We’ve got to have that deal on the unfunded liabilities because that’s what those warnings are about. That’s what we should be concerned about, not raising more taxes. Those warnings are not about raising more taxes. It’s about getting rid of the out-of-control liabilities that are racked up because of the spending, which is out of control.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

It doesn’t get—we’ve been here 59 days, in this Congress. Not a single bill has been brought to this floor which will deal with the sequester, not one. As a matter of fact, we’ve only met 17 of the 59 days this year. So my friend laments the fact that the sequester is going into effect and he talks about bills that, as he didn’t deny, they’re dead and gone. The Senate can’t take them up.

So many folks want us to read the Constitution of the United States. I’m for doing that. It’s Article I that gives us the House, as the leader, I’m sure, knows, the responsibility to raise revenue and to pass appropriation bills. It’s the House that needs to initiate legislation, and we guard that pretty jealously. We guarded it—we just passed VAWA, there was a lot of discussion about VAWA. Having—in the last Congress, that passed overwhelmingly, was delayed because, very frankly, they had some money effect in that bill. We said that was subject, therefore, to objections on our side.

And we meet, and when we do meet, the only real bills we pass are passed in a bipartisan fashion, as happened today.
And when we talk about balance—and I get very frustrated. Take somebody else’s money. Did you want to take it out of your pocket? Was the Constitution of the United States, which formed a more perfect Union, designed to European money or our education, our health care research, our highways, our national security? Of course not.

It is our money. Each one of us individually works hard, and we apportion a part of our earnings to the common good, to the common defense, to the common investment in our future, in education, in innovation, in infrastructure. Yes, we do that.

And I will tell my friend, and he well knows this, I get somewhat frustrated when I hear this. When I served in this Congress from 2001 to 2008, when the economic policy that was in effect was all your party’s economic policy, and you cut substantially and you increased spending substantially and we went from surplus to deep deficit, we need to solve that. I agree with the gentleman. We need to solve it, but we need to do it on a bipartisan basis.

That’s why I point out the only bills of substance that have been signed by the President, that weren’t suspension bills on which we all agreed, were bipartisan bills that had an average 124 Republicans voting for them and an average 168 Democrats voting for them. Both parties joined together to solve problems. That’s what needs to happen.

And I will tell the gentleman, he can talk about the defense side and the revenue side. And that’s what needs to happen.

The gentleman loves to go back and talk about why the rating agencies downgraded us. There were a number of reasons. But the greatest reason was—and they articulated it, Standard & Poor’s articulated it—they weren’t confident that we could solve problems, and we’re not doing that.

The gentleman continues to not want a balanced program. Every group, every group that I’ve seen or read about or talked to people about has said, ‘Come on, from where we’re in the deep debt that was created in the last decade to where we need to be, a balanced fiscal and sustainable plan for America for the years to come, without addressing both the spending side and the revenue side.’

The example I use is, we are selling a product. Mr. Leader, that many of us have voted for it, and you want to accommodate on the defense side, which costs $23, and we are pricing it at $15. If you ever want to accommodate on the defense side, which costs $23, and we are pricing it at $15.

You and I have talked about this a lot. Every Member goes home and says how by savaging either defense or non-defense spending or entitlements.

And so I would certainly hope, Mr. Leader, that we would come together. You and I have talked about this a lot. Every Member goes home and says how bipartisanship we’re going to be.

On our side, I will tell you, we are prepared. We understand there are going to be things that we have to do that we won’t like. On your side there will be things to do that you won’t like. That will be a compromise. That’s the definition of a compromise. Our country needs it. Americans want it.

I would hope that we could, in the coming days, not only address the sequester, but address the need, over the next 10 years, to get this country back to balance where we were in 2000, where we had a balanced budget, the debt was coming down, and, in fact, some people were concerned that it was coming down too fast.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate the gentleman’s yielding, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman loves to go back and talk about that period from 2001 to 2008 and the fact that there were too many tax cuts in place and without the control in spending.

Mr. HOYER. Can I just reclaim my time? Because my point, I’ll tell the leader, is that we didn’t pay for what we bought. We kept buying but we didn’t pay for it.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I was saying that there were too many tax cuts in place. And I agree with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, not on the fact that there were tax reductions in place, but the fact there wasn’t a control on spending. And that is a problem here, Mr. Speaker.

But, ironically, the gentleman has consistently been in support of and just voted to extend 98 percent of those tax cuts. And so what we’re saying right now is we’ve got to do something about the spending.

You just got $650 billion in tax increases, Mr. Speaker, over the course of the next 10 years through the fiscal cliff deal. And I, just prior, spoke about the imbalance this year, FY 2013, of the amount of new revenues versus the actual spending that is being projected to be reduced in this sequester.

I agree, let’s get back to balance. Let’s go ahead and increase the spending reductions. Washington does have that spending problem. The gentleman agrees.

So, again, I think it’s unfair to say that there’s just no agreement on the fact that we ought to go and reduce tax rates and taxes, because the gentleman supports doing that. So let’s talk about balance.

And we’ve got the highest level of revenues. It’s been reported that we have the highest level of revenues coming into the Federal Government this year, ever. And the gentleman does know, as well, the spending is out of proportion in terms of history, in terms of the percentage of GDP. So why can’t we focus on that? We’ve got to get the government under control.

And the gentleman is correct in saying the government needs to be adequately funded, but we’ve got to take a look at what we’re funding. That’s what we’re talking about in replacing the sequester is prioritizing. What are the functions of government? And the sequester, it does cut spending, but we’d rather cut it in smarter ways.

Again, I hear the gentleman talked about he would like to be here on the floor passing bills. We would, too. Get the Senate to act. We have a bicameral process here, and the Senate has not acted.

The White House, the President hasn’t even sent up his budget, Mr. Speaker. The President has that obligation at law and has not presented his budget to the House. The Senate refuses to do anything.

And what is the White House doing right now? The President has been going around the country campaigning for the past 2 months scaring people, creating hardships. Is that leadership? The President says to the Americans that their food is going to go uninspected and that our borders will be less patrolled and unsafe. His Cabinet Secretaries are holding press conferences and conducting TV interviews, making false claims about teacher layoffs.

I just feel that people ought to take a look and say, hey, these expenditures spending levels—not the sequester, but the spending levels, and say, in 2009 was food not inspected? Because that’s what the claim is, Mr. Speaker, that somehow if we were ever to reduce spending at all, we couldn’t have food inspectors. Did we have any border patrol agents in 2009? Of course we did; of course we did. They will be funded at the same levels under the sequester. And that’s our point: replacing the sequester with smart cuts.

But the other side, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and his Caucus, won’t join us in doing that. Because all we hear again and again is: Raise taxes. And I have said, as the gentleman knows, we can’t, in this town, be raising taxes every 3 months. That’s just not the way we can get this economy back on track.

Did the FAA shut down in 2009? That’s the claim. That’s the claim that the President is saying: Shut down the FAA, stop air travel as we know it, or give us higher taxes. That’s the false claim that this President and this administration are out there hawking. We can’t have that. That’s not leadership. Let’s come together.

I agree with the gentleman. Let’s stop the false choice, stop the games, and let’s get it done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said a lot, and I could have a lot of comments on that, but I will say this. As long as the gentleman believes it’s only us saying that we need a balanced program, he will oppose it because they’re not doing it.

If the gentleman listens to independent advice all over this country, from all sorts of sources, Republicans
and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, they will say you need a balanced approach. We need to cut spending. We need to restrain spending and we need to balance the cost of what we provide with the income that we have. Every working parent, small, medium, and large, understands that concept. We have not followed it, and we did not follow it in the last decade.

I regret the fact that the gentleman doesn't like the President going around the country and telling the truth saying what the consequences may well be. Now, are they going to be on March 1? No. But will they inevitably occur if the sequester stays in place? The answer to that I think is an emphatic, "Yes." I think the President is going around the country saying these are the alternatives.

And saying that the Senate won't act or the President won't act—people did not elect me, I will tell you, to make the President act or to make the Senate act. They didn't think I could do that. What they did think I could do was make STENY HOYER act. And if I were the majority leader, they expected to have the House act, even if people didn't agree with legislation I put on the floor. They expect us to do our job, not to cop out, with all due respect, to the fact that the President is not doing something or the Senate is not doing something.

We have a responsibility here in this Chamber, the people's House, as representatives of 435 districts, to do our job. And if the other folks don't do their job, we can lament that, we can criticize, we can inform the American public of that, but we cannot say that's why we are not acting.

So I would hope that next week we would, in fact, act and bring legislation to the floor. And I would be, as the gentleman knows, my friend knows, I'm for a big deal. I'm for getting us to that $4 trillion that Simpson-Bowles recommended, because I think that would give real confidence to our economy, really grow businesses and put our country on a fiscally sustainable path.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize more than 20,000 individuals who represent the Pennsylvania Special Olympics.

The Special Olympics is about people helping people. It's a global movement that has flourished due to the commitment and passion of its local volunteers and the determination of its participants and athletes.

In March of each year, the Pennsylvania Special Olympics hosts more than 300 athletes and 100 coaches for the State Floor Hockey Tournament. This year, the competition in team's floor hockey and individual skills floor hockey will be held at my alma mater, the Bald Eagle Area High School in Centre County, Pennsylvania, where I will have the opportunity to attend and lend a helping hand on Saturday, March 2.

I would like to commend the Pennsylvania Special Olympics for their years of hard work, from expanding an ever-growing volunteer base to providing floor hockey athletes to develop physical fitness, courage, and the lifelong relationships that are gained as a result of these games.

I look forward to sharing these experiences with our local community and wish all of our participants the very best in this week's competitions.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, the sequester is scheduled to go into effect in less than 24 hours, and I stand today to call out a particularly objectionable concept that this is not taking effect today, that this is going to somehow not affect people particularly, it's going to roll out over time; and that's just not the case. Because if you're a family who is facing layoffs or furloughs: or a civilian or a military who is trying to figure out how to defend the country and you've got to be spending your time worrying about what jobs you're going to stop and who you're going to lay off; or if you're that scientist, that budding scientist, who is thinking about where are you going to do your science, whether it's here in a country that invests in science or abroad, someplace where it looks like you will get better opportunity, those impacts are happening today.

And that's why we should not adjourn. We should be staying here, working on the sequester, avoiding these cuts. Let's stay at work and get this problem solved.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the President seems to think that the only way for us to replace the arbitrary spending cuts, known as the sequester—the sequester which the President's own operatives came up with—is to enact more tax increases. But should we really be talking about raising taxes when so many examples of government waste abound?

Do we need to spend $1.2 million to have the National Science Foundation pay people to play video games?

Do we need the EPA to give away over $100 million in grants to foreign countries like China?

Or what about bankrolling Tax TV? The IRS spends $4 million of our tax dollars every year to run its very own full-service television studio.

Instead of raising taxes, let's get serious about cutting waste. The House has acted to replace the sequester with commonsense cuts and reforms. It's time to see a serious plan from the President.
each year. The potential closure of the tower is unacceptable.

As we know, President Obama initially proposed the sequester in 2011. I voted against its creation, and I voted twice to replace its arbitrary cuts. Americans deserve real solutions and genuine accountability. Improper payments by the Federal Government exceeded $115 billion in 2011. Surely, the President would be willing to address those improper payments before allowing the sequester cuts to take place.

IMPACTS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring awareness to the automatic trigger cuts—known as sequestration—and the impact they will have on domestic programs in California.

I thank my colleagues who voted today for a commonsense piece of legislation known as the Violence Against Women Act. This landmark legislation comes on the eve of looming budget cuts that will have devastating impacts on domestic violence preventive programs throughout California, which already operate on tight budgets.

The Obama administration estimates almost $1 million of funds that provide services to victims of domestic violence in California will be cut, resulting in 3,000 fewer victims being served. Although we have made significant strides towards safeguarding all women by passing this important bill, we must ensure that we continue to strengthen these programs by avoiding this sequester.

IT’S TIME TO GET SERIOUS

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

Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. Speaker, President Obama’s sequester will take effect tomorrow. Because of the President’s irresponsibility of cutting just pennies of waste for every dollar Washington spends, the men and women of the 122nd Air National Guard in my district face furloughs. Across the globe, our national security will pay the price for this.

How did this happen? It seems that during his Chicago-style campaigning, President Obama forgot that his primary responsibility is to serve as Commander in Chief. Today, instead of working to replace these security cuts with cuts to waste, President Obama and HARRY REID are trying to pass a tax hike in the Senate, a tax hike that the nonpartisan CBO says will increase our deficit for the next 2 years. It seems that instead of solving the problem, President Obama and his allies are only making it worse.

Mr. Speaker, it’s time to get serious about the $3 billion we borrow every day and cut spending in a responsible way that saves the American Dream and keeps our national security strong.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. Speaker, unless we do something, Friday will be a day that none of us want to see but that very few of us seem to have the courage or conviction to prevent.

Today, we stand here with two options: devastating, meat-cleaver cuts or political courage. Last week in my district I met with the leadership of the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base. California military cuts of almost $70 million would put this base at risk.

Who are we talking about? These are our first responders, our firefighters, our citizen soldiers. These are the people that will be affected by sequestration.

If we must choose between cuts or political courage, I choose political courage. We must come together to do what is right.

I ask for a balanced approach to deficit reduction that eliminates sequestration. I support Congressman VAN HOLLEN’s bill, H.R. 699, and I ask unanimous consent to bring this bill to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded on page 752 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman’s request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

TRIBAL PROVISIONS IN VAWA

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. Speaker, this is one of those moments where you come up here for 1 minute, and I wanted to share a certain frustration, particularly the votes we just had here in the House.

I come from Arizona. We have 22 tribal communities, 21 actual designated reservations. I lived almost my entire life alongside the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community. It’s a sophisticated tribe with wonderful outreach into the community. They’ve come light years in the last 10. They’ve done amazing things.

We have been working with that community and Congressman COLE’s office trying to work on language that would work with them in VAWA, and yet Congressman COLE and Congressman ISSA were not allowed in the process to offer their amendments. That’s of great frustration to me because there was months of months of labor and work put into that.

But there was also another irony here. I heard some folks on the right and a lot on the left talking about the self-determination court process within those tribal communities. Okay, great. Are we now ready to have this body step up and help our tribes in Arizona that are sophisticated manage their own finances and their own health care? Because they’re asking for that self-determination.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. O’ROURKE, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give voice to the concerns I am hearing from my constituents and my community when it comes to the sequester.

El Pasos are worried about cuts to public education, canceled flights, delays in processing Social Security and veterans’ benefits, and fewer resources for law enforcement.

They are also worried about their jobs. For example, I represent 20,000 workers and their families who are going to be facing furloughs. We are concerned that wait times at our ports of entry will increase to 4 or 5 hours if the sequester happens and furloughs result in 7,000 fewer Customs and Border Protection officers. This undermines those employees and their families and the trade that supports nearly 100,000 jobs in the El Paso region.

Mr. Speaker, let’s fix this. Let’s vote on legislation that will replace the sequester with responsible cuts and revenues.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. VEASEY, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the impending cuts to the Federal programs that are harmful to our national security, education system, transportation infrastructure, and economy. If we allow the sequester to take effect, Americans will see more teachers laid off in their neighborhood schools, indiscriminate cuts to special education, a loss of 4 million meals for seniors, and debilitating cuts to health care for military families.

The severe and arbitrary cuts caused by sequestration will go into effect tomorrow. Unless we vote on a resolution today, these cuts will deeply hurt the constituents that I represent in the north Texas Congressional District 33 and also citizens across the Nation.

I was not in Congress when sequestration was passed 2 years ago as part...
of the Republican cut, cap and balance bill. There’s still time to prevent these harmful, across-the-board spending cuts.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester that includes both spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained without appropriate clearance.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to really applaud the House for renewing today the Violence Against Women Act. This will protect our citizens. It’s important legislation. I had the privilege of helping to author the original one in 1994 with Patricia Schroeder, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, and Joe BIDEN; and we reauthorized it twice. I’m pleased that it passed today.

I was very pleased that the bill included two bills that I had authored, one the SAFER Act with Congressman Poe, in a bipartisan way, that would process the DNA rape kits that are sitting on shelves across this country gathering dust and hopefully put rapists behind bars and protect women from future assaults from these perpetrators behind bars and protect women from future assaults from these perpetrators. This means less money for everyday needs in the economy of the Keys. Students on work-study programs at schools like Miami-Dade College and FIU will see their funding cut.

The leadership of this Congress owes the American people an explanation of why we have gotten to this point.

There is a better alternative that will create jobs, and that is H.R. 699. I respectfully ask unanimous consent to bring up this balanced budget bill that replaces the sequester with balanced cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY PANEL ON THE GOVERNANCE OF THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to section 3166(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Pub. L. 112–239), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise:

Ms. Heather Wilson, Albuquerque, New Mexico

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BRITISH-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276L, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. GARCIA, Texas
Mr. Crenshaw, Florida
Mr. LATTA, Ohio
Mr. ADERHOLT, Alabama
Mr. WHITFIELD, Kentucky

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China:

Mr. SMITH, New Jersey, Co-Chairman

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share my deep concern with my colleagues of what these dangerous sequestration cuts mean to my community.

I have the honor to represent the suburbs of Miami-Dade County and the Florida Keys. We are a community of middle class families, and my constituents and I am sure that the leadership of this Congress fails to act.

Here are a few examples: south Florida’s economy depends on the flow of tourists. It is an engine which fuels our economy. If sequestration goes into effect, TSA and customs agents will be furloughed, passengers throughout the country will miss their connecting flights, and we will have fewer tourists and hurt businesses.

Up to 600 civilians who work in the Florida Keys Naval Base will be furloughed. This means less money for everyday needs in the county. Students on winter-study programs at schools like Miami-Dade College and FIU will see their funding cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) is recognized for 6 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber, we’ve heard over the last several days numerous speakers who have spoken quite eloquently about the impact of sequestration on their communities and their constituents across this country; and I daresay there are many Americans who have no idea what sequestration is. But they will come to know, Mr. Speaker, exactly what sequestration is when they figure out that of the range of programs and services that impact them and their communities, the Federal Government is taking a step backwards because of Republicans’ failure to bring forward a balanced approach to dealing with our budget. In fact, we’ve just been moving from one crisis to the next crisis.

Today, in this House Chamber, we did something very special. We passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, which was first passed in 1994 and had enjoyed bipartisan support up until recently. We ended up passing the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act which, frankly, we could have done about a year and a half ago but for failure in this House Chamber.

In passing the Violence Against Women Act, we, on one hand, provided for authorizing funds to support shelters, services, and programs for victims of domestic violence, many of them women, all across this country. And on the other hand, March 1 sequestration looms and, in fact, is happening, and we take away with one hand what we’ve provided with the other under the Violence Against Women Act that was just reauthorized today by a bipartisan vote with overwhelming support from both sides. But tomorrow, $29 million will be cut from the very shelters and programs that we authorized today.

Six million women all across this country face domestic violence, and yet the programs and services that they depend on from the Federal Government will be ripped away in a sledgehammer approach—across-the-board cuts, arbitrary cuts to the budget. Beginning on March 1.

Workers and families all across this country have truly grown weary of watching this and past Congresses create and kick down the road fiscal disaster after fiscal disaster. Sequestration is going to rattle our very still-recovering economy and take an axe hammer to so many agencies and programs that are struggling to meet their work loads to deliver services for the American people.

§ 1300

Sequestration is estimated to lower the U.S. economic output by $297 billion.

In the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland that I have the privilege of representing in this Chamber, people are truly preparing for the drastic impact sequestration will have on them, their capacity to pay their bills and to meet their obligations.

These cuts are devastating, and today we’re here to talk very specifically about the devastation to women
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and children across this country, and specifically to women of the impact of sequestration. Whether that is the devastating cuts to the Women, Infants, and Children program that so many low-income women depend on; school nutrition programs in our Nation’s schools; other cuts to Head Start; cuts to serving children with disabilities; cuts to health care screenings like cancer, cervical cancer and breast cancer screenings that so many women rely on, and this at a time when we have discovered that, in fact, younger women are suffering from greater rates of breast cancer than ever before in our history, here we go slashing and burning a budget.

I don’t like to use the term “war on women.” But, Mr. Speaker, as a woman, it sure feels like it. Sequestration definitely has that impact.

Joining me today, who I will yield to in just a few moments, is my good friend from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY. She is quite a leader on a range of women’s issues, and she knows clearly the devastating impact of sequestration on women.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank my colleague for leading the important Special Order and to note two women’s issues that will be introduced next week.

One is the women’s museum. It will cost no extra money and will create a commission to put a women’s museum on the Mall. We have it for postage stamps, flights. It should be there for half the population, and it is something, hopefully, we can move forward with in a bipartisan way.

Also, next week, I’m reintroducing the equal rights amendment. We really lag behind in the Western World in not having that important provision in our Constitution. But regrettably, this country has a habit of sweeping women’s issues under the rug and ignoring them. But there is a better approach through sequestration will disproportionately hurt women.

Tomorrow, $85 billion will be cut from our budget, sequestration will go into effect, and economists predict that over 700,000 jobs will be lost.

Chairman Bernanke testified yesterday before the Financial Services Committee that the sequester could make it harder to reduce the deficit, not easier. The whole purpose of sequestration is to cut the deficit. But the Chairman pointed out in his testimony—and I will quote him directly—he said that it would have “adverse effects on jobs and incomes,” and “a slower recovery would lead to less actual deficit reduction.”

Here we are hearing from the head of the Federal Reserve and many economists that sequestration will literally hurt the deficit, hurt our economy, and hurt jobs.

Why can’t we agree on a measured, balanced approach that targets those areas? Why in the world are we giving tax deductions to companies that move jobs overseas? We should be giving tax incentives to people who create jobs in America, not those who move their companies and their jobs overseas. And why are we giving up to 40 percent subsidies to very profitable oil companies that are making profits? Why are we doing that when we are going to be turning around and giving them subsidies to move their factories overseas?

Because of sequestration, we’ll be cutting teachers, which is the very investment that we need for the future. Teaching is one of the professions that is disproportionately headed by women. And these cuts are not only going to hurt the future of our country, but women teachers and male teachers in our country.

I am particularly concerned in one area that my friend mentioned, and that’s research. This country has invested in research, and it is one of the areas that has moved us out of our recessions with innovative ideas. But there are across-the-board cuts in research. NIH may face as much as 40 percent cuts because of this sequestration. And women are disproportionately hurt in this area.

Constitution. But regrettably, this country is to reduce the deficit. But as he noted, it is making it harder to reduce the deficit, not easier. And it particularly is devastating to women. And it particularly is devastating to women.

So I join my good friend from the great State of Maryland in really pushing for common ground. Now, common ground is to come together, to commit to finding some form of agreement on where we go from here. This is a crisis. This is not a political discussion. This is a crisis. It’s really unfair and completely lacking in compassion to place this additional burden of sequestration on their already burdened households. Even worse, low-income women and women of color who are toiling in the low-wage jobs are going to be hit the hardest by sequestration.

I want to highlight these cuts and the resulting fiscal instability that is in addition to the fact that we are already falling farther behind other Western World nations in providing employment protections, pay equity, sick leave, promoting child care services. These are all the things that particularly women have use of as caregivers.

Is this really the way, Mr. Speaker, that we see ourselves as leaders of the free world? I don’t think so.

With that, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentlelady from New York, and I know what they will say. I don’t know what they will say. They’re also doing this and operating at the absolute margin. It’s really unfair and completely lacking in compassion to place this additional burden of sequestration on their already burdened households. Even worse, low-income women and women of color who are toiling in the low-wage at the lowest-wage jobs are going to be hit the hardest by sequestration.

I want to highlight these cuts and the resulting fiscal instability that is in addition to the fact that we are already falling farther behind other Western World nations in providing employment protections, pay equity, sick leave, promoting child care services. These are all the things that particularly women have use of as caregivers.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentleman from New York. Thank you so much for your leadership.

You know both as a woman and a woman legislator what this impact is going to be to your communities in New York, and I know what they will be to mine in Maryland.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we throw out these numbers, and most Americans don’t understand what numbers mean in real terms. From March 1, until the end of this fiscal year, we’ll have to cut $85 billion with a wide range of impacts across this country. Women are going to be disproportionately impacted by these. And there is no other word. Mr. Speaker, for these absolutely senseless cuts.

It is as though as legislators we are brain dead when it comes to making decisions that impact people’s lives. These deep cuts are going to slash vital investments in job training, in public health, in public safety and education and small business. We know that so many women are juggling multiple responsibilities. They are juggling the responsibilities of the workplace and their families; the responsibilities of a job or running a business; the responsibilities of being active in their community and making sure that there’s a quality of life for themselves and their children. And they’re also doing this and operating at the absolute margin. It’s really unfair and completely lacking in compassion to place this additional burden of sequestration on their already burdened households. Even worse, low-income women and women of color who are toiling in the low-wage at the lowest-wage jobs are going to be hit the hardest by sequestration.

I want to highlight these cuts and the resulting fiscal instability that is in addition to the fact that we are already falling farther behind other Western World nations in providing employment protections, pay equity, sick leave, promoting child care services. These are all the things that particularly women have use of as caregivers.

With that, I want to thank the gentlelady for organizing this Special Order.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York. Thank you so much for your leadership.
Against Women Act was passed because of Democrats’ championing the right direction so that immigrant women, so that the LGBT community and so that Native Americans could be specifically covered, which, as a lawyer, is what the law is all about. Fuzzy legislation cannot be the answer, but when you specifically designate in law the protection of these groups, then you have brought about a change. I say that only because I want to thank our Republican friends who voted for that ultimate Senate bill that was passed in a bipartisan way in the Senate and now in the House.

That should be an example of what we can do with regard to this dastardly act that is going to occur tomorrow—the sequester—which most Americans don’t even understand. So I am delighted to join and to be able to be part of this Special Order, led by the gentle lady from Maryland, on explaining how vulnerable women can be impacted.

We did a good act today. Vulnerable women in the evening of the storm since this legislation was not re-authorized, and women’s centers and shelters all over America were feeling the ax of the non-funding of the STOP grant, but today we made a difference. I want to make a difference in stopping the onslaught against women and children that the sequester will bring about, and I am going to use as an example the impact on a State like mine—the State of Texas—that has a diverse congressional delegation, with more Republicans than Democrats. Frankly, the people of the State of Texas are not interested in what party we are; they simply want to find out why we can’t come to the floor and vote to block the sequester and find common ground.

Specifically, I have worked extensively with our teachers and schools and school districts: $367.8 million for funding for primary and secondary education, putting 950 teaching jobs at risk, indicating that they may ultimately be terminated. Those jobs are at risk in the State of Texas. 172,000 fewer students can be served in approximately 280 schools. That’s not just in Houston; that’s throughout Republican and Democratic districts in the State of Texas. That is shameful. Texas will lose approximately $50 million in funds for about 620 students and aides to help children with disabilities.

Work study jobs will impact our college students who have been in the eye of the storm. 4,720 fewer low-income students will be able to have those jobs, and, of course, it will eliminate the opportunity to finance the cost of college to around 1,450 students, who will not get work study jobs;

Head Start. Many of my Head Start leaders advocated and asked me, as I was in Austin this past week, to stop the elimination of their funding. I will be meeting next week, approximately 4,800 students in Texas, on the reducing of access to critical early education;

Law enforcement. Part of the Violence Against Women Act specifically speaks to the question of helping the crime victims. When I had a gun briefing in Texas, I made sure that the victims of gun violence were in the room. What we’ll be stopping is $1.1 million in what we call Justice Assistance Grants, which specifically deal with our crime victims;

This is an example of what will happen in America if you’re looking for jobs and if you want assistance from the Federal Government. It’s interesting how people make light that the Federal Government does nothing. My friends, the Federal Government is you. It is the tax dollars used wisely to ensure our safety, to complement, a collaborator with State government. So you will be losing in the State of Texas, for those of you who are searching for jobs—and you do it every day—for some $2.2 million if this goes through.

Child care. Up to 2,300 disadvantaged and vulnerable children may lose their access to child care. That impacts women who go out every day, one possibility to go out to work; it’s important, to go out to go to work. I hate the thought that 9,000 children will have a lack of access to vaccines. That’s a mother’s responsibility, that’s a parent’s responsibility to ensure her child care is getting vaccines, and the public health system will collapse because of the lack of resources;

$1.1 million will be lost, in particular, for HIV tests, which is devastating. We are seeing, among those in the community, particularly women. We have encouraged them now to get tested. We’ve tried to remove the stigma. When they go up to the door of the public health entity to get tested, you’re going to tell me that there are a million less dollars and that the door will be closed? On the STOP Violence Against Women’s program, which we’d now reauthorize, I’m sad to say that Texas could lose $543,000 and that 2,100 more victimized individuals. I am going to tell me that there are a million less dollars and that the door will be closed?

Let me come to a close and look at it generically across America as I cite what Congresswoman Edwards just cited about small businesses, and I would indicate that, on a nationwide scale, a small business that we know have come from small businesses. As I listened to the news this morning about a woman-owned business that does work with the Defense Department, she was being interviewed, and she said, about 5 days from now, she’ll literally have no job. So what we’re talking about is losing $900 million across the Nation in helping small businesses. That is a travesty.

When we travel internationally, one thing we sort of look at is the question of food safety, and what we pride ourselves on here in the United States is that which stops disease and that which stops contamination. Well, my friends, 2,100 food inspectors for the NOS—of which some have critiqued. I want to thank our Republican friends who voted for that ultimate Senate bill that was passed in a bipartisan way in the Senate and now in the House. Why do I want revenue? Because I want for the money not to run out when the victims of Hurricane Sandy are desperate. That’s why I want revenue.

I want the Head Start programs to be funded, and I want our military in a
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balanced way to be funded. So I support the utilization of the Buffett rule that has been offered by the Senate, and aspects of many other proposals. They are out there, we can do it, and we can do it with the kind of grace and mercy and understanding of the needs of women, of heads of households, do not face these devastating cuts that would literally shut them down, their small businesses, Head Start, teachers for their children's schools, to ensure that there is funding for the Violence Against Women Act.

I want to say thank you to Congresswoman E. D. W. A. R. D. S. for allowing us to have an opportunity to share our concerns today. I am pained by what we are saying today, but I am extending a hand of friendship to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Leadership can call us back. We are ready to be called back. We can huddle somewhere else. We can find a way to get consensus by email so that when we come back next week, we have an immediate vote because we are willing to do so.

I'll close by saying I'm supporting Mr. C. O. N. Y. E. R. S. who has offered an alternative that will be coming forward next week that ends the sequestration. I believe that is the way to go to allow us more time for debate and consideration. I hope others will join us in supporting this legislation we're introducing today. I thank him for his leadership on that. I think that speaks to the fact that all Members, Congresswoman E. D. W. A. R. D. S., are following the leadership of this Special Order, which is to protect women from this devastating impact of sequestration. Thank you so very much for the opportunity to speak today.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentlelady, and especially to thank her for, Mr. Speaker, pointing out to us that in virtually everything that impacts our lives as Americans, and particularly impacts women, there is a devastating impact of sequestration on a whole range of things that you know, most of us get up every day and don't even think about. But we will think about them beginning on March 1 because the services won't be there. They're going to suffer even more devastating cuts. I would note, for example, in Texas, Texas will lose $11 million ripped out of Head Start; $9 million ripped out of title I schools; $8 million, almost $10 million, taken out of funding our young people with disabilities, and that's a total of almost 300 jobs that will be lost as a result of these cuts. And that's in my small State of Maryland.

You know, we've heard from Members representing New York and Texas. Well, they're going to suffer even more devastating cuts. I would note, for example, in Texas, Texas will lose $51 million from education for children with disabilities. Texas will lose $67 million from their title 1 schools. And Head Start will lose to a tune of $30 million from Head Start. This is devastating for women and children, for their families.

But it doesn't end there, Mr. Speaker. Would that it would, but it doesn't end there. Sequestration, as I said, has a devastating impact and a disproportionate impact on children, women, and families. I would note that about 600,000 children and pregnant women are going to lose access to food and health care and nutrition education, including supplemental nutrition programs that are the difference between having a meal or a healthy meal, or not. The difference for a mother who, even as she is working every day, has the ability to make sure that there is a good meal on the table for her children. Six hundred thousand children and pregnant women will lose those benefits.

Let's look at child care. There's not a one of us, Mr. Speaker, who hasn't had children and had the need of child care. Now if you are a wealthy woman who can become if you become if you have enough money, your needs may be very different. But for most of us who get up and go to work every day, we really do need child care assistance. About 30,000 children across the country who are in low-income families will lose essential Federal funding for child care services. That's about $121.5 million, Mr. Speaker.

Let's just look at the Centers for Disease Control. Twenty-five thousand low-income women—and this is according to thinkprogress.org so I'm not making it up. Americans across the country can go to thinkprogress.org, and what they can find is the same information that I've been able to share with you today. At the Centers for Disease Control, 25,000 low-income women who rely on the Centers for Disease Control for their breast cancer and cervical cancer screenings are just going to be lost. So there will be a ripple effect through the health care system as these women, potentially with cancers that are curable, will not have those diagnosed in time.

In Army military construction of family housing where we have so many more female recruits who are in need of housing, they're going to lose about $424 million. How on one hand can we say that we support and honor those who serve and who are in uniform, but the other hand rip out funding our young people just so we can have an opportunity to share our concerns? I am pained by what we are saying today. I am extending a hand to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Leadership can call us back. We are ready to be called back. We can huddle somewhere else.

We can go through so many other impacts to our children. 70,000 children, Mr. Speaker, who are going to be cut from Head Start and Early Head Start programs. Sixty percent of these program recipients, 60 percent of those 70,000 children, are pregnant.

And so I guess we're saying, Mr. Speaker, that we don't care about our Nation's children. We don't care that they go hungry. We don't care that they're not receiving adequate child care. We don't care that they're not getting the education they need. Mr. Speaker, these across-the-board, arbitrary, senseless cuts just say to the rest of America, we don't care.
And you know what? I would love it if the blame were equally shared across the board, but the reality is that Republicans control this Chamber, and this Chamber could have gaveled in tomorrow morning, straight up, and stop this sequestration. That’s what would happen, and that is what would make a difference to America’s women and children.

You know, I would look to Mr. Speaker, about devastating impacts to education. Can you believe that 7,400 special education teachers and other staff servicing our vulnerable kids with disabilities are going to be laid off, 7,400 educators who will be laid off because we haven’t provided the resources for them to serve our children with disabilities? It’s pretty shameful, Mr. Speaker.

I’m thinking about the landmark Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. You know, we did something very special, actually, in this Chamber when we passed ObamaCare. But the reality is that, because of these looming cuts, these cuts that will take place just hours, hours from now, Mr. Speaker, they’re going to jeopardize critical health and prevention initiatives, medical research to help women lead healthier lives. These sequestration cuts will affect millions of women.

Four million dollars is going to be cut from the Safe Motherhood Initiative. What do you say, Mr. Speaker, to a Democratic Governor or to a Republican Governor. Whether you talk to a Republican Governor or to a Democratic Governor. Whether you talk to a Republican Governor or to a Democratic Governor. Those Governors will tell you that the investment and the payoff for making investments in Women, Infants, and Children programs is enormous, that it results in great benefit, not just for the quality of lives of the women, infants, and children who are served by the WIC programs, but, really, to communities, enabling them, people, women, to go out and get an education, to get on their feet, to take care of their children.

These are really lifeline programs, and they’re highly effective. And yet there’s no sense to these cuts, and so we will end up creating ineffective programs in the same way that we cut the most effective ones. That’s what sequester means.

Let’s look at unemployment benefits. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, really recovering from the devastation of the economy of the last 5 years, unemployment going down, but still the need for so many in this country for unemployment benefits. Now, I don’t know, Mr. Speaker, about other people, but any of us who’ve ever received an unemployment check because of the misfortune of losing a job, it’s not a big check, Mr. Speaker. And yet, even that small check, which is a fraction of what your income might have been were you working, even that check will face devastating cuts, and particularly to the long-term unemployed, to people who are out of work and who’ve been searching for a new job for at least 6 months, not because they don’t want to work, Mr. Speaker, but because the economy is recovering and because work is hard to find.

And yet we rip 10 percent of their weekly jobless benefits if this sequester goes into effect. Maybe the 1 percent or the 2 percent out there can get away with not having 10 percent of their income. But the families that I know, the communities I come from, a 10 percent cut in an income is the difference between paying your electric bill and your water bill and your rent or your mortgage. A 10 percent cut. No one can afford that. And yet that’s exactly what happens beginning on March 1 with this senseless sequester.

Child care assistance is going to be cut by $121 million. Child care. What great nation doesn’t ensure child care for its nation’s children so that moms and dads can go out and work and not have to worry about the care that their children are receiving? Worse yet, not have to worry about leaving young ones unattended because the choice is between going to work and staying at home because there’s not quality child care available. Child care assistance cuts 30,000 children across this country who would lose essential Federal funding for child care.

And we’ve talked about the Violence Against Women Act. But I want to get specific because I spent a lot of years providing services to women. And I came into Congress writing on these issues of violence against women, on domestic violence, on sexual assault, on stalking, trying to make sure
that the Federal Government meets its responsibilities for women. We’ve worked on a hotline. I’ve been in a shelter. I know what it means to provide those services. I know what it means to provide those services. I know that when a woman calls and she’s being abused and she’s seeking help, that phone call needs to be answered.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we’ve passed the Violence Against Women Act and we’re running the risk that because of these cuts in this sequester—because of these cuts—that phone call from that woman in the middle of the night calling a shelter or a program or a hotline, that call won’t be answered.

Who’s going to take responsibility when that abuse results in the death of a woman or her children because we’ve not done the right thing in this Congress? That’s what’s at stake. And that is real and it is harm, Mr. Speaker, to this Nation’s women. And so we passed the Violence Against Women Act, but you can be sure that what we gave with one hand was going to be taken away with the other hand beginning on March 1 because of these devastating cuts to domestic violence shelters and programs and hotline services, to the law enforcement officials who need to be trained about issues of domestic violence so that they don’t endanger themselves and so that they provide the kind of law enforcement assistance that’s needed in every community across this country.

Mr. Speaker, you sit on that hotline and know that you can’t pick up a call because the other phone is going unanswered. Because the other phone is going unanswered because the Congress hasn’t done what we need to do to protect women and children and their families.

The Department of Justice estimates that the cuts to the Violence Against Women Act is going to mean that 33,927—and I want you to hear, Mr. Speaker, every single one of them—33,927 victims will be prevented from gaining access to shelter and to legal assistance and to services for themselves and for their children, every single one of them vulnerable because Republicans in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, have not done their job. The cuts are going to mean that domestic violence training is going to be eliminated for 34,000 police officers, prosecutors, judges, and victim advocates. This is really shameful, Mr. Speaker. And as I said before, I’m not particularly fond of the term, Mr. Speaker, “war on women.”

But these contracts are in jeopardy, Mr. Speaker. In fact, contracts that have been won by women-owned businesses dropped 5.5 percent in fiscal year 2011; and the damage that they are facing now, the harm our vulnerable women-owned businesses are facing is not going to go away because this sequester may reflect stiffer competition over a shrinking pool of contract revenue, but it may get worse for women as women face difficulty in winning a greater share of contracts in an era of these devastating cuts.

And that’s according to Bloomberg. It’s not made up by this Congresswoman from Maryland. It is what is happening in our economy, Mr. Speaker. Thousands of public sector jobs are going to be lost. That’s on top of jobs that have already been lost, Mr. Speaker. And since women are 50 percent more likely than men to be employed in the public sector, just like education, these jobs are going to be cut and lost needlessly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that my colleagues in this Congress have the ability to exercise common sense and rationality; but these cuts don’t reflect common sense at all. In fact, they’re going to take away from the fact, in my view, when you say across the board, that would be like in your own family budget, when you know you have to tighten up the budget, rather than looking at where you’re doing things that are wasteful, rather than with a scalpel to cut that wasteful spending—in my household, I would probably cut the coffee expenditures—but we’re not doing that. We say we cut coffee just like we cut the mortgage. We cut coffee just like we cut the groceries. We cut coffee just like we cut buying school clothing.

But this is what is happening with the Federal budget. We’re taking an ax or hammer to the entire budget. We’re not looking at the big list and asking or making strategic and thoughtful and important choices about what needs to stay and what needs to go. That’s the danger here. And for women, the impact is really substantial.

Mr. Speaker, I’m going to close now, but I wish I were closing and saying I’ll see you tomorrow. But, unfortunately, we won’t be seeing each other tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, because when you gavel out this evening, Mr. Speaker, as I said to you, we said the sequester is going to go into effect. So what? Sequester is going to go into effect and we’ll just come back next week and name a couple more buildings. But we won’t deal with the real issues that are facing America’s families that are facing America’s women.

And as I said before, I’m not particularly fond of the term, Mr. Speaker, “war on women.” But as a woman, when I know that there’s a threat of not getting a cervical exam or a breast exam or that as a woman there’s a threat of not receiving family planning services, when I know as a woman that my children won’t be able to go to a Head Start program or that if I have a child with a disability that child won’t receive the kind of education that he needs to get or his fullest potential, when I know as a caregiver that a senior woman won’t get Meals on Wheels, when I know that the important research that could lead to a cure for Alzheimer’s isn’t going to happen, Mr. Speaker, it may not be a war on women, but it feels like as women we are on the front line and we are bearing all of the heavy-duty fire coming in.

And so I would urge you, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge my Republican colleagues to do as my colleague from Texas said: get back to work. Come back to work and let’s do the business of the American people. Let’s take up a truly fair and balanced approach to our Nation’s fiscal problems. Let’s make certain that we preserve and protect a social safety net for so many of our vulnerable families.

Let’s make certain that we make the investments we need to make in education, in research and development, in small business so that we really can grow our economy, so that we, Mr. Speaker, together can create growth, but create growth by making great investments.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will close by just saying to you that I want to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but it does take two tango. Unless we do that, women in this country are going to take the devastating impact of these budget cuts that go into effect on March 1.

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

VIOLENT MEDIA ROLE IN MASS SHOOTINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STOCKMAN). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Today, I rise as the father of five and the grandfather of 16—many of whom are of the age to play video games—to express my deep concerns about the lack of discussion on mental health issues and violent media and the role they play in mass shootings.

As we continue to seek ways to end mass violence, in addition to gun safety, we must address the impacts of mental illness and, of equal importance, violent video games, movies, and TV.

I have supported legislation that would keep guns from getting into the wrong hands. I voted for the Brady Bill in 1993, safety lock requirements, and provisions that help police conduct effective background checks. My father was a Philadelphia policeman.

As chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that funds the Justice Department, I have increased funding for the national background check
system to keep firearms out of the hands of the mentally ill and violent criminals. In fact, my bill provided more than double the funding requested by both the President's and the Senate's budget plan.

In a letter to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I ask them to require that university faculty members teaching classes involving firearms to students, shall have completed a training course in the safe handling of firearms. This course would include a review of the history of firearms in the United States, the impact of firearms on public safety, and the role of firearms in violent crime. The purpose of this training is to ensure that those teaching about firearms are aware of the potential dangers of firearms and the importance of proper safety measures.

In the Virginia Tech massacre, which occurred in April of last year, a gunman killed 33 people and wounded 17 others before turning the guns on himself. The shooter, a 23-year-old Virginia Tech student, had a history of mental illness and had been treated for depression. He also had a history of violence, having been arrested for burglary and assault.

Aurora, all deserve a vote for gun control. The families of Sandy Hook, Columbine, and Virginia Tech are waiting for answers. They want to know why their loved ones were killed. They want to know how this could have happened.

I will continue to fight for common-sense gun control measures. I will continue to fight for a ban on assault weapons. I will continue to fight for universal background checks. I will continue to fight for a ban on high-capacity magazines. I will continue to fight for a ban on bump stocks. I will continue to fight for a ban on assault rifles.

I hope that my colleagues in Congress will join me in this fight. Together, we can make our schools safer and our communities stronger.

Thank you.

Rep. GABBY GIFFORDS
Chair, Democratic Task Force on National Gun Violence Prevention
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example, has five age-based ratings: 3-plus, 7-plus, 12-plus, 16-plus, and 18-plus; and six well-recognizable symbols for potentially objectionable material: violence, sex, drugs, discrimination, fear, and gambling.

The current rating system is confusing to parents. For example, there is R for movies, TV-MA for TV, and FV for fantasy violence in video games.

Another possible idea, which is something that has long been advocated for, is to put warning labels on violent video games. The report also quotes:

More research is also needed on what types of individuals are most strongly affected by violent video games. Many of the spree shooters have been described as "social outcasts." Are such individuals more likely to behave aggressively after playing a violent video game? Are such individuals more likely to play violent games alone?

A copy of the National Science Foundation report can be found on my Web site at www.wolf.house.gov. Let me say that again, because parents might want to look at it, and hopefully the Members of the body on both sides will look at it, and hopefully members of the administration will look at it. A copy will appear at www.wolf.house.gov. And these are the views of this body.

I am not naive enough to think that video game violence is the only issue here. We need to have an honest discussion about media violence, TV, movies, and video games. We need to have an honest discussion about mental health. And we need to have an honest discussion about guns.

It is easy for the President to go after the NRA. He doesn't support the NRA, and the NRA doesn't support him. But will the President of the United States ever, ever ask the entertainment industry to get involved or will he continue to be silent?

While media violence is not the only factor, and it is one of the easiest factors to change and it needs to be addressed, in addition to looking at access to firearms and looking at health.

Don't we owe it to all the victims who have been killed to look at everything?

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

PARTICIPANTS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON YOUTH VIOLENCE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE SOCIAL, BEHAVIORAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES DIRECTORATE, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION:

Calvin Morrill, Ph.D., Professor of Law and Sociology and Director, Center for the Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley.

Michael Gottfriedson, Ph.D., President and Professor of Sociology, University of Oregon

Ann S. Masten, Ph.D., Irving B. Harris Professor of Child Development, Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota

Mark Drechs, Ph.D., Assistant Research Professor of Computer Science, Johns Hopkins University

Daniel B. Reilley, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Information Systems; Director, Event and Pattern Detection Laboratory, H. J. Heinz III College, Carnegie Mellon University

Daniel W. Vath, MPH, Professor and Director, Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research

Nina G. Jablonski, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor of Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 4, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications and reports taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

558. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tomatoes Grown in Florida: Certification of Qualified Disposition; [Docket No.: AMS-FY-12-0051; PV12-966-1 IR] received February 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

559. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report on operations of the National Defense Stockpile; [Docket No.: 02-12-0051; PV12-966-1 IR] received February 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

560. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Hospital Mortgage Insurance Program-Refinancing Hospital Loans (Docket No.: FHL-I-02-02) (Docket No.: 2992-A-174) received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

561. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Dubai Aerospace Enterprise (DAE) Limited of Dubai, United Arab Emirates pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

562. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Docket No.: 05-246) received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

563. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Addition of South Sudan to the Restricted Destinations List [NRC-2012-0078] (RN: 3150-A.32) received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

564. A letter from the Principle Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore (NPS-SSLB-1206a) (PPMWS-LB560-PPMSPIDIZ.YM0000) (RN: 1024-AE11) received February 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

565. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program for the period October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009 as required by section 143(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1522(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GRAFFITI of Virginia, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 879. A bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CALPUANO, Ms. PHILLER of Maine, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SARABANES, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELAUGO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 580. A bill to amend Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on certain trading transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BUSPTANY, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 881. A bill to limit the use of cluster munitions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Ms. SOPER):

H.R. 882. A bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 883. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit the Secretary for Veterans Affairs, individual veterans who were discharged or released from the Armed Forces by reason of service-connected disability to transfer benefits under the Post-9-11 Educational Assistance Act of 2008 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 884. A bill to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liability and to require an ethics inquiry into, and the garnishment of the wages of, a Member with Federal tax liability; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):
H.R. 885. A bill to expand the boundaries of San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. KIND):
H.R. 886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. CROSTINO, Mr. LAM BORN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. AMASH, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BETTIVOLI):
H.R. 887. A bill to eliminate the Economic Development Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LAM MUTO):
H.R. 888. A bill to amend section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act (relating to prevention of mercury emissions) to stop the flow of imports of ores containing mercury; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. HONDA):
H.R. 889. A bill to combat trade barriers that threaten the maintenance of open Internet, that mandate unique technology standards as a condition of market access and related measures, and to promote online free expression and the free flow of information; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):
H.R. 890. A bill to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:
H.R. 891. A bill to establish, in the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, a grant program in the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to fund the establishment of centers of excellence to support research, development, experimentation, and implementation, and the evaluation of effective programs in financial literacy education for young people and families ages 8 through 24 years old, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOVISH of Virginia:
H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporations to form certain trusts, estates, trusts, or other entities to which certain tax attributes may be transferred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. BARTLETT):
H.R. 893. A bill to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign persons who transfer to or acquire from Iran, North Korea, or Syria, or for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):
H.R. 894. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the supervision of fiduciaries of veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERHAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEW, Mr. BLACK, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HARVEY, and Ms. SCALWESKY):
H.R. 895. A bill to amend title 42, United States Code, to provide for the improvement of HIV/AIDS programs in Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):
H.R. 896. A bill to amend title XXVI of the Social Security Act (relating to the Veterans Health Administration) to require States to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. BUSTOS, Ms. LEDYARD, Ms. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. WATERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. BOWMAN):
H.R. 897. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUSTOS (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOWMAN of Georgia, and Mr. BOWMAN):
H.R. 898. A bill to amend title II of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for improvements under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal justice system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. RUNYAN):
H.R. 899. A bill to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. GRAYSON):
H.R. 900. A bill to eliminate the sequestration under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. JENKINS:
H.R. 901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic extension period to longstanding regulatory rule; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. PUR.instances, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. DELAURER):
H.R. 902. A bill to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical health care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOWMAN of Georgia, and Mr. BOWMAN):
H.R. 903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):
H.R. 904. A bill to establish a common fund to pay claims to the Americans held hostage in Iran, and to members of their families, who are identified as class members in case number 1:08-CV-00487 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. CARNEY:
H.R. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the research credit permanent and to increase the alternative simplified research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARBON (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):
H.R. 906. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for improvements under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal justice system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. MURAN):
H.R. 907. A bill to authorize project development for projects to extend Metrorail service in the Northern Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
H.R. 908. A bill to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness and to designate the Quinault National Forest; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 909. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug testing program for applicants for and recipients of assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLEMMING:

H.R. 910. A bill to reauthorize the Sikes Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. GOSAR:

H.R. 911. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Mr. BOHDHALLO, Mr. FALKOMAVAEGA, Mr. SABLON, and Ms. GABBARD):


By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 913. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to provide for expedited project implementation relating to the comprehensive Everglades restoration plan; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP (for himself, Mr. BORNHAUSEN, Mr. HARTZLER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. GOHMER):

H.R. 914. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the authorization of the repeal of the former Department of Defense policy concerning homosexual behavior in the Armed Forces not infringe upon the free exercise of religion by and the rights of conscience of members of the Armed Forces, including chaplains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 915. A bill to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. KIND (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 916. A bill to improve Federal land management, resource conservation, environment, and use of Federal real property, by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to develop a multipurpose casade of Federal real property and identifying inaccurate, duplicate, and out-of-date Federal land inventories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. LOFgren, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 917. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COX, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 918. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 919. A bill to promote industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. McMORRIS ROGERS (for herself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CASSIDY, and Mr. BRADLEY of Iowa):

H.R. 920. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 921. A bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care and services; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 922. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to extend the authorization of the Northern Border Regional Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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. NADLER:

H.R. 923. A bill to amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for direct-to-consumer advertisements of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCARELL (for himself, Mr. LoBIONDO, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from offshore wind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. MENG, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. McCaul, Mr. MERRS, Mr. Radel, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. YOHOS):

H.R. 925. A bill to amend the Diplomatic Security Act to revise the provisions relating to the Accountability Review Board under such Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GRIFFIN):

H.R. 926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to disclose certain return information related to identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 927. A bill to permit certain current loans that would otherwise be treated as non-accrual loans as accrual loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GEORGIO MILLS of California, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 928. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the Medicare Program; 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. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 929. A bill to provide Federal contract preferences for certain entities in the rate of income tax imposed on, Patriot corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KEES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. JUDY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 930. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the archeological site and surrounding town site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 931. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Hualapai Tribe in the Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 932. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to protect the well-being of soldiers and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FALKOMAVAEGA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MOCLINTOCK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H. Res. 89. A resolution condemning the attack on Iranian dissidents living at Camp Hurria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 90. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that...
the Committee on Agriculture should not propose any reduction in the availability or amount of benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP) in effect under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and that the House of Representatives should reject any proposed legislation that includes any provisions that reduce the availability or amount of benefits provided under SNAP; to the Committee on Agriculture.
By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. Broun of Georgia, Mr. Raven of Mississippi, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVYIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPRINGER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):
H. Res. 91. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 28, 2013, as Rare Disease Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mrs. Davis of California):
H. Res. 92. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to recognize March 1, 2013, as Read Across America Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.
By Ms. LEWIS (for himself and Ms. MOORE):
H. Res. 93. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of February 2013 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H. Res. 94. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding women’s health and economic security; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII.
2. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 88 expressing strong opposition to the United States Supreme Court ruling in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:
H.R. 879. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 (to make Rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval Forces); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (to make laws necessary and proper for executing the powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof).
By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 882. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I, To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CAMP:
H.R. 890. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8, Clause 3 of Article I of the United States Constitution, to “provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”
By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:
H.R. 891. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of section of Article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. REICHERT:
H.R. 892. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:
H.R. 893. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.
By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:
H.R. 894. 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. WATERS:
H.R. 895. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 896. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:
Article I, Section 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and Amendment VIII to the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 898. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. JOHNSON of Tennessee:
H.R. 899. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CONYERS:
H.R. 900. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Section 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. JENKINS:
H.R. 901. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FOXX:
H.R. 902. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. COLE:
H.R. 903. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. RUSH:
H.R. 904. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. TAYLOR of New York:
H.R. 905. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CONYERS:
H.R. 906. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:
H.R. 903.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:
H.R. 904.

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. CARNEY:
H.R. 905.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:
H.R. 906.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 908.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

The Congress shall have power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:
H.R. 907.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

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. DELBENE:
H.R. 908.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FINCHER:
H.R. 909.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. FLEMING:
H.R. 910.

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 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which states "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 911.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

"The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Ms. HANABUSA:
H.R. 912.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:
H.R. 913.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:
H.R. 914.

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

This legislation is introduced under the authority of Article I, Section 8, Clause 14, which grants Congress the power to "make Rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval Forces,"; Article I, Section 8, Clause 16, which grants Congress the power "to provide for the organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States"; and the "free exercise" clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution, which ensures the right to freely exercise one's religion.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H.R. 915.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted under Article I, Section 8, Article IV, Section 3.

By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 916.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:
H.R. 917.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' powers to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court, under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LEE of California:
H.R. 918.

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. LOEBSACK:
H.R. 919.

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

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

By Mrs. McOMORRIS RODGERS:
H.R. 920.

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

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. MICHAUD:
H.R. 921.

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. MICHAUD:
H.R. 922.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:
H.R. 923.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 924.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 925.

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

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 which, in part, states: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises. . . . and the Sixteenth Amendment which states: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 927.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 which, in part, states: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises. . . . and the Sixteenth Amendment which states: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 927.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H.R. 928.

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

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H.R. 929.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHOCK:
H.R. 930.

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

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:
H.R. 931.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 932.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. MEHAN, Mr. WENSTRIJP, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. TIPPTON.
H.R. 50: Mr. McNerney, Mr. Veasey, and Mr. Pocan.
H.R. 106: Mr. Young of Florida and Mr. Tipton.
H.R. 125: Mr. McGovern.
H.R. 129: Mr. Conyers, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. Christensen.
H.R. 137: Mr. Sherman.
H.R. 141: Mr. Sherman.
H.R. 151: Mr. Wittman.
H.R. 163: Mr. Dingell.
H.R. 164: Mr. Luetkemeier, Mr. Labrador, and Mr. Walgren.
H.R. 176: Mr. Womack, Mr. Crawford, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Neugebauer, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Fincher, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Kingston, Mr. Westmoreland, Mr. Harris, Mr. Roskam, Mr. Bouziany, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Nugeent.
H.R. 185: Mr. Brady of Texas, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Cuccinelli, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Hensarling, Mr. Barton, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Flores, Mr. Neugebauer, Mr. Marchant, Mr. Williams, Mr. Farenthold, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Ms. Eddie Brice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Carter, and Mr. Stockman.
H.R. 232: Mr. Thompson of Mississippi.
H.R. 239: Mr. Long.
H.R. 258: Mr. Tonko, Mr. LoBiondo, Mr. Paulsen, Mr. Hall, Mr. Labrador, and Mr. Reed.
H.R. 278: Mr. Swalwell of California.
H.R. 301: Ms. Chu.
H.R. 330: Mr. Wittman and Mr. Griffin of Arkansas.
H.R. 331: Mr. Honda, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Peters of California.
H.R. 335: Mr. Petri and Mr. Luetkemeier.
H.R. 354: Mr. Andrews and Mr. Gingrey of Georgia.
H.R. 366: Mr. Yoho and Mr. Smith of Texas.
H.R. 416: Mr. Radel.
H.R. 432: Mr. Heck of Nevada.
H.R. 446: Mr. Andrews.
H.R. 454: Mr. Doyle.
H.R. 482: Mr. Cicilline.
H.R. 485: Mr. Falco.
H.R. 506: Ms. Shea-Porter.
H.R. 507: Mr. Schwerkert.
H.R. 517: Mr. Langevin.
H.R. 519: Mr. Veasey, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Gonzalez of Florida, Mr. Welch, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Bishop of New York, and Ms. Congress of Florida.
H.R. 523: Mr. Collins of Georgia and Mr. Smith of Texas.
H.R. 530: Ms. Meng.
H.R. 531: Mr. Deutch.
H.R. 532: Mr. Quezada, Mr. McNerney, and Ms. Velazquez.
H.R. 544: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Poe of Texas, Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Stockman.
H.R. 548: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Petri, Mr. Cartwright, Mrs. Miller of Michigan, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Collins of New York, and Mr. McIntyre.
H.R. 560: Mr. McHale of North Carolina.
H.R. 568: Mr. Meadows.
H.R. 569: Mr. Walz.
H.R. 570: Mr. Walz.
H.R. 578: Mr. Graves of Georgia.
H.R. 582: Mr. Stockman, Mr. Bilirakis, and Mr. Luetkemeier.
H.R. 595: Mrs. Bratton, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Clay, Mr. Richmond, Ms. Moore, Mr. Rangel, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Horsford, and Ms. Jackson Lee.
H.R. 597: Mr. Moran.
H.R. 609: Ms. Shoop.
H.R. 612: Mr. Peterson.
H.R. 621: Mr. Ross and Mr. McCaul.
H.R. 627: Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Pearce, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Petri, Mr. Shimkus, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Barletta, Mr. Marino, Mr. Gehrke, Mr. Hall, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Bucshon.
H.R. 628: Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Levin, Ms. Meng, and Ms. Tsongas.
H.R. 630: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Markey, Mr. Higginson, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Lofgren, Mr. Brownley of California, Mr. Maffei, Mr. Ellison, and Mr. McNerney.
H.R. 637: Mr. Jordan and Mr. Long.
H.R. 644: Mr. Smith of Nebraska.
H.R. 671: Mr. Jones.
H.R. 673: Mr. Olson.
H.R. 688: Mr. Bentivolio and Mrs. Miller of Michigan.
H.R. 693: Mr. Andrews.
H.R. 728: Mr. Swalwell of California.
H.R. 745: Mr. Castor of Florida, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, and Mr. Lowenthal.
H.R. 746: Ms. Hanabusa, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. Schock, and Mr. Ross.
H.R. 755: Mr. Rahall, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Himes, Mr. Lamborn, Ms. Noem, Mr. Michaud, Ms. Pinch, and Mr. Stutzman.
H.R. 760: Mr. Jones, Mr. Pearce, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. DeSantis, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Yoho, Mrs. Lummis, Mr. Garrett, and Mr. STutzman.
H.R. 761: Mr. Coppman, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Fincher, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mrs. Lummis, Mr. Southerland, Mr. Schock, and Mr. Flores.
H.R. 763: Mr. Coppman and Mr. Ross.
H.R. 766: Mr. Pascrell.
H.R. 769: Mr. Ross.
H.R. 807: Mr. Hall, Mr. Ribble, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Conway, Mr. Flores, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Pompro, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Brooks of Alabama, and Mr. Fleischmann.
H.R. 811: Ms. Meng.
H.R. 812: Mrs. Capuano, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Yarmuth, and Mr. McNerney.
H.R. 816: Mr. Petersen and Mr. Conaway.
H.R. 824: Mr. Barton, Mr. Hultskamp, Mr. Prince of Georgia, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Flemin, Mr. Yoder, Mr. LaMalfa, and Mr. Duncan of South Carolina.
H.R. 828: Mr. Chabot, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Long, and Mr. Graves of Georgia.
H.R. 841: Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Blumenauer, and Ms. Bonamici.
H.R. 847: Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Schiappa, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Pleisch, Mr. Coppman, Ms. Schwartz, Mr. Pincher of Maine, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cucullile, Mr. Hanna, Ms. McCollum, Ms. Norton, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Himes, Mr. Levin, Mr. Hastings of Florida, Mr. Briley of Iowa, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Grimm, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Mehern, Mr. Lewis, Ms. Lowerta Sanchez of California, Mr. Ellison, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Grisalva, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Sarran, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Holt, Mr. Cohen, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Runyan.
H.R. 849: Mr. Visclosky.
H.R. 850: Mr. Bilirakis and Mr. King of New York.
H.R. 852: Mr. Ellison.
H.R. 855: Mr. McNerney and Mr. Ryan of Ohio.
H. J. Res. 24: Mr. Gibson.
H. J. Res. 31: Mr. Linsky.
H. Res. 39: Mr. Nolan, Mrs. Bratton, and Mr. Horsford.
H. Res. 36: Mr. Hall, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Flemin, Mr. LaMalfa, and Mr. Mullin.
H. Res. 31: Ms. Norton.
H. Res. 69: Mr. Buchanan.
H. Res. 71: Mr. Napolitano, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Biedenstine, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Lipinski, and Mr. Carney.
H. Res. 75: Mr. Huizenga of Michigan and Mr. LoBiondo.
H. Res. 80: Mr. Rush.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

5. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2013-28124 urging the Congress to ban the sale and possession of semi-automatic assault weapons and high capacity ammunition devices and magazines, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

**PRAYER**
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

> Let us pray.

> You, O God, are a shield for America. Because of Your mercy and power, we lift our heads with optimism. When we cry aloud to You during our moments of exasperation, You answer us from Your holy mountain.

> As we anticipate an across-the-board set of budget cuts becoming law in our land, we still expect to see Your goodness prevail. We remain unafraid of what the future holds because You have promised to never leave or forsake us. Rise up, O God, and save us from ourselves. Pour Your wisdom upon our lawmakers so that they will do Your will.

> We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
The Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ 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.

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

> U.S. SENATE.
> PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

> To the Senate:

> Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

> PATRICK J. LEAHY, President pro tempore.

> Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

**SCHEDULE**
Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business for 1 hour. The Republicans will control the first half, the majority the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the American Family Economic Protection Act.

> At a time to be determined today, there will be two cloture votes on the motions to proceed to S. 368 and S. 16, which are the Democratic and Republican sequestration bills. Senators will be notified when the votes are scheduled. I will work that out with Senator MCCONNELL.

**FAREWELL TO RICK DEBOBES**
Mr. REID. Mr. President, today the Senate says goodbye to a valued and accomplished staff member, Rick DeBobes, who is retiring after 10 years as staff director for Senator LEVIN in the Armed Services Committee.

> Rick came to the Senate more than two decades ago, after a distinguished 26-year career as a judge advocate in the U.S. Navy. He spent his entire Capitol Hill career with the same committee—that committee being the Armed Services Committee—a rare occurrence in the Senate. He worked first for Chairman Sam Nunn and then Chairman CARL LEVIN.

> For the last decade, Rick has led the committee’s oversight of two of our longest running wars ever—Iraq and Afghanistan—working to reward the dedication of military personnel and their families.

> Under Chairman LEVIN’s guiding hand, he has also filled the staff of the Armed Services Committee with the next generation of national security professionals.

> Rick’s expertise, integrity, and commitment to public service will be missed by Democrats, Republicans, and our country. On behalf of the Senate community, I thank him for his service and wish him well in his retirement.

**THE SEQUESTER**
Mr. REID. Mr. President, Rick’s departure from the Senate Armed Services Committee comes during a trying time for our Nation’s military, as deep across-the-board spending cuts are set to strike hundreds of thousands of civilian employees at the Defense Department who will be furloughed in the coming weeks and months. Families and businesses across the country are also bracing for the pain of deep cuts in programs that keep our food safe, our water clean, and our borders secure.

> But it is not too late to avert these damaging cuts, and cuts for which the overwhelmingly majority of Republicans in both the House and Senate voted—174 in the House, 28 here in the Senate. We believe we have a balanced plan to remove the threat of the sequester, fully paid for.

> Our proposal would reduce the deficit by making smart spending cuts, and it would also close wasteful tax loopholes allowing companies that outsource jobs to China or India to claim tax deductions for doing so.

> Our plan would stop wasteful subsidies to farmers, some of whom don’t even farm anymore. That is right, there are some farmers who grew rice decades ago, who still get payments from the Federal Government for rice they do not grow. Chairman STABENOW,

> This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
has led the effort to make sure that won’t happen anymore, and that is part of our legislation.

Our bill would also ask the wealthiest among us—those making, for example, $5 million a year—to pay a minimum of 30 percent more in taxes. I don’t think that is too outrageous. It is called the Buffet rule because that multibillionaire said he should pay as much in taxes as his secretary, which he doesn’t. So this legislation would make it more fair in that regard.

Almost 60 percent of Republicans around the country favor this balanced approach, revenue from the richest of the rich and continuing with governmental cuts. This proposition would ask millionaires and billionaires and wealthy corporations to contribute a tiny fraction more, as I have already indicated.

And everybody agrees—Republicans around the country and about 80 percent of the American people agree—that is the right thing to do. Almost 60 percent of Republicans around the country agree it is the right thing to do. The only Republicans in America who don’t agree are those who serve in Congress.

Republicans in Congress are going after easy marks because it goes after their special interests. Now, after days of infighting, Senate Republicans have announced their plan. But instead of replacing the pain of sequester with something smarter and more responsible, their plan would embrace these devastating cuts while abandoning any of the responsibility that goes along with them.

One of the Senators in our caucus we had on Tuesday said the Republican plan we thought was coming—and it did—would be like being told you have to have three fingers cut off, and their proposal is to send this to the President and have he decide which finger is going to go first.

Reps often call the plan “flexibility.” Let’s call it what it is: It is a punt. They are punting. As President Obama said yesterday, it would simply raise the question: “Do I end funding for this naval shipyard that helps disabled children or poor children? Do I close this naval shipyard that helps disabled children or poor children? Do I cut that back by 2.4 percent, that would mean to the average American family.

In the year and a half since the Budget Control Act became the law of the land, the President has done virtually nothing—nothing—about it. He has ignored it. He has ignored it. He has ignored it. The President’s idea in the first place. As much as he and his press secretary and staff try to deny it, the fact is, as he wrote in his recent book, Bob Woodward has made the point that they told him it was their idea. The White House proposed it to Congress and the President signed it into law on August 2, 2011.
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This is not a mystery. This is not something that Republicans know that Democrats don’t know; we all know it; and the President knows it because his own bipartisan fiscal commission told him in December 2010. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the White House-backed bill offered by our Senate Democratic friends to replace the sequester would actually raise the deficit this year by tens of billions of dollars. Now, you may be wondering about that, thinking that that proposal was supposed to cut spending. But, actually, the proposal made by our friends across the aisle would raise the deficit this year by tens of billions of dollars—not exactly what I would call progress. It is absolutely ludicrous, especially when we consider that even with the sequester spending by the Federal Government will still be higher this year than it was last year. Let me repeat that in case people weren’t listening. Even with the spending cuts mandated by the sequestration, $85 billion in cuts, this administration will still have more money to spend this year than last year. It is hard to see how that would break any kind of record. Yet last year we didn’t see planes falling out of the sky, we didn’t see empty supermarket shelves for lack of safe food, nor did we see the national parks shutting their front gates. We didn’t see any of the doomsday scenarios the President and his Cabinet were now warning about after 1 1/2 years of doing nothing. Of course, the President talks endlessly, it seems, of the need for a so-called balanced approach. Well, he got his pound of flesh. He got his $600 billion in additional tax revenue from the American people. So where is the balance to that? When all he and his party propose is more taxes and more spending, that is not balance. Now is the time to cut spending. That is the only way forward, and that is the only way to begin—with one small step—to return our country to fiscal footing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this year, the Democrats who run Washington, America, would be different under a reelected President Obama. Instead of politics, they would focus on policy. Instead of leaving everything until the last minute, they would get the people’s work done ahead of time for a change—and with the regular order. Well, those promises didn’t last very long.

Later this afternoon, less than 24 hours before the President’s sequester proposal takes effect, we will vote on a Senate Democrat plan that does more to perpetuate the culture of irresponsibility around here than it does to fix the culture of spending that Washington Democrats claim to be concerned about. Point of fact: Not only would their legislation fail to fix the spending problem facing our country, it would actually add billions more to the deficit. In the same vein, it isn’t a plan at all. It is a gimmick.

Top Democrats already concede it will never garner enough votes to pass the very legislative body they control, much less the House. But let’s be very clear: For those in the Senate who think the American people will buy into a series of empty promises, they are wrong. They will focus on policy. Instead of doing nothing.

The Republican leader is recognizing, that is not balance.

Listening to the President and his Cabinet Secretaries about their plans being tied on cuts, you would think he would be banging on our doors demanding flexibility. But now—get this—he is complaining that having extra authority might mean he would actually have to choose which programs to preserve and which ones to cut; that he would have to prioritize spending within the Federal Government.

Well, with due respect, Mr. President, I think a lot of people who voted for you think that is your job, to make those tough decisions—especially tough decisions to implement the plan you, yourself, proposed and insisted upon. Surely, you can find a little more than 2 percent to cut from the Federal budget, and sure enough, we didn’t do it without raining down a phony Armageddon on American families. They had to find ways to cope with the 2 percent less in their paychecks just last month after the payroll tax went back up. Why in the world can’t Washington?

Look, the American people will simply not accept replacing spending cuts agreed to by both parties with tax hikes, and I plan to make all of this very clear to the President when I meet with him tomorrow. He already got hundreds of billions of dollars in new revenue earlier this year when the tax law expired. Now it is time for the balanced part of the equation, and that means keeping our promise to reduce spending.

So the time for games is over. No more protecting waste and broken promises at the expense of those who actually need government help. The American people were promised more spending control, and Republicans are going to help them see that promise is fulfilled in the smartest way possible.
I yield the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a disappointing milestone that we passed yesterday.

Yesterday was the 1,400th day since the Senate passed a Federal budget—1,400 days. So I guess today is the first day moving toward 1,500 days, but yesterday was the 1,400th day.

It has been— and I know I have said it on this floor—that planning to plan is planning to fail. If you don’t have any idea where you are going, you are not likely to get where you would like to be.

When it comes to our budgetary future, the strategy of the majority has been just not to deal with it.

Last summer Vice President JOE BIDEN challenged and said: Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value. Why the Vice President would have said that I really don’t know.

The President’s budget that has arrived late and has been dead on arrival, apparently, every time it has arrived in the last 4 years and a Senate majority of the Vice President’s party that has not passed a budget—why the Vice President would have said: Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value, I don’t know.

I like the Vice President personally a lot. I often don’t know exactly why he said what he said. But this comment really does raise a question about why we are not willing to talk about the things we want to achieve as a government.

Nearly 4 years have passed since we had any kind of blueprint. I am told when we talk about a budget in Washington that apparently there were no political consequences because the majority was rewarded with the majority again even though if there was one comment made over and over again in that one, it has been this: It has been since there has been a budget, and now we are saying it has been 4 years since there has been a budget, and we have seen the government lurch from crisis to crisis. Frankly, most of these crises have been created by the people who say they are trying to deal with them.

I could not imagine, in November and December, why we would want to start a new year with the issues before us that were before us then. This could have been handled at that time as easily as it could be handled now. Part of it is the failure to plan.

Since the Senate, controlled for some time now by Democrats, passed a budget in April of 2009, lots of things have happened. Four years ago nobody in America had an iPad yet because iPads had not yet been invented. Nobody in America now doesn’t know somebody who has an iPad if they don’t have one themselves. Instagram, which our conference just added to one of these tools this Congress, didn’t exist 4 years ago. The Federal debt 4 years ago was less than $12 trillion. Now it is $16.6 trillion. LeBron James was still a Cleveland Cavalier the last time the Senate passed a budget. ObamaCare—and the President, in the Presidential campaign, said he now liked that term. I think he may not like it as well as he does now when people find out more about it—was not even the law yet. It was not even President Obama’s show before it was still in the air. NASA had not announced yet that we were done with the space shuttle missions. Prince William and Kate Middleton were not engaged, and Brett Favre still played for the NFL. Lots of things happened in the last 4 years, but one thing that has not happened is the Senate has not passed a budget.

Republicans in the House have drawn up and voted for budgets. We figured out ways occasionally to have a budget vote. But the President’s budget would get no vote. There was no Senate majority budget on which to vote. I look forward to seeing that budget on the floor.

I was glad to vote just a few weeks ago on the bill that said that if we do not have a budget, we do not get paid, because if we do not have a budget, we do not have the fundamental tool it takes to have the other debates on the appropriations bills. People deserve a Senate that has a budget, is willing to put it out there, and then that is willing to have the debates on appropriations bills we need to have. It has been 15 months since we had an appropriation bill. We have a lot to happen. We cannot begin to get by with the money we were spending 6 or 9 or 12 months ago?

If we want to have this discussion, that is fine with me. These spending cuts are not sustainable. We cannot begin to get by with the money we were spending 6 or 9 or 12 months ago? Nobody believes that.

Now the crisis, of course, is the sequestration deadline. If you listen to the administration, you would assume that this is the last day it is safe to go outside; that starting tomorrow terrible things are going to happen. I just heard our leader, the Republican leader, talk about our willingness to give the President of the other party a billion dollars to do what he wants. That is a bigger leverage. The Government Accountability Office has said are inefficient, ineffective, and overlapping—51 areas. Why don’t we deal with that? That is the Executive’s responsibility, to say: Here is how we are going to do that. Otherwise, I guess we are committed to keep the programs that are inefficient, ineffective, and overlapping and spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers’ money.

That would include things such as 180 economic development programs operating in five different Cabinet agencies. I am for economic development. I am for opportunity and jobs. But do we need 180 different programs that? That is the Executive’s responsibility, to say: Here is how we are going to do that. Otherwise, I guess we are committed to keep the programs that are inefficient, ineffective, and overlapping and spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers’ money.

That would include things such as 180 economic development programs operating in five different Cabinet agencies. I am for economic development. I am for opportunity and jobs. But do we need 180 different programs that? That is the Executive’s responsibility, to say: Here is how we are going to do that. Otherwise, I guess we are committed to keep the programs that are inefficient, ineffective, and overlapping and spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers’ money.

There are 173 programs across 13 agencies to promote science, technology, and math education. That is not a bad goal, but does it take 173 programs in 13 agencies to do it?

Twenty agencies oversee more than 50 financial literacy programs. More than 50 programs across 4 departments are there to support entrepreneurs. Private sector job creation should be the No. 1 domestic goal of the country.
today, but do you need 50 programs in four departments to encourage entrepreneurial skills? Probably not.

Why don’t we hear about that instead of the air traffic controllers and the highway engineers and the meat plant inspectors and the Head Start teachers? Why don’t we hear about these programs that we all know are ready to be made more efficient—or in some cases just simply the way to make them more effective is to eliminate those programs.

There are 47 job training programs in 9 agencies that cost $18 billion in fiscal year 2009. I do not have a number newer than that. We actually don’t have a budget much newer than that. But $18 billion for 47 programs in 9 agencies? I am sure we can do better.

The Government Accountability Office found at least 37 duplicative investments in information technology—that was $11 billion spent in 5 years—14 programs to administer grants to reduce diesel emissions across 3 departments. This is not 14 programs to administer grants and loans, this is 14 programs to administer grants and loans to reduce diesel emissions. I am even for the Federal Government paying some attention to whether that is being done. But do we need 14 programs in 3 different agencies to do it?

Across-the-board cutting, which is what sequester really means—that means we couldn’t get to the number because, by the way, we didn’t have any budget, we didn’t pass any budget, so of course we couldn’t get to the number. We couldn’t get to the number the law requires us not to exceed in our spending, so the cure for that is to cut every line item in the discretionary spending part of the budget—the part that was not the country; 5 years—and 14 programs to build highways, the part that administers most educational needs in which the Federal Government is involved? That is what sequester is. We can do better.

The Department of Defense has spent more than $67 billion in the last 10 years on nondefense spending. Probably somebody better than the Department of Defense could do the non-defense work. The Department of Energy weatherization program, which has received $5 billion in stimulus funds, exhibited a failure rate of 80 percent. The stimulus program really worked out well. Here is an 80-percent failure rate in energy weatherization.

The Federal Aviation Administration, the one about which my friend the Secretary of Transportation, with whom I served in the House, said we would have to eliminate air traffic controllers—they spend $500 million each year on consultants. It could be that it is more important that the air traffic controllers show up than that the consultants show up. I have a list here I am going to submit because the list literally goes on and on.

The Internal Revenue Service stored 22,486 items of unused furniture in a warehouse, at an annual cost of $862,000.

We will have this discussion of “why cut that instead of this” if we want to. But my side is willing to give the President authority between now and the end of this haphazardly put together appropriating year to target cuts so that those of us in the Senate can appropriate the money for next year’s spending.

We ought to be moving right now. We should not be having this debate at all today. We should be having a debate on the budget to have it done by April 15 so the Appropriations Committee can begin to do its work and we can find out what needs to happen here.

This is a good time to ask the question, Is this a job for the government? If the answer is yes, the second question is, Is the Federal Government the best of all governments to solve this problem or is there some government closer to the people and closer to the problem that can solve it in a better way?

There are two things I wish to submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as I close my remarks. One is a July 31, 2012, memo to agencies from the Office of Management and Budget that says, “Agencies should continue normal spending and operations since there are more than 5 months that remain for Congress to act.”

On September 28 the same management organization, the Office of Management and Budget, under the Executive Office of the President, sent another memo out that says, “Agencies should continue normal spending and operations, as instructed in the July 31 memo from the Office of Management and Budget to executive departments and agencies which addresses operational and other issues raised by the potential of January 2 sequestration.”

So the new spending year is about to begin in 2 days—2 days after this goes out—and the direction from the White House is business as usual, full-speed ahead, spend money just like you are. Don’t bother with that law which says that beginning on January 1, we have to spend less money.

Well, I am convinced we are going to spend less money. I am prepared to work with the President to see that we do that in the smartest possible way, but we have to get our spending under control, and I look forward to seeing the Senate do its job first with the budget and then with bills that debate our money and what we spend our money on.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
from agencies on sequesterable amounts and, where applicable, unobligated balances, and calculate the percentage reductions necessary to implement the sequestration. In the meantime, agencies should continue normal spending and operations since more than 5 months remain for Congress to act.

The steps described above are necessary to prepare for the contingency of having to issue a sequestration order, but they do not change the fact that sequestration is bad policy, was never meant to be implemented, and should be avoided through the enactment of bipartisan, balanced deficit legislation. The Administration urges the Congress to take this course.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

WASHINGTON, DC, September 28, 2012.

OMB BULLETIN No. 12-02—TO THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENTS

Subject: Apportionment of the Continuing Resolution(s) for Fiscal Year 2013

1. Purpose and Background. H.J. Res. 117 will provide continuing appropriations for the period October 1, 2012 through March 27, 2013. Section 101(c) of H.J. Res. 117 requires that the joint resolution be implemented so that only the most limited funding actions shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities authorized or passed by the full House or Senate Appropriations Committee for floor action. The agency may file by the full House or Senate Appropriations Committee for floor action. The agency may be amended, if necessary, the Bulletin will calculate the percentage reductions necessary to implement the sequestration order that the President may be required to issue on January 2, 2013, under section 251A of BBEDCA. Until such time as the Bulletin is amended, agencies should continue normal spending and operations, as instructed in the July 31 memo from OMB to executive departments and agencies which addressed operational and other issues raised by the potential January 2 sequestration.

7. Credit Limitations. If there is an enacted credit limit (i.e., a limitation on loan principal or commitment level) in FY 2012, then the automatic apportionment is the pro-rata share of the credit limitation or the budget authority (i.e., for subsidy cost), whichever is less. To calculate amounts available, see exhibit 123B of OMB Circular No. A-11.

8. Written Apportionments for Amounts Provided by Sections 101(a) and 101(b). If an agency receives an amount that is more than the amount automatically apportioned under sections 101(a) and 101(b), a written apportionment must be requested from OMB. OMB expects to grant only a very limited number of these written apportionment requests. Each of these requests must be accompanied by a written justification that includes the legal basis for the exception apportionment. Similarly, an RMO or an agency may determine that an amount for a program should be the total amount automatically apportioned by sections 101(a) and 101(b) in order to ensure that an agency does not impose on the final funding prerogatives of the Congress. In those cases, a written apportionment will also be required.

Agencies do not need to request a new written apportionment for each extension of the CR (unless otherwise required by your RMO). Instead, in the case of accounts that receive a written apportionment at any time during the CR period, the automatic apportionment will apply to such accounts under any subsequent extensions of the CR, provided that the total amount apportioned during the CR period does not exceed the total annualized level of the CR. However, any footnotes on the written apportionment continue to apply to the accounts, when subsequent operations are performed under the automatic apportionment.

The written apportionments described in this section are not intended to address the written apportionments for amounts provided by section 101(c) or accounts with zero funding. Those requirements are described in sections 4 and 5 above, respectively.

JEFFREY D. ZIENTS,
Deputy Director for Management.

Attachment(s):
### Attachments

#### B: Non-CHIMP Cancellations

Recurring in a 2013 Continuing Resolution.

#### C: Changes in Mandatory Programs

Recurring in a 2013 Continuing Resolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Agriculture and Rural Development</strong></td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Justice, Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defense</strong></td>
<td>-245</td>
<td>-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Water Development</strong></td>
<td>-1,395</td>
<td>-1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Services and General Government</strong></td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeland Security</strong></td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Financial Services and General Government</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeland Security</strong></td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior and Environment</strong></td>
<td>-136</td>
<td>-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Construction and Veterans Affairs</strong></td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Foreign Operations</strong></td>
<td>-547</td>
<td>-547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cancellations of Unobligated Balances:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA: The Office of Advocacy and Outreach</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA: Buildings and Facilities (National Institute of Food and Agriculture)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA: Public Law 440 Title I - Great Lakes Agricultural Research and Development Grants</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA: Public Law 440 Title I - Great Lakes Environmental Research and Development Grants</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA: Salaries and Expenses (Foreign Agricultural Service)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Agriculture and Rural Development:**

**Commerce, Justice, Science:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Emergency Shel, Oil, and Gas Loan Program Account</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Coastal Zone Management Fund</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Public Telecommunications, Facilities, Planning and Construction</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Information Technology Grants</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Working Capital Fund</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Salaries and Expenses, United States Marshals Service</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Salaries and Expenses (Drug Enforcement Administration)</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Buildings and Facilities</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Justice Assistance</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Juvenile Justice Programs</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Community Oriented Policing Services</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL: Violence against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA: Mission Support</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA: Space Operations</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA: Science</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA: Exploration</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA: Aeronautics</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA: Education</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA: Construction, Environmental Compliance, and Remediation</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Commerce, Justice, Science:**

**Defense:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Procurement, Defense-wide</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Aircraft Procurement, Navy</td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Weapons Procurement, Navy</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Other Procurement, Navy</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Aircraft Procurement, Army</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Missile Procurement, Army</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Procurement of Armament, Army</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Other Procurement, Army</td>
<td>-497</td>
<td>-497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Aircraft Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>-253</td>
<td>-220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Missile Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>-194</td>
<td>-194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Other Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide</td>
<td>-254</td>
<td>-254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army</td>
<td>-357</td>
<td>-357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force</td>
<td>-258</td>
<td>-258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: National Defense Health Fund</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Defense:**

**Energy and Water Development:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI: NNSA, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI: Fossil Energy Research and Development</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Services and General Government:**

**Homeland Security:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Office of the Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Working Capital Fund</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Citizenship and Immigration Services</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Salaries and Expenses (United States Secret Service)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Aviation Security</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Immigration and Customs Enforcement</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Automation Modernization (Immigration and Customs Enforcement)</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Customs and Border Protection</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Border Security, Infrastructure, and Technology</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Operating Expenses (United States Coast Guard)</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements (U.S. Coast Guard)</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: State and Local Programs</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: National Pre-disaster Mitigation Fund</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS: Management and Administration</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Homeland Security:**

**Interior and Environment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI: NPS, Construction (and Major Maintenance)</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI: Fish and Wildlife Management</td>
<td>-82</td>
<td>-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA: State and Tribal Assistance Grants</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA: Hazardous Substance Superfund</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Interior and Environment:**

**Military Construction and Veterans Affairs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Military Construction, Defense-wide</td>
<td>-131</td>
<td>-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Base Closure Account 2005</td>
<td>-259</td>
<td>-259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Military Construction, Army</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD: Military Construction, Air Force</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs:**

**State and Foreign Operations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittee</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State, Diplomatic and Consular Programs</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Economic Support Fund</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export-Import Bank Loans Program Account</td>
<td>-460</td>
<td>-460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT B: NON-CHIP CANCELLATIONS RECURRING IN A 2013 CONTINUING RESOLUTION—Continued

### Appropriations Subcommittee 2012 Enacted 2013 CR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, State and Foreign Operations</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Housing and Urban Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Compensation for General Aviation Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Capital Investment Grants</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Operations and Training</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XII) Program Account</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD, Housing Certificate Fund</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD, Other Assisted Housing Programs</td>
<td>-232</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Transportation and Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>-529</td>
<td>-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Cancellations of Unobligated Balances</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>2,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations of Advance Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction and Veterans Affairs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA, Medical Support and Compliance (appropriation)</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA, Medical Service (appropriation)</td>
<td>-1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA, Medical Facilities (appropriation)</td>
<td>-250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>-1,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>-650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Cancellations of Advance Appropriations</td>
<td>-2,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations of Balances &amp; Advance Appropriations</td>
<td>-7,395</td>
<td>2,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations of Overseas Contingency Operations Funding:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense, Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund</td>
<td>-357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD, Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD, Other Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Defense</td>
<td>-380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction and Veterans Affairs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD, Military Construction, Army</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD, Military Construction, Air Force</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>-245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Rescissions/Cancellations of Overseas Contingency Operations</td>
<td>-650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations of Congressionally-Designated Emergency Funding:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS, Immigration and Customs Enforcement</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS, Aviation Security</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS, Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements (U.S. Coast Guard)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Homeland Security</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Cancellations of Congressionally-Designated Emergency Funding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total, All Cancellations</td>
<td>-8,065</td>
<td>2,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excludes offsets that are the result of canceling or blocking spending from mandatory programs. See Attachment C on CHIMPs for this information.
2 These funds were technically rescinded in the appropriations bills but were immediately reappropriated. This rescission-reappropriation mechanism is to simply to extend the availability for two years.
3 These funds were technically rescinded as Overseas Contingency Operations pursuant to Section 252(b)(2)(A) of BBEDCA, as amended.
4 Funding is not designated “Emergency” pursuant to Section 252(b)(3)(A) of BBEDCA, as amended. These amounts are counted outside of the discretionary caps.

### ATTACHMENT C: CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS RECURRING IN A 2013 CONTINUING RESOLUTION

#### Appropriations Subcommittee 2012 Enacted 2013 CR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012 Enacted</th>
<th>2013 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Funds for Strengthening Markets, Income, and Supply (Section 32)</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Commodity Credit Corporation Fund (Biobased Crop Assistance Program)</td>
<td>-184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Conservation Credit Corporation Fund (Voluntary Public Access)</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Watershed Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>-165</td>
<td>-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Rural Energy for America Program</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Rural Microenterprise Investment Program Account</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Energy Assistance Payments</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Farm Security and Rural Investment Programs</td>
<td>863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Stewardship Program</td>
<td>-231</td>
<td>-217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality Incentives Program</td>
<td>-350</td>
<td>-258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Protection Program</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland Reserve Program</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Reserve Program</td>
<td>-673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Management Assistance Program</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Rural Economic Development Grants (Cushion of Credit)</td>
<td>-155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Trade Adjustment Assistance for Farmers</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, Child Nutrition Programs (Obligation Delay)</td>
<td>-133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td>-2,560</td>
<td>-4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Justice, Science:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC, NOAA, Promote and Develop Fishery Products Transfer</td>
<td>-109</td>
<td>-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC, NOAA, Fisheries Enforcement and Sanctions Enforcement Asset Forfeiture Funds:</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations, Research, and Facilities (ORF): Reduction in Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF, Residency and Housing and Ordinance Authority from Collections</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer out of Unobligated Spending Authority from ORF</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Expended as Receipts in Asset Forfeiture Funds</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending of Receipts in Asset Forfeiture Funds</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer in of Unobligated Spending Authority to the Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC, Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC, Assets Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>-575</td>
<td>-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC, Other Assets (Obligation Delay)</td>
<td>-7,113</td>
<td>-9,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC, Citizen and Immigration Services Transfer</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Commerce, Justice, Science</td>
<td>-7,905</td>
<td>10,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Water Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE, SPR Petroleum Account</td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE, Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Energy and Water Development</td>
<td>-600</td>
<td>-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services and General Government:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury, Forfeiture Funds</td>
<td>-950</td>
<td>-950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA, Disaster Insurance Fund Transfer to the OIG</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Service, Transfers to the OIG &amp; Postal Regulatory Commission</td>
<td>-255</td>
<td>-255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. BLUNT. I yield back whatever time I might have.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Time is yielded back.

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. We will have a vote on the floor of the Senate. It is an important vote because tomorrow is the day of sequestration. The American people are learning new terminology. The fiscal cliff meant nothing to most Americans 6 months ago, but by New Year’s Eve many understood that something serious was about to occur. Laws had been passed which meant that taxes would go up on virtually every taxpayer paying American on January 1 if Congress failed to act. That was the fiscal cliff.

We reached a last-minute agreement on ways to avert that from happening and to make sure any tax increases on the income tax side were going to be excluded to those in the highest income categories. Well, the Americans breathed a sigh of relief and said thank goodness that emergency is over.

We are good in Washington at manufacturing crises, and now we are in a new crisis of our own creation. This is not some act of God, some natural event, some occurrence we have no control over. We created this. We created something called sequestration, and here is what it was all about.

The President sat down with the leaders in Congress—this goes back over a year now—and said: Listen, we need to do something about our deficit, but let's do it in a bipartisan way and a balanced way. Let's put together a supercommittee—an equal number of Democrats and Republicans—and let's reach an agreement once and for all. Stop bickering and reach an agreement. Let's reduce the deficit as a result. It is in a bipartisan way and a balanced way. Let's do it.

But he said, let's, to make sure you take it seriously, if you don't reach an agreement, then as of this year, 2013, we are going to have automatic spending cuts called sequestration, and the sequestration cuts are not going to be very kind. They are going to be across-the-board cuts by each line item of the budget. So to avoid that, do the right thing and reach a bipartisan agreement in the supercommittee.

We failed. We failed when the Republicans of the committee said no revenue, no taxes. Sorry. We will just talk about spending cuts and cutting Medicare, that is all we are interested in talking about.

End of story; end of supercommittee; welcome to the world of sequestration. The threat that was supposed to make the supercommittee act is now about to become the reality. The reality means that in the remainder of this year—we do fiscal years, not calendar years—between now and September 30, we need to cut $85 billion in spending. Half of it will be on the defense side, and half of it will be on the nondefense side. Some might say: Come on, this is a big government and this is a big budget, and you are telling me $85 billion is a big problem?

I happen to agree with the Senator from Missouri—Republican Senator BLUNT who was here a moment ago—that there are plenty of areas to save in the Federal Government. I will speak to a few in a moment. We don't create an opportunity for that kind of thoughtful discussion and decision-making. Instead, it is automatic. It just happens.

What is wrong with cutting every line of the budget by a certain percentage? Well, let's take it home. Let's talk about an American family. Let's assume that family has just learned that next year, due to circumstances beyond their control, they are going to be making $500 less each month; somebody lost a job in the family or something like that. They look at the family budget and they say: We are going to have to tighten things up and make some hard choices. Someone else at the family table says: Wait a minute, we don't have to do it that way. What we should do since $500 is maybe 5 percent of what we take home in pay, let's cut everything we spend by 5 percent. If we do that, we will be able to reach that $500 mark.

When they stop and think about it for a minute, they realize that doesn't make any sense at all. We are going to cut our mortgage payment by 5 percent? We cannot do that; we will default on our mortgage, and we will lose our home. We will cut our utility payment by 5 percent? They will cut off the lights. We cannot cut the prescription drugs by 5 percent. We need that medicine to keep our children healthy. No, we have to look at a more thoughtful way. Let's look at parts where we spend money that we can afford to cut.

That is how families budget, that is how the government should budget, but sequestration doesn't cut budgets that way. It cuts it by each line item—the mortgage, the utility bill, the prescription drugs are all cut the same. That is what we face starting tomorrow. Well, there are ways to avoid that. The most important opportunity will come tomorrow afternoon. President Obama is bringing the congressional leaders—the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, all four—together for a meeting in the White House. Let's hope cooler heads prevail. Once again, we are at the deadline. Once again, the American people are looking to us and wondering what is going to happen.

What is at stake here? There are several things at stake. One of the things that is at stake is that the cuts for many agencies are going to be unreasonable. It will be unreasonable because they have to be done in a matter of 5 or 6 months. I am now chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. It means that most of the civilian employees who work for the Department of Defense are going to lose 1 day's pay...
each week. It will result in a 20-percent cut in pay between now and the end of the year and will be a hardship on some families.

Don’t believe these are fat-cat Federal employees. Many of them are struggling families doing jobs in our Department of Defense which are critical for our Nation’s security. They range across the board from some of the most sophisticated decision-making to keep our Nation to the basics of keeping the lights on in the buildings where these decisions are made. They are going to see this kind of furlough, reduction in pay and, unfortunately, reduction in productivity because of it. It is not good.

Other things are going to happen because of it. When workers are laid off at a depot where they repair a ship, it means the ship that was in for repairs has but it will not be there. It cannot go out and protect America.

Last week I was in a place called Bahrain. Bahrain, an island in the Persian Gulf, is a critical front in America’s national defense. The 5th Fleet is there, a different group of individuals. ADM John Miller took me around on the ships and introduced me to the men and women in uniform. I could not have been prouder as an American to say hello to these people who are literally giving and risking their lives for our country. How are they protected while they are out there? Well, we have a great aircraft carrier out there. It is there if needed. It is a proposal that not a single Republican will vote for. I would have voted against the majority floor. It is a proposal where we take a look at one of the most wasteful areas of spending and eliminate it. It applies to my State of Illinois, and here is what it is: direct payments to farmers. I don’t know whether we did this, but in the last farm bill we said we will give direct support payments to farmers whether they make money or lose money. Sometimes we will give them the direct payments whether they grow a crop or don’t grow it. Does that make sense? I don’t think it does.

We said for a long time, 70-years plus, the U.S. Government will be there when the farmers need it—when they need a helping hand. I understand that. Farming is a risky business, but direct support payments don’t work on that principle. They make a payment regardless. When Senator Stabenow of Michigan wrote the new farm bill, she said: I am eliminating direct payments. It saves $25 billion over 5 years. We had 64 Senators, which is about a dozen Republicans, to join us in passing the farm bill. They agreed and the farm groups agreed that they could no longer defend direct support payments. They could not defend it a time when we have so many deficits.

The farm bill could not pass in the House. They were unable to pass a farm bill. I don’t know why, but they couldn’t. So what we will do this afternoon is take that savings from the direct support payments and use that to defer some of the cuts that would otherwise occur in sequestration. I think it is pretty sensible.

We will find out that not a single Republican will vote for it. They can come to the floor and list where they will save money, and they will have a chance on the floor this afternoon to actually save $25 billion on something that the farmers agree with and farm organization support—and many of them voted for—but not one will vote for it. Not one. It is a sad situation.

Let me tell one other thing they ought to think about. Do the for-profit schools. Does anyone know what they are? Well, if you have a child—a son or daughter in high school—you will know them soon because they are inundating your son or daughter with invitations to come join their university. Let me give you one of the biggest names in the for-profit school industry: University of Phoenix. Ever heard of it? The combined enrollment of the University of Phoenix is more than the combined enrollment of the Big Ten. The second largest one, I believe, is DeVry, which is out of Chicago, and then Kaplan, which is a career education corporation. These are private companies that purportedly educate students. Some do, most don’t.

If someone wants to know about the for-profit colleges in America, they should remember three numbers. The first number is 12; 12 percent of all the high school graduates in America go to for-profit schools, such as the ones I mentioned, and other things. The second number, 25; 25 percent of all the Federal aid to education goes to these schools. So they have 12 percent of the students and 25 percent of the Federal aid to education. Well, how much is that? And the third number; $32 billion a year goes to for-profit schools, and it is Federal taxpayer dollars.

If we took the $32 billion that is going to for-profit schools and translated it into a Federal agency, it would be the ninth largest Federal agency in Washington—$32 billion to these schools. Hang on for the third number. The third number is 47—12, 25, 47. Forty-seven percent of all the student loan defaults occur among students who are going to these for-profit schools.

What does that tell you? They are getting too deeply in debt, they cannot finish school, and they cannot find a job. What a waste. They end up with debt and nothing to show for it. The schools end up with the money; the students and their families end up with the debt.

Let me recite one of these stories. I have invited students to tell me their stories at my Web site, and many of them have. Tabitha Hewitt, who is a first-generation college student, was aggressively recruited by for-profit colleges. They promised her a great future with a paying job. What she ended up with was a student debt of $162,000. She attended the International Academy of Design and Technology, which is a for-profit college owned by Career Education Corporation.

Tabitha is a veteran of the Air Force. She thought her education would give her the skills she needed to be successful in the civilian workplace. It turns out she does the same job as her colleagues who didn’t attend any of these
for-profit schools. She didn’t pick up any advantage; she just picked up a debt. The GI bill didn’t cover the tuition because it was too high, so she took out student loans.

Paying her loans is a daily struggle. For Tabitha, it consumes her life. She sometimes has to walk away from other bills just to pay her student loans. She is constantly in battle with the lenders, trying to negotiate a reasonable payment plan, and they refuse. She can’t save for anything. She can’t pay for her own health insurance. She probably can’t get married and have children. She just can’t afford it. She wants to go back to a real school for a real education, but guess what. This deeply in debt, she can’t borrow any money to go to school—to a real college instead of a for-profit school.

For-profit colleges prey on veterans such as Tabitha. They use deceptive marketing and aggressive tactics. They tell them everything is going to be great and everything is going to be paid for. It is simply not true.

The 90-10 rule permits for-profit colleges to receive up to 90 percent of their total revenue from the Federal Government. For-profit colleges are only allowed to receive 10 percent of their total revenue from the Federal Government. These for-profit colleges to receive up to 90 percent of their total revenue from the Federal Government.

For-profit colleges prey on veterans such as Tabitha. They use deceptive marketing and aggressive tactics. They tell them everything is going to be great and everything is going to be paid for. It is simply not true.

The 90–10 rule permits for-profit colleges to receive up to 90 percent of their total revenue from the Federal Government. For-profit colleges are only allowed to receive 10 percent of their total revenue from the Federal Government. These for-profit colleges prey on voters who largely would not consider reform voting. They would not entertain raising any revenue.
try to force each other to do it on the backs of one piece of our large Federal budget.

So to my conservative neighbors or those in the other party, I am sorry, we just cannot do this through cuts to discretionary, nondefense programs alone or the elimination of entitlement programs. We cannot responsibly deal with this deficit and debt just within those two areas.

In the last 2 years we already made more than $5 trillion in discretionary spending cuts. On the trajectory we are on now, in the next decade the percentage these programs make of our total Federal Government will drop to levels not seen since Dwight Eisenhower was President, even as our revenues today are at their lowest as a percentage of our economy in 50 years.

Federal spending, done right, in the right sectors, fuels our long-term competitiveness. I am talking about investments in education, in infrastructure, in R&D—will be crowded out. Progressive growth engines is being cut off. We need to sustain investment in some of these critical areas of the Federal budget. But equally, I will say to my liberal neighbors, to folks in my party, we cannot solve this budget problem just by raising taxes on the wealthy and on corporations. The math just does not work. There is not enough we can raise there to deal with the whole challenge.

Remember, the fiscal cliff deal we just passed in the last few weeks will bring in another $600 billion in revenue over the next 10 years. So we are making progress. We also cannot do it if we simply ignore the poor fiscal health of our long-term entitlement programs either. Last year Medicare and Medicaid Programs—plus interest on the debt—made up almost 30 cents of every $1 the Federal Government spent. In two decades, on our current trajectory, it may be 50 cents of every $1.

Demographics, steadily rising costs of health care will keep driving this, and we must deal with it. Unless we change course, putting all these things together, productive expenditures that grow our economy—medical research, R&D—will be crowded out. Progressive priorities such as Head Start, low-income housing assistance, breast and cervical cancer screening—those things that help care for the least among us or that help make us healthier will be gone.

So in my view, why not take this moment we still have a Democrat in the White House and Democrats in control of this Chamber to make tough choices while we have historically low interest rates and fight to preserve the legacy of the earned benefits—Medicare, Medicaid, and the vital entitlement programs we treasure. In my view, we cannot simply hope that the cost of our entitlement programs comes down and we cannot simply tax our way to economic health. Anyone who tells you that either of these is enough is wrong. Spending has to be cut. Entitlements have to be reformed. Revenue needs to be raised. They are all part of the problem, and they should all be part of the solution.

Somehow, we actually do manage briefly to have a substantive debate on these questions, we tend to spend all of our time focusing on the smallest facet of the Federal budget—discretionary spending—but almost no time discussing these others, the rest of the equation, the big drivers.

This place has become somewhat of an alternative reality where, if we dig in real hard and people get really excited about issues such as "sequester" or "fiscal cliff," we can ignore the facts. There is no question that we do have to reduce spending, but the sequester is the worst way to do it. When conceived, the sequester was to do harm side effects. It was supposed to be motivated to move Heaven and Earth to prevent it from taking effect. That is how terrible it is as policy. Yet here we are.

I am dumbfounded, it is not as though the budget is not plenty of time to make this better—18 months, by my count. Why are people talking now in the press here on Capitol Hill about whether BOEHNER will lose his speakership or whether the first person to suggest the sequester in the White House or in the Capitol, whether Republicans have more to gain by the sequester kicking in or Democrats? How much time have we been spending trying to fix blame rather than fix the problem? Who owns the sequester seems to be the fight of the day here. Who cares is my question. There are no winners in this fight.

I think the question of how we reduce our deficits, stabilize our economy, prioritize spending that will grow jobs—this debate can either dominate the next 10 years, as we lurch every 3 months from crisis to crisis, or we can address the broader, bigger question and fix it and lay a groundwork for healthy, long-term recovery. Again, the math is not that hard; the politics are.

We here in Congress, with the executive branch, have largely created this problem, and now we need to solve it. Tomorrow, leaders from this Chamber and the House will go to the White House to meet with President Obama about how to address the sequester on the very day it takes effect. On behalf of my constituents, on behalf of the teachers, the police officers, the non-profits, the kids, their parents, my neighbors, on behalf of my State, I urge our leaders to embrace this moment and to work not only to avert this short-term sequester—not just this $85 billion in cuts—but to resume their work on the grand bargain. We need a big deal. We need it to be balanced. We need it to be fair. Spending, entitlements, revenue—they all need to be addressed. They all have to be part of the equation.

My question for everyone in that meeting tomorrow—Mr. MCCAIN, I have to ask for regular order. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority time has expired. Mr. COONS. I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to conclude my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. My question for everyone—everyone—in both parties, both Chambers who goes to this important meeting at the White House tomorrow is, How much more time do we have to fight and not to act, to attack and not compromise, to spin rather than solve? Based on the e-mails, the calls, the contacts I have gotten from my constituents, from my neighbors, the time to step up and address this larger problem is now. The sequester, while savage, is not the underlying problem. It is our unwillingness to come together across parties and Chambers to deal with the underlying challenges of our budget. It is my hope, my prayer, that we will take this moment and act.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

AMERICAN FAMILY ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 388, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 18, (S. 388) a bill to appropriately limit sequestration, to eliminate tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in addition to the two cloture votes on bills dealing with the sequester today, there be set a time, to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, that without intervening action or debate the Senate proceed to a rollcall vote on the motion to proceed to my alternative bill dealing with the sequester which is now at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?
The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object and will say just a few things.

Unless we act by midnight tomorrow, Friday, across-the-board cuts will kick in. The Republican alternative is not going to protect our air safety, our food supply, and, most importantly, our national security. And frankly, Mr. President, air safety, which I mentioned, food supply—that is also part of our national security in addition to our military.

The alternative that has been put forward by my friend the Republican leader would not replace the cuts. As I said earlier this morning here on the floor, one of my colleagues in the Democratic caucus said at our caucus on Tuesday that he understood what the Republicans were going to put forward, and he said it would be like sending the President an order: We have already decided you are going to have to cut off three fingers, and we are giving you the alternative to decide which one you cut first.

The Republican alternative would not replace the cuts but would call for making the cuts in some different way. Republicans call their proposal “flexibility.” In fact, it is anything but that. Their proposal is entirely inflexible on one key point: not a single dollar of revenue, not a single tax loophole would be closed.

Now, remember, Mr. President, the one proposal we have forward says that if you make $5 million a year, you will have to pay 30 percent tax minimum. That is it. That does not sound too outrageous. That is why the American people, the Independents, and 60 percent of Republicans.

Now the Republican side seeks a third vote on the Ayotte amendment, which would replace the cuts with a parade of even more unfair cuts and penalties on immigrants, people receiving health care under ObamaCare, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, those kinds of things.

I also have trouble understanding, as I do—I frankly do understand why, as I read the proposals. Mr. McCain, Mr. Graham do not like the Republican proposal—haven’t we ceded enough power to the President?

So it is not our fault over here that the Republican leader chose to offer not the Ayotte alternative but instead chose the Republican alternative that we are going to talk about and vote on later today.

I return to my main question again briefly. Are Republicans really filibustering on the Ayotte amendment? My question is, Would the Republican leader modify his consent to allow for simple up-or-down votes on each of the two alternatives? Would it make a difference if we allowed votes on three bills, including the Ayotte alternative? I would be happy to have three votes if the Republican leader would simply allow the votes to be held at majority thresholds.

So the Republicans—Mr. President, I would do it formally. I would be happy to do so if there is any taking of my request here. But this having been the case, if my friend the Republican leader says: Yes, why don’t you put that in proper form—and I would be happy to do it then—then we would have votes on all three, with a simple majority on each one of them. Not hearing someone say: Great idea, then I object to the request of my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would say to my friend the majority leader that I would object. He can either propound such a consent or not, whatever he chooses, but I would object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. Yes, I did that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, obviously we regret that we have not been able to reach an agreement. I am especially disappointed that we are unable to consider the Ayotte amendment, which is an alternative to the sequestration that would still sooner or later have the same Draconian effects on our national security.

I also would point out to my colleagues that what we are about to go through is in some respects a charade because we know the proposal on that side will not succeed with 60 votes, and the proposal on this side will not succeed with 60 votes. Meanwhile, the clock moves on until sometime tomorrow night.

Some of us warned for a long time about the effects of sequestration, and if we want to have a blame game, then I will take blame, everybody takes blame. But isn’t it time that we prevented what our military leaders in uniform, who have made their careers and their lives serving and sacrificing for this country, say would harm and inflicts terrible damage on our ability to defend this Nation, our inability to train our men and women who are serving? I always appreciate very much when Members on both sides of the aisle praise the men and women who are serving in the military. I am always pleased to see that. But shouldn’t we be thinking about them now? Shouldn’t we be thinking about those men and women who are serving who literally do not know what they are going to be doing tomorrow—like the crew of the aircraft carrier that they decided now to deploy to the Middle East at a time when tensions are incredibly high?

I would also point out to my colleagues that this is not a fair sequestration. Most Americans believe this is half out of defense, half out of non-defense. It is not.

Under the formulation of the sequestration, about half of the spending we engage in is exempt, such as compensations. The three of us traveled to an evening function at a pizza place with him and his comrades who fought. A book was written by Jake Tapper, an excellent book—I recommend it to all of my colleagues—about eight of their comrades who were killed. Here we are unable to make sure these young men and women serving in harm’s way have the equipment, the training, and everything they need to defend this Nation a great disservice, and the President did them a disservice when he said in the campaign: Not to worry, sequestration won’t happen. The President of the United States said that. I didn’t say it. The three of us traveled this country warning about the effects of sequestration. Of course, we now know the idea came from the White House. That is the blame game, and I will be glad to engage in this game.

Can’t we at least come to some agreement to prevent this? Are we going to lurch from one fiscal cliff to another? If we want to do that, that is one thing.

General Odierno is one of the great leaders I have had the opportunity of knowing for many years. General Odierno, the Chief of Staff of the Army, a man who has decorations from here to there, said he cannot replace the men and women who are serving in Afghanistan under this sequestration because he doesn’t have the ability to train their replacements. Isn’t that an alarm for us?

We are going to go through a charade here. In a little while we are going to have a vote on the Democratic proposal, and it will not get sufficient
votes; and the same thing here on this side, and the clock will tick.

Tomorrow, on the last day, the President is going to call people over to the White House to see if we can address it. Where was he in the last year?

Against what? Taking the floor today for the blame game. I am pleading for the men and women who are serving this Nation in harm’s way who every single day have a hell-of-a-lot tougher time than we do. Can’t we do something on their behalf to sit down with the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief, and get this issue resolved before we do great damage to our national security? I think Senator Ayotte for her proposal. It contains real reductions in spending so we don’t have to go through this sequestration. On the one side, now we have a choice between “flexibility,” which nobody really knows what is, and the Senator from South Carolina who authored pore. The Senator from South Carolina who authored pore. On the other side, obviously, a proposal that really bears no relevance to the issue that faces us.

I thank my colleagues for the time. If I sound a little emotional on this issue, it is because it is. It seems to me we, at least on this issue of national security and the men and women who serve our Nation, should come together. I stand ready to put everything on the table to prevent what could be, in the words of the departing Secretary of Defense, a devastating blow to our ability to defend this Nation in what I could make an argument are the most dangerous times.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire who authored this amendment, Senator McCaskill, and I support. She spent a lot of time and effort trying to fix sequestration in the first year and trying to look at programs that are not as essential to the Nation, in my view, as the Department of Defense.

Let me put this in perspective. I don’t need a poll to tell me what I think about this. The majority leader referenced some poll out there about where the American people are. I appreciate polling. It is a tool all politicians use. I don’t need one here to know where I stand.

The question is, Do the people in South Carolina think I am right or wrong? I will have an election in 2014. I am certainly worried to stand before the people of South Carolina and say what we are doing in this sequestration proposal is ill-conceived, dangerous, and despicable.

Let me start with the Commander in Chief. This is the what Mr. Lew said, our new Treasury Secretary:

Make no mistake, the sequester is not meant to be policy. Rather, it is meant to be an unpalatable option that all parties want to avoid.

That was their view of sequestration. According to Bob Woodward and comments since, this idea came out of the White House. The White House thought that if we created a penalty clause for supercommittee failure called sequestration, where we would have to take $600 billion of the $1.2 trillion out of the Defense Department, that would make the supercommittee more likely to achieve a result. If we took $600 billion out of nondefense, that would put pressure on the supercommittee to get the right result.

We are going to spend $45 trillion over the next decade. The next question for me is, where are we going to save $1.2 trillion without destroying the Defense Department and raising taxes? Yes, we could if we tried. Put me in the camp that this is an achievable spending cut. This is not something that is unachievable.

What Senator McConnell said is very important. Two-thirds of the budget, almost, is exempt from sequestration. When you hear Republicans say, we can find $85 billion out of $5 trillion of trillions, Republican colleagues, stop saying that. That is not accurate. We are not cutting $85 billion out of $3.5 trillion. We are cutting $85 billion out of $41.57 trillion. Because the Budget Control Act took off the table two-thirds of the government from being cut.

I will get to the President in a minute, but let me talk a little bit about my party, the party of Ronald Reagan, the party of peace through strength. This party that believes—at least we used to—the No. 1 obligation of the Federal Government, before it does anything else, is to get national security right. That was what made Ronald Reagan.

That is what I believe, I don’t need a poll to tell me that. I don’t care if 90 percent of the people in the country said the Defense Department is not my primary concern when it comes to Federal budgeting. Count me in the 10 percent.

The party of Ronald Reagan, even though it came out of the White House, this very bad idea, agreed to it. What did we agree to? We agreed to take off the table two-thirds of the Federal Government—pell grants. My sister received a Pell grant when my parents died. It is a very important program. It helps people go to college who are low-income Americans. In 2008 it was $16.25 billion and in 2013 it is $11.57 billion.

Food stamps. A lot of people need help. I understand that. The Food Stamp Program has doubled since 2008. I guess the Republican Party believes the Pell grants, food stamps, the FAA, and home mortgage interest deduction, and all the other stuff in the Federal Government should be shielded, but those who have been fighting the war that protects us all from radical Islam should be on the chopping block. Ronald Reagan should be rolling over in his grave, I don’t think he would agree with this. I don’t think he would agree this was a good idea on our side.

I cannot tell you how disgusted I am with the concept that when it comes time to cut—because the budget politicians can’t reach an agreement—we fire the soldiers and keep the politicians and every other social program intact and put half the cuts on those who are fighting the war.

Secretary Panetta said: After 10 years of these cuts we would have the smallest ground forces since 1940, the smallest number of ships since 1915, and the smallest Air Force in its history. This isn’t like the drawdowns in the past when the potential enemy was disabled and in some way rendered ineffective. We are still confronting a threat, a threat of terrorism that would decimate our defense. It would cripple us in terms of our ability to protect this country.

It would result in the hollowing out of our forces. It would terribly weaken your ability to respond anywhere in the world. It is a ship without sailors. It is an airwing without enough trained pilots. It is a paper tiger. In fact, it invites aggression. A hollow military doesn’t have the personnel. It comes from poor stewardship and poor leadership. I couldn’t agree more.

To my Democratic colleagues, we are not going to raise any more taxes to spend money on the government. The next time I raise taxes, we are going to try to get out of debt. We are $17 trillion in debt, and every time there is a crisis in this Nation you want to raise taxes to pay for the government we already have. We have enough money to run this government. We need to spend it better.

To my Republican colleagues, there is not enough flexibility in the world to change the top line number. You either believe Secretary Panetta or you don’t. You either believe every military commander—I don’t trust everything a general tells me, but the question for me is do I trust all generals who tell me the same thing. Can all of them be wrong? It is one thing to have a dispute with a general or an admiral, but when every general and every admiral tells you the same thing—and if we don’t believe them, we need to fire them—we act accordingly.

As to the President, you have one obligation that nobody in this body has. You are the Commander in Chief of the United States. They trust you, they need you, and your primary goal is to take care of those in uniform and their families.

Mr. President, you have let them down. My party let them down, but you are different from any other politician. You are the Commander in Chief. How could you have considered this as an
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will help us deal with it, but it will not solve the problem in terms of our national security.

So that is why I decided to come up with some alternative savings. My proposal will not get a vote today. I think it is important that we aggressively bring more ideas to the floor, not less ideas, and debate this vigorously in the Senate, instead of where we are right now, which is a charade. We are going to have one vote and another vote and then we are all going to go to our respective sides and say: OK, American people, we know there are real risks, particularly to the safety of this country, that we should be addressing. From my perspective, I believe we can address them through alternative spending cuts.

Through all this, we have the President, who has called leaders of both parties tomorrow to the White House. I have heard from both sides that the time is now to stop this charade, and it is my hope that we can be in these crisis moments in which we have been in a position to try to resolve them. I do think we actually have ideas, and just as we are seeing in the Senate, there are people who want to protect our national security. I think the President should have been on this much sooner, but now it is time for his leadership as the Commander in Chief—leadership we could have used this past summer when we were all talking about it. We could have been in a position to try to resolve it then rather than continuing to be in these crisis moments in which we find ourselves in the Senate.

Where I am left on all this is that we owe it to our men and women in uniform to find alternative ways to save the money, still protecting our national security. Also, so people understand that the cuts that are taken in 2013—during a shorter period, not a full period—OMB has estimated on the defense end it is about 13 percent, on top of the $487 billion in reductions, and in nondefense spending it is about 9 percent over the additional $487 billion.

So I would just simply ask for a time to stop this charade, and it is my hope we could actually get down to resolving this in a responsible way for our country. That is why I put pen to paper. People can be critical of my proposal, but I think that now is the time when we should have a vote on every proposal and we should have every idea come to the table because it is a time to start the charade and it is a time to solve this problem. Let’s make sure we protect our country at a very dangerous time.

I will continue to work to do that for our country, I think we can do it, still addressing our deficit, still with savings, but we certainly need to do it, and having the charade vote we are going to have today will not solve it. The American people deserve better and we should be giving them better and solving this.

I thank the Chair for allowing me the time, and I yield the floor.

The Acting President pro tempore, The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of the Democratic alternative that would cancel the sequester for this year.

Before the beginning of this debate from New Hampshire leaves, I would like to take a minute to compliment her on her energy, her passion, and the fact that she actually wants to present ideas to be more inclusive. I want her to also know I support the concept she is advocating of no more delay; that we cannot solve America’s fiscal situation and also important public investments we need to make in research and innovation and keep our fragile economy going by just punting now. I think we agree on that.

The other thing we agree on is the goal to get our fiscal crisis in order, to strengthen our economy, and to keep America strong. We just are going to disagree on the means. But that is OK. That is called America. That is called the Senate. That is called debate. Let’s let the world watch and hear that we actually have ideas, and just as we are seeing in the Senate, there are people who want to protect our national security. I think the President should have been on this much sooner, but now it is time for his leadership as the Commander in Chief—leadership we could have used this past summer when we were all talking about it. We could have been in a position to try to resolve it then rather than continuing to be in these crisis moments in which we find ourselves in the Senate.
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I will continue to work to do that for our country, I think we can do it, still addressing our deficit, still with savings, but we certainly need to do it, and having the charade vote we are going to have today will not solve it. The American people deserve better and we should be giving them better and solving this.

I thank the Chair for allowing me the time, and I yield the floor.
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I thank the Chair for allowing me the time, and I yield the floor.
Let me start first with defense, because much has been said about defense. Many tables have been pounded, many chests have been thumped talking about it. And we do have to look out for our military. But our $27.5 billion recognizes the reality of both on the ground. The reality of boots on the ground. Our troops are coming home. They will all be home by the summer of 2014. Our defense cuts kick in in 2015, so nothing we do will in any way di-lute, or tamper with, the money that would go to our men and women in harm's way. So our cuts don't kick in until 2015, and then it will be $3 billion a year over a 9-year period, which our generals and our Acting Secretary of Defense, Secretary Hagel, now con-curs with. So we are OK with defense. And, most of all, the military is OK with it.

Then we also cut domestic spending. Here, we cut $27 billion in the farm bill. It eliminates subsidies we don't need to do anymore. The President took it away from these subsidized tax-take expense account deductions while ordinary people pay them every day. And, most of all, the military is OK with it.

Do you know what drives me wild? The Presiding Officer is the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The Democratic alternative is sound solutions are given by people who get it this afternoon. For all those people who are crying their tears and don't know what the choice is, that is the choice they are making. Leader Reid's bill would replace the indiscriminate cuts of the so-called sequester with targeted cuts to agricultural subsidies and defense spending—as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said—after the troops are home when the costs can necessarily come down, paired with revenue not from raising taxes but from closing a loophole, a tax loophole that allows the highest paid people in America to pay lower tax rates than regular middle-class families.

Mr. TOOMEY. But there will be time available?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, would the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. TOOMEY. I thank the Senator, the gentleman from Rhode Island.

I wish to express my appreciation for your question clarifying the procedure. My understanding is there is time reserved for me after the Senator from Rhode Island finishes with his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No order has been forthcoming to that effect yet.

Mr. TOOMEY. But there will be time available?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am rising today in strong sup-port of Leader Reid's proposal to stop the sequester. We need to reduce our debt and our deficit. We should do so in a thoughtful manner.

We have so often on this floor heard our Republican friends criticize Demo-
committee here: The President believes no spending, even wasteful spending, should be cut.

Well, let’s look at the facts. Through the Budget Control Act of 2011 and several other measures, we have cut spending cuts of $1 trillion in the budget period of the next decade. When you include interest savings—the top part—from that reduced borrowing, it comes to $1.7 trillion in spending cuts and associated interest savings.

On the revenue side, we have only generated a little over $700 billion from ending the Bush tax cuts for the top 1 percent—at least over $450,000 in income—and from the associated interest savings. This together puts us $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction toward our goal of $4 trillion in total deficit reduction that most economists agree is needed to stabilize our budget. But notice, in the balance between spending cuts and new revenues, spending cuts are ahead by $1 trillion.

The ranking member of the Budget Committee said President Obama believes no spending, even wasteful spending, should be cut. And he is $1 trillion ahead on spending versus revenues. We have cut $7 of spending for every $1 of revenue in the last couple of decades—which now U.S. Government revenue is at its lowest percentage of GDP in more than 50 years, more than half a century. Our proposal going forward is 50/50, spending cuts and revenues. So let’s not pretend to or allow Congress to believe this spending cuts. There have been more spending cuts than new revenues. We have tried to find a balanced approach and so far, in this $2.4 trillion, we have not even looked at tax loopholes, at spending that happens through the Tax Code that mostly benefits big corporations, special interests, and super-high-end American earners.

Take a look at how big that amount is. We collect, in individual income tax revenue, about $1 trillion every year from individuals. But the total liability of individuals under the Tax Code is over $2 trillion. What happens to this other $1.02 trillion? It flows back out. It never comes into the government as revenues. It goes back to people as tax deductions, loopholes, and various ways that we spend money through the Tax Code.

If you look at the corporate income tax side, it is about the same. We look at our corporations—which, by the way, contribute about one-sixth as much into our national revenue as they used to. They are at an all-time low in terms of contributing to our national revenues in the last couple of decades—60 years, I want to say. They are at $118 billion, at one time it gets collected and becomes revenue. And there is another $157 billion that is corporate tax liability, but we let them get it back through loopholes in the Tax Code. You put them together and you have $1.16 trillion that we can use to help defeat or replace the sequester.

It is a big deal to look at the tax spending as well as just the revenues that come in. We have done nothing on that yet. That should be part of this discussion. That is what we do in the proposal I put out.

Last year we spent a great deal of time in this body debating whether the top corporate tax rate should be 35 percent or 39.6 percent, and we ultimately set the rate at 39.6 percent for families whose income is over $450,000. But what we know is that many of those families will never pay anything close to that top marginal rate. The middle class deals with those special provisions that I talked about, the loopholes, the tax spending that disproportionately benefits high-income folks. They are special deals for special interests. Of them all, perhaps the most egregious is the so-called carried interest loophole that allows billionaires—literally billionaires—to pay lower tax rates than regular families. That is why in the last election it became apparent that Mitt Romney was paying something like an 11-percent tax rate.

It is not just Mitt Romney. The IRS tracks the effective tax rates paid by the top 400 highest income earners in the country. In 2009, the last year they have data, the top 400 earned an average of $26.8 million each. They paid over $200 million each. What did they pay in taxes on average? About 20 percent. About 20 percent on average. Some paid more. The nominal rate was supposed to be 35 percent. How many Mitt Romneys are there paying 11 percent in order to average to 20 percent? And 20 percent is the same rate that an average firefighter pays in Rhode Island, or a brickmason pays in Rhode Island. Don’t tell me a billion-dollar corporation can pay a higher tax rate than a brickmason. It is not just the top 400. The Congressional Research Service estimates that about a quarter of people in America who make more than $1 million a year are there paying lower tax rates than over 10 million middle-income taxpayers. In that sense the Tax Code is upside-down in favor of these high-income earners. Loopholes let them do that.

So we cut across all these loopholes with the so-called Buffett rule. They are supposed to pay 39.6 percent. The Buffett rule says: Ok, take all the loopholes you want, but you cannot go below 30 percent. We will let you take the loopholes. What the Buffett rule says: You are supposed to pay but you cannot go below 30 percent. You can’t go to 11 percent. You cannot be paying lower than a brickmason pays. That is in our sequester replacement bill. It produces $71 billion.

High-earning professionals can perform another trick. They can avoid paying Social Security and Medicare taxes simply by calling themselves corporations for tax purposes. You heard the Republican Presidential candidate saying corporations are people. This is the flip side. These people are corporations. If you make enough money you can afford to turn yourself into a corporation to dodge paying your Social Security and your Medicare contributions. So the second item on my list closes that loophole too, which is another $9 billion.

The next item on the list contributes $3 billion by ending special deprecation allowances that allow jet owners can depreciate their aircraft faster, for tax purposes, than commercial aircraft. I am very happy for anybody who is successful enough to have a private jet. But that luxury need not be subsidized by putting aside the need for this because of the sequester, this is a change that makes sense just on fairness grounds. It stands on its own and it is another $3 billion.

The fourth provision in my bill would end tax breaks for big oil companies. Over the past decade the big five oil companies have collectively enjoyed over $1 trillion in profits—yes, trillion with a T. Repealing taxpayer giveaways to them is something we should be doing anyway. It is another $24 billion toward getting rid of the sequester.

The final provision in my plan helps replace the sequester by ending a tax break that, unbelievably, rewards manufacturers that close up shop in the United States and move jobs to other countries. It does that by allowing those corporations to indefinitely delay paying taxes on profits from those foreign overseas operations. Ending the deferral loophole for companies that manufacture goods overseas for sale to American customers is something we should do anyway to support our domestic manufacturers. It adds almost $20 billion toward replacing the sequester cuts.

Each one of these five provisions would make the Tax Code more fair for ordinary Americans. I love our chairman of Appropriations. She can speak to issues on the floor of the Senate like nobody else. When she said these are cushy, lobbyist-driven earmarks, she is dead right. They do not deserve to stand on their own. And we can get rid of some of the smelliest ones and spare ourselves the sequester and the loss of a million jobs at the same time? Gosh, I think we ought to be doing that.

I strongly support Leader Reid’s bill to replace the sequester cuts with a 50/50 mix of revenue and spending. But I also want to show we can avoid the sequester for the coming year by looking at the vast tax spending we do through loopholes and gimmicks in the Tax Code, especially for the rich, out-of-powerful corporations, special interests, and very high-income individuals. When you set that against the economic harm the sequester is going to cause to our country, closing those loopholes should be a higher priority, on economic grounds and on grounds of fairness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.
Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for allowing me to go first. I assure him I will be very brief. I know the distinguished Senator from Washington State is here. She has an interest in going back to the cause of her very strong support of the Violence Against Women bill.

Earlier this month, the Senate came together in the best tradition of the chamber to pass the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act with a strong bipartisan vote. I am happy to report that the House of Representatives just passed the Senate-passed bill. This vital legislation will now go to the President, and it will be signed into law. It will help victims of rape and domestic violence and victims of human trafficking who could not wait another day for us to act. This action of Congress will prevent terrible crimes and help countless victims rebuild their lives.

Today Congress showed that we still can act in a bipartisan way. I thank Senator CRAPo for being my partner on this legislation from the beginning, and I was glad when he and Senator MURKOWSKI, another steadfast supporter, joined me on a bipartisan letter earlier this week asking Speaker BOEHNER to pass this legislation to help all victims of domestic and sexual violence. Today, the House followed the Senate’s example, and listened to the call from thousands of survivors of violence and law enforcement by passing this fully-inclusive, life-saving legislation with a bipartisan vote.

We made the Violence Against Women Act our top priority this Congress but it should not have taken this long. Our bill was written with the input of law enforcement, victims, and the people who work with victims every day to address real needs. None of those things changed. What should have been controversial was, still, at a time when we face gridlock and stonewalling on even the most compelling issues, I am glad to see that we could find a way to cut through all of that to help victims of violence.

This new law will make lives better. It will encourage and fund practices proven to help law enforcement and victim service providers reduce domestic violence homicides. It will lead to more round-the-clock services, regardless of rape and sexual assault crimes and more services provided to victims of those crimes. It will also help eliminate backlogs of untested rape kits to help those victims receive justice and security promptly.

This reauthorization, like every VAWA reauthorization before it, takes new steps to ensure that we can reach the most vulnerable victims whose needs are not being met. For the first time, it guarantees that all victims can receive needed services, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. This law strengthens protections for vulnerable immigrant victims. It ensures that colleges and universities will do more to protect students from domestic and sexual violence. This reauthorization also takes important new steps to combat the appalling epidemic of domestic violence on tribal lands and to ensure that no perpetrators of this terrible crime are above the law.

The bill that the President will sign also includes the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, which continues and strengthens effective tools to combat the scourge of human trafficking. It is unacceptable that 150 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, the evils of sex trafficking and labor trafficking, forms of modern day slavery, still exist around the world and even in the United States. It has been too difficult, but I am glad that Congress is finally acting once again to address trafficking.

I will never forget going as a young prosecutor to crime scenes at 2:00 in the morning and seeing the victims of these awful crimes. As we worked on this bill, I heard the moving stories in hearings and rallies and meetings of those who survived true horrors and had the courage to share their stories in the hopes that others could be spared what they went through. We have finally come together to honor their courage and take the action they demanded.

I thank the many Senators and Representatives of both parties who have helped to lead this fight, and the leadership of both Houses who have prioritized moving this vital legislation. I thank Representative COLE for his steadfast dedication to help preserve the protections for Native women. But most of all, I thank the tireless victims, advocates, and service providers who have given so much of themselves to ensure that this legislation would pass and that, when it did, it could make meaningful difference. Lives will be better because of their work and because of this law.

I yield the floor and thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise to address the issue of the sequestration and the Democratic and Republican alternatives. But I want to start by addressing the most important issue that we are having the debate in this fashion. This is certainly among the very most important issues we are grappling with—should be grappling with as a Senate, as a Congress, as a Federal Government. Getting ourselves on a sustainable fiscal path is as important as anything we can be doing. The sequestration is an important part of that, and unfortunately the majority party here does not want to have a full and open debate and will not permit multiple amendments from both sides.

I don’t know how many ideas there are on the Democratic side. I know there are at least three or four or five different ideas on the Republican side. Frankly, I think any sensible approach to this ought to have a full and open, robust debate and I am happy to vote on every one of them. I will vote against some, I will probably vote for others. But why would we say there can only be two choices, one Democratic choice and one Republican choice? I have to say I am extremely disappointed that we have gotten to this point where we cannot have an open, robust debate and we do not have a wide range of ideas, because the challenges require that kind of response. It is very disappointing that the majority party refuses to conduct that debate and appears unwilling to have those votes.

Nevertheless, I have developed a bill, together with Senator INHOFE, which I think is a much more sensible way to achieve the savings we badly need. I will say unequivocally, we need to trim spending. We cannot continue spending at the rate we have been spending money. We cannot continue trillion dollar deficits. We have a $16 trillion debt. The massive deficits and the accumulated debt are today costing us jobs and holding back our economy, so at the rate we have been spending we cannot afford to go on. This sequester—if it goes into effect as its equivalent—would reduce spending by 2.3 percent. After growing by 100 percent, we cannot find 2.3 percent. By the way, that is budget authority, which means permission to spend the actual amount that would be spent during this year would go down by about 1.2 percent. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of our economy.

Here is the other thing. This is how much austerity we are talking about: If the savings of the sequester go into effect, we are talking about a cut in the size of Federal spending in 2013 will be greater than spending was in 2012. So let’s just be clear about what is going on here. This is not nearly the amount of savings we need. This is merely one step in the right direction. While government has been growing, the economy has not. We have had all of this spending growth. We have had massive deficits. What have we gotten in return? The worst economic recovery from any recession since the Great Depression. Why have our unemployment rate that is persistently unacceptably high. Eight percent is the official measure of unemployment, but when we take into...
account the people who have given up looking for work altogether, it is much higher than that. The fact is economic growth does not depend on a bloated government that is always growing.

In fact, we will have stronger economic growth as we begin to demonstrate that we can get on a sustainable fiscal path, as soon as we can start to take the threat of a fiscal collapse off the table by showing we can get spending under control. It is absolutely critical that we begin to take both sides of our economy and job growth that we achieve the savings of this sequester.

I am the first to acknowledge there are a couple of problems with the way this legislation goes about it, and that is the reason I introduced this legislation along with Senator INHOFE. The two big problems are, first, the savings our defense budget disproportionately. The defense budget is about 18 percent of total spending, but it is half of this whole sequester, and that is after we already cut some spending. The very sympathetic to the concern that this imposes a real problem on our defense budget.

The second problem is that the cuts are not very thoughtfully designed. Their direction or focus. The categories that are subject to the sequestration are spending cuts across the board. There are huge categories that are not subject, such as the entire Social Security Program and many other entitlements. That are not affected at all. But for those programs that are cut, there is no ability to discern which programs ought to be cut more or which ones ought to be cut less and which ones, perhaps, should not be cut at all.

The bill Senator INHOFE and I have introduced and will be voting on today—at least the cloture motion—addresses both of these problems. It does require that we achieve the savings of the sequester—and that is very important—but it would allow the President flexibility in how it is achieved so we don’t have these very ham-handed, poorly designed, across-the-board cuts.

If the bill passes, the President will be able to go to his service chiefs on the defense side, he could go to his agency and department heads on the nondefense side and say: OK. Look, you have been used to budgets that keep growing and growing, and that is what has been happening. This year you are going to have to back a little bit. We have a few pennies of every dollar. Look for the programs that are working least well or not at all. Look for areas where there is waste and inefficiency. Look for redundancies, and that is where we are going to trim a little bit and not hit these areas. That is what competent managers in any business would do. That is what families have to do, and that is what State and local governments have to do. That is what we need to do here, and that is what our bill would enable to the President to do. He would have to find the areas where we can make the cuts without causing great disruption.

This is not a blank check for the President. There are constraints on what the President could do under the legislation that Senator INHOFE and I are proposing. For instance, there could be no tax hike. We don’t think we need still more tax increases after all the tax increases that have already been through. The defense cuts could not be any greater than what is contemplated in the current sequestration. Under Senator INHOFE’s approach and mine, they could be less. The President could choose to cut this senator for military advisers and cut the defense budget a little bit less and shift this elsewhere.

I am one who believes our defense budget should not be exempt from scrutiny, from spending discipline, and some cuts, but I think they ought to be done carefully and thoughtfully.

The President would not be able to increase any amounts. This is not an exercise in just shifting money to another account. We Sangiher out where we can do the cuts most thoughtfully and sensibly. Any cuts in the defense budget would have to be consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act that has been passed. The President could not even leverage 100 percent of the savings; that is part of this. He could not use any gimmicks to do it. There would be no phony cuts in the future offset by promises for cuts at another time. There would be none of that kind of a show. That would have to be straightforward and honest.

Finally—and I think this is an important point—Congress would have a final say. When the President—under this approach if it were to pass and be signed into law—would be required to propose an alternative series of cuts, and then Congress could vote to disapprove them if Congress chose to do that. Ultimately, Congress would still control that important element of the budget process, but we would allow the President to find the most sensible way to do this.

The President is saying he does not want this flexibility. That is kind of unbelievable to me. He is going around the country scaring the American people and threatening all kinds of disastrous things he says he will have to do. Then in the same breath he says: By the way, don’t give me the flexibility to do something else. I don’t understand that. It seems to me the obvious thing to do to these cuts in a way that would not be disruptive and would not do harm.

Let me give one particular example: A good example is the FAA. If the sequester goes into effect on the FAA, the budget there will be cut by $665 million. That is from a total of just about $17 billion.

The President and the Transportation Secretary have said if the sequester goes into effect, they are going to lay off air traffic controllers; they might have to shut down control towers; we will have long delays at airports with flights being canceled. All kinds of problems. It is interesting to note, if the sequester goes into effect, the amount of funding available to the FAA will still be more than what the President asked for in his budget.

In his budget request was the President planning on laying off air traffic controllers at non-military airports and control towers? I rather doubt it. So if we gave the President flexibility just within the FAA budget, the President could adopt the kinds of savings that he proposed in his budget and allocate the savings properly to pay all of the air traffic controllers and keep the airports running. The point is even within the FAA’s budget, there would be no service disruptions whatsoever. They are not necessary.

Our bill would give the President even more flexibility. He would be able to achieve savings in other areas. In other words, he would not have to hit a particular savings number for the FAA. He might find savings in other places. You could suggest we have an unbelievable lengthy list of opportunities to reduce excessive and wasteful government spending. Instead of closing down air traffic control facilities or military bases or FBI offices, maybe what the President has proposed and we could do cut back on Federal employee travel.

We spend $1 billion a year for Federal employees to go on conferences and trips. Maybe we could cut back on the cell phone subsidies where we buy cell phones for people, costing $5.5 billion a year. We spend millions of dollars on an old-fashioned style trolley in St. Louis, millions on a sports diplomacy exchange program. We have 14,000 vacant and underutilized properties. We spend money for a cowboy poetry festival and $1 million for taste-testing foods to be served on Mars.

I don’t know about anybody else, but I think some of these are a little less important than keeping our air control system intact and safe. To me, it seems like common sense that we ought to give the President the discretion he needs to reduce the spending on the less vital things and continue to fund the important things. We don’t have to only go after wasteful spending, we have an unbelievable number of redundancy in duplicate programs. I have just a few examples. We have 80 different economic development programs spread across the Federal government. We have 47 different job training programs. Doesn’t it make sense if we are going to have some savings that we look to those programs that are not working so well? It cannot be that every program is equal. I guarantee that some of them are not working so well. I would like to think that the administration has metrics for performance and that it knows which ones are performing better and which ones would concentrate the cuts on those that are not working or we could decide to consolidate this huge plethora of programs
and save a lot of money and overhead in administrative and bureaucracy costs.

There is just any number of ways to achieve savings. Senator Tom Coburn has made an enormous contribution to our federal Government by providing exhaustive litanies of duplication, redundancies, waste, and excesses. In addition to what I have mentioned, that would be a very useful place to begin in terms of finding alternatives. I would simply say we have a simple choice here. This sequester is going into effect. Nobody here suggests they would not be painful, where there is waste, and where there are excesses? We are talking about what will amount in actual outlays to a little over 1 percent of the total government spending. This is a Congress that has doubled in size in the last 12 years.

The people in Pennsylvania who I represent don’t believe that every dollar of government spending is spent wisely and prudently and is necessary. They know that there is a lot of waste. This is all about the next 6 months. As we know, the $1.2 trillion in savings in subsequent years is achieved by statutory spending caps. In those years the savings will be figured out by the Appropriations Committee, which is where this should be happening. I wish we had taken up an appropriations bill over this last year, but we didn’t. At least given the reality that we face, we have an opportunity to avoid the kind of calamity and disaster that is being threatened and is completely unnecessary.

I hope we will do the commonsense thing and adopt a bill that will give the President the flexibility he needs to make these cuts in a rational and sensible fashion. We need to achieve the savings for the sake of economic growth and job creation. This is no time to trade higher taxes for more spending, as my Democratic colleagues would prefer. This is a time to make sensible spending. We can do that, and I urge adoption of the measure that Senator Inhofe and I have proposed.

I yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mrs. Murray. Madam President, in the last 2 weeks we have learned more and more what the across-the-board cuts for sequestration really mean for our families and our communities that we all represent. We have heard of workers who are on pins and needles about getting a layoff notice. We have heard from businesses that are experiencing fewer customers. We heard from school superintendents wondering how they are going to absorb deeper cuts on the budgets that are already extremely tight.

After 2 years of watching our economy limp through the longest crisis, I think we all agree the American people have dealt with more than enough of this. That is why I am here today urging our colleagues to support the American Family Economic Protection Act which will replace the automatic cuts from sequestration in a responsible and a fair way.

Our legislation builds on the precedent that was set in the year-end deal, and it is in line with the balanced approach that the American people favor. It would replace the first year of the sequestration with equal amounts of responsible spending cuts and revenue from the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. Half of the deficit reduction would come from responsible cuts in spending between domestic and defense spending.

As the drawdown from Afghanistan is completed, our bill will make targeted reductions in an overall defense budget which will be phased in responsibly as American forces in Afghanistan is fully completed and are in line with the strong military strategy for the 21st century.

Our bill would eliminate the direct payments to farmers that have been a long time coming to crops that are not grown. Those are the kinds of cuts we can and should make, because responsibly tackling our debt and deficit is crucial to our country’s long-term strength and prosperity.

But to do this in a way that puts American families and our economy first, we are all going to have to do our fair share, and middle-class families and seniors and the most vulnerable Americans shouldn’t be asked to share the whole burden alone.

Our bill would replace half the sequestration with new revenues from the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. It calls on the wealthiest Americans to pay at least the same marginal tax rate on their income as our middle-class families pay. It will help reduce the deficit by eliminating a tax break that encourages companies to ship jobs overseas and by getting rid of a special tax loophole for oil companies. And so many American families struggling just to get their kids off to college or to pay their mortgage or to put food on the table, it only seems fair to ask those who can afford it the most to contribute to this national challenge as well.

My Republican colleagues will say the year-end deal closed the door on revenue. Most of them seem to think that closing loopholes for the richest Americans is too high a price to pay— even to replace the serious cuts to defense that are going into effect. Instead, they say all we need is more spending cuts.

But that is not how the American people see it. More than a month after the year-end deal, 76 percent of Americans—and, by the way, 56 percent of Republicans—favored a combination of spending cuts and revenue increases to reduce our deficit. We also know the American people want an end to the cycle of looming deadlines and uncertainty and political posturing we are seeing here in Washington, DC. They have spent enough time wondering if infighting in Congress will affect the jobs they have worked hard to rebuild or the future they want for their children. I think we can all agree our constituents deserve a solution and some certainty.

So our legislation meets Republicans halfway. It reflects the balanced approach the majority of the American public wants. It protects families and communities we represent from slower economic growth and fewer jobs and a continued national debt crisis. It allows us to move past this sequestration debate toward a fair, comprehensive budget deal that provides certainty for American families and businesses.

While the Democrats have taken a balanced approach and responsible approach in our sequestration replacement bill, Republicans have gone in a very different direction. They seem to be more focused today on trying to make sure President Obama gets the blame for the sequestration. They want to stop it. They have all been hearing from our constituents. They want us to come together to solve this problem. They want to see compromise. They want to see a balanced replacement.

But the Republican Inhofe-Toomey bill fails to meet these expectations. It does not solve the problem. It doesn’t stop sequestration. It is not a compromise. I urge all of our colleagues to oppose it.

The Republican Inhofe-Toomey bill would keep in place the massive cuts to both domestic and defense spending. It wouldn’t replace them; it would lock them in. Instead of making the tough decisions required to replace those cuts with responsible deficit reduction, the way our bill does, the Republican bill simply hands the problem off to the President. Instead of taking a balanced approach—the approach that is favored by the vast majority of the American public and the President—we would protect the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations from paying even a penny more in taxes to help us solve this, while pushing the entire burden of deficit reduction onto the backs of our families and our communities and our national defense programs. Their bill would protect defense spending from cuts, open up nondefense spending to more cuts, and specifically prohibit raising revenue to replace the cuts.

One of my Republican colleagues who is very concerned about the cuts to defense spending that would be locked in by this Republican bill called this approach “a complete cop-out.” That
same Republican said if something such as this were to pass, Republicans would be forcing President Obama to make impossible choices and then “every decision he’ll make, we’ll criticize.”

Another Republican opposed this approach as well, saying, “I believe the appropriations process belongs in the legislative branch.” That is us.

The Republican bill will be devastating to our economy. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that sequestration would cause 750,000 workers to lose their jobs by the end of this year. They estimate the economy would shrink by six-tenths of a percent by the end of the year. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said on Tuesday that rearranging these cuts would not have any substantial impact on the near-term economic picture.

Republicans have spent months talking about how they would not raise taxes on the rich and that we need a cut-only approach. But now they can’t even agree on a bill that names a single cut. They want the President to do it. Leader Reid and Leader McConnell agreed to have these votes we are having today over 2 weeks ago, and it took the bill last night to decide what they were even going to bring to the table. After all that time, they decided to play political games and not make any of the tough choices.

Tackling our debt and deficit requires both Republicans and Democrats to be responsible. Only then will we see serious progress on this issue, so I hope Republicans get serious. I hope they will listen to their constituents, come back to the table, and work with us on a responsible replacement to these automatic cuts that are scheduled to begin tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to support our approach, the American Family Economic Protection Act, and to oppose the Toomey-Inhofe bill.

VAWA

Before I yield the floor, I wish to say that I am very pleased the House of Representatives just took up and passed the bill that we need that we need to get to the White House to fix a dangerous gap, to do something meaningful for tribal women and men around this country, and to make a difference in the lives of many Americans.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, as I look at my watch, the clock is ticking toward midnight. Midnight becomes March 1, and that is the point at which the sequester kicks in, which is the across-the-board cuts—hardly massive when this year it will be about 1.2 percent of our total outlays this year. So, I am not making a massive argument, but I do think it can be used with any credibility; but, nevertheless, this is going to happen.

Republicans have proposed a way to address the President’s concerns—the very concerns that have been stated on this floor—including the concern that across-the-board cuts is no way to govern because it doesn’t separate the essential from the nonessential. I think we as Republicans couldn’t agree more. It is not the best way to govern, because it treats everything on an equal basis and basically says that every Federal program, no matter what its performance over the years, doesn’t deserve a look at how to adjust it for its lack or strength of performance. It doesn’t separate the essential functions of the Federal Government are from the “this is what we would like to do but can’t afford to do right now.” So, to say that this government and the out-of-control spending that has occurred over these last several years is totally functional and that every penny we have spent is wisely spent and has been done in the interests of the taxpayer and protecting their hard-earned dollars, and that the money we are extracting from them—those of us—this is one of the very few programs which happened less than 2 months ago on every American; every American’s paycheck was reduced. It is not just the millionaires and billionaires who took the hit, because $620 billion over the years of money of the out of America’s paychecks. So, for someone to say that what we are doing is massive when this year it amounts to a 1.2-percent cut in total spending, when virtually every business in America, every family in America has had to tighten their belt in this past fiscal cliff vote, that Republicans cannot agree to it. The so-called sequester. The sequester was a fallback in case we weren’t able to come to grips with the problem we have and reach an accommodation, an agreement, on how to address it in the best way possible. This was the fallback.

And all the attempts, starting with the President’s own commission, which he rejected, and then the Gang of Six proposals, and then the supercommittee of 12, all of the efforts, that President rejected them on all of the proposals, for whatever reason did not succeed. So, what was put in place to drive a solution, didn’t drive a solution, and as a result, here we are with a sequester.

But, to say the sequester cutting; this isn’t coming from the Republican side, is not addressing a fiscal imbalance is the U.S. Government.

The passage of VAWA today is validation of what we have all been saying on this side, and I am proud of the Senate for its bipartisan work. I see Senator CRAPRO here today, and I thank him for his leadership on this critical issue.

I have heard from so many women throughout this months-long battle, and I especially want to mention one woman today: Deborah Parker, a member of the Tulalip Tribe from my home state who happened to be here the many months ago when Congress wanted to dump the tribal provisions in order to move the bill. She stood up with all the courage she could muster and told the story she had never told before about the abuse she had suffered while she was a very young girl and watching the same person who abused her abuse other tribal members because she had nowhere to go for recourse.

Today, that changes, for Deborah Parker and for thousands and thousands of other tribal members and other women and men in this country. Today, we are going to work on this legislation, and I am very excited that this President is going to sign this bill into law and pass something that is going to make a difference in the lives of many Americans.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.
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It seems the White House has an obsession with solving this problem through increasing taxes and not wanting to make the hard decisions to cut even 1.2 percent of our total budget—24 in succeeding years. To say we cannot, or do not have the oversight to do that, is not worthy of asking taxpayers to keep sending their hard-earned money to Washington in order to cover that spending—when Senator Coburn, Senator Toomey, when many of us—I have been standing here every day in virtually every session basically saying, just through waste and ineffective programs we can easily come up with this amount of money. Everyone else in America has had to do it. Why can’t we?

The charge we have heard over and over is that this is such a terrible way to address it that we need the flexibility so these agencies can move the money around and take the money from the nonessential programs to keep the security at the airports with the TSA traffic controllers and also keep the meat inspectors and the others who are essential.

In order to keep them from having to take the hit, we came up with the others who are essential. From the nonessential programs to move the money around and take the money that, of course that is not an essential function of the Federal Government. It has had a miserable performance as a program. Why do we keep throwing money at it, particularly at a time of austerity when so many people are out of work?

Yes, we need to do that. But that needs to be coupled with what I think there is almost full agreement on: The need for comprehensive tax reform. That is where closing the loopholes, which Republicans are willing to do in order to lower the rates, to make us more competitive and make our Tax Code much simpler and much fairer—that needs to happen. Of course, it cannot happen if we take closing loopholes and use it for spending, which is what the President wants to do instead of using it to make our code simpler, fairer, and make us more competitive around the world and to promote growth.

That is a proven process. Unless we put that together with some regulatory reform—but most important of all and most essential of all is to address the runaway mandatory spending, which if not addressed will undermine the sanity and the solvency of entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare. The trustees—do not trust a Republican conservative saying this—the trustees of the programs have said: ‘You have to deal with this, and the longer you put it off, the tougher it is and the more painful it will be.”

This morning, again, Dr. Boskin and even Dr. Goolsbee—the President’s former Economic Council head—said you have to do this, you have to take it on. You are talking about it to one, two, save the programs, two, save the country from bankruptcy, and, three, give us the opportunity to have funds to pay for the essential functions of government.

We are not against government. We want it to be leaner, more efficient, more effective. My State has taken measures that quintuple what is being talked about here. We ended up achieving a surplus. We have a AAA bond rating. We have put off our State government, the most efficient spending, which government with taxpayer dollars of any State in the country.

It can be done, and it can be done here. But what we have that is different from what our States have is the fact that mandatory spending—that spending which we have no control over—is eating our lunch. Until we step up and deal with it, we are not going to solve this problem; we are going to keep careening from crisis to crisis.

And this issue is not just with the sequester going in place—can we step up and sensibly adjust it through flexibility in terms of how we reach...
that goal? Can we summon the will and the political courage to do what we all, I believe, know we need to do; that is, simply to do what is right for the future of America—America’s interests not our own political interests?

First, let me put this in context. That cannot be done, despite all the time, all the efforts made, many on a bipartisan basis—Simpson-Bowles was bipartisan, the Gang of 6 was bipartisan, the Committee of 12 was bipartisan. It is not true we are at a standoff in terms of how we will deal with what we have not had is leadership from the White House. Something of this magnitude cannot be done without Presidential leadership, and the President has refused to do anything other than plead on a campaign basis for yet evermore taxes, which he calls balance.

So that is our challenge.

We need you, Mr. President, to lead the way. We will work together with you in putting together a package which achieves the right ratio. We will work together to do what is right for the future of America and not what is right for our political future this year or next.

I guess we are pleaded with the President. Similar to Presidents of the past—Ronald Reagan, a Republican, and Bill Clinton, a Democrat, took on the toughest issues and together we worked for the benefit of our people and for the future of this country and we made enormous strides in that regard. But it would not have happened had the President not become engaged. At this point, the only engagement the President has made is to call for higher taxes and go out and campaign against the President has made is to call for higher taxes and go out and campaign against those of us who are trying to sincerely address this problem.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

MRS. LEAHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to applaud the passage by the House, just a little while ago, of the Violence Against Women Act.

I wish to also congratulate my colleagues, Senator Leahy, my neighbor from Vermont, and Senator Crapo, who is on the floor today, for their leadership in getting this legislation passed so early in this session and for helping to see that it got shepherded through the House where it had been so challenged.

This is legislation that treats all victims equally regardless of whether they are Native Americans, whether they are members of the LGBT community, whether they are immigrants. It supports law enforcement by providing critical funding for police officers and prosecutors so they can hold abusers responsible. It supports crisis centers for women and families, to provide for immediate needs such as shelter and counseling.

On behalf of the thousands of women and families in New Hampshire who will benefit because of this reauthori-

zation, I wish to thank all the 268 Members of the House who voted for it and all the people in the Senate where it had such a broad bipartisan majority.

Again, I thank my colleagues, Senators Leahy and Crapo, for the leadership they provided in getting this done. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I too want to stand to congratulate the House for their passage of the Violence Against Women Act. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her kind remarks.

I am honored to have worked on this bill with Senator Leahy and my other colleagues in the Senate. Senator Leahy and I have worked together for years on issues of domestic violence and stalking, and this is one of the key endeavors we needed to get across the finish line. Now we see that we will, and we will send this important legislation to the President.

I would also like to commend the advocates across the Nation and specifically the Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence who have worked tirelessly on this issue.

As a longtime champion of the prevention of domestic violence, I am glad to see there are areas in Congress where we can come together to support these important causes.

This act provides critical services to victims of violent crime as well as agencies and organizations that provide important services to individuals. For nearly two decades, the Violence Against Women Act has been the centerpiece of our Nation’s commitment to ending domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual violence. This legislation provides access to legal and social services for survivors. It provides training to law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, attorneys, and advocates to address these crimes in our Nation’s communities. It provides intervention to give witness abuse and are more likely to be involved in this type of violence. It provides shelter and resources for victims who have nowhere else to turn.

There is significant evidence that these programs are working not just in Idaho but nationwide. The U.S. Department of Justice reported that the number of women killed by an intimate partner decreased by 35 percent between 1993 and 2008. In 2012 it was reported that in 1 day alone, 688 women and their children impacted by violence sought safety in an emergency shelter or received counseling, legal advocacy, and children’s support.

These important provisions are making a difference in the lives of people across this Nation. I again wish to commend all of my colleagues who supported this legislation and helped to move this critical piece of legislation to the President’s desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the vote we are going to have today at 2:30 regarding sequestration, and I wish to strongly support the notion of giving the executive branch the flexibility it needs over the next 7 months to work through this situation in a more graceful way.

As a longtime advocate for the American people, we are going to spend $47 trillion of your money over this next decade. It was incumbent upon a bipartisan group about a year ago to try to come up with about $1.2 trillion in savings over the next 10 years. Believe it or not, that didn’t happen. The sequestration was a method to ensure that at least there was some reduction in the growth of spending. I do want to say that there have been a lot of discus-


d on the one hand, we made enormous strides in that re-


t work together to do what is right for the future of America and not what is right for our political future this year or next.

The task a year or so ago was for six Republicans and six Democrats to come up with $1.2 trillion. It is beyond belief that this did not occur. The sequestration was put in place as a mechanism to ensure that there at least was slowing down of growth. The first 7 months of the sequester is the most ham-handed portion of it. It is cut at the PPA level. It is across the board and focused on two important categories. I agree that it is ham-handed, and the only thing worse is sequestration. In my opinion, would be kicking the can down the road on some much needed fiscal discipline here in Washington.

I hope what we will do today is get behind a very thoughtful proposal that would say: Look, we are still going to reduce spending by this amount, but we are going to give the executive branch, because this first 7 months is hard enough, so different way. In the first 7 months to work through this situation in a more graceful way.

Businesses obviously held this as incredible intelligent. They need to deal with these kinds of issues right now. The past several years have had to do the same kind of thing. Obviously, to them, it is very intelligent to give the executive branch a degree of flexibility where they have some transfer authority to work through this in a more graceful way.

Republicans thanked me because it was a way for us to at least begin turning the curve in a different direction...
and certainly still having the cuts that are necessary in growth, I might add, not in real spending. That is where we are.

We have a proposal, the Toomey-Inhofe proposal, which gives the executive the flexibility they need to work through this. It is my understanding they don’t want that flexibility. I can’t imagine being President of the United States and having something that I thought was a little bit ham-handed and heavy-handed. Look, we will candidly defer to you to make some transfers.

I have spoken with some of the folks in our security apparatus in this Nation. The best thing to do is: CORKER, look, we understand we are going to have some reductions, but if you would just give us some flexibility, we could work through this gracefully. We could live within these constraints.

Speaking of these constraints, I want to say that there is a number that has been thrown out of $85 billion over the next 7 months. Again, know that this is Washington’s language. We are really only talking about half that in real expectations. We have budgeted amounts and then we have outlays. We do things very differently than do most people back home. This is not nearly the amount of reduction people are talking about as far as real money flowing out.

I strongly support the Toomey proposal, the Inhofe proposal. I hope others will join in and at least move to debate this issue. I have a sense that is not going to be the case. So, CORKER, next week when some things happen, some others will be open to doing this.

I can’t imagine why anybody in this body, if they think draconian things are happening in a specific area and some judges or courts are being used to really alleviate that, I can’t imagine why anybody in this body would not want to give administrators of these various agencies the ability to have some degree of transfer authority to make it work better. I can’t imagine there is a one-man shop or a large corporation, that wouldn’t want that flexibility. I can’t imagine a Democrat or a Republican really thinking it is a bad idea to give the administration the ability to be more graceful in dealing with this.

Today it looks as though we might have a partisan vote. It is a shame.

Again, this is ham-handed. We can make it work better. Hopefully, on March 27, if we continue on this course until that time—obviously, to me, the only thing worse than this ham-handed approach is not enacting the $1.2 trillion in cuts. This needs to happen, in my opinion.

Maybe on March 27 when the appropriators come forth with a continuing resolution, they will have shifted this around to a degree that we end up with the same amount of spending reductions. This is the way regular order should work here, the way the Senate should work, the way the House should work. It is not that far down the road.

As a matter of fact, I am understanding that if the Appropriations Committee wanted to, they could pass out an omnibus—not a CR but an omnibus—that has already gone through the checks. I think the two staffs have been talking and we haven’t been talking about it at the House and the Senate. It is my understanding that they could pass something out in a week. I think maybe there are going to be some discussions about this later in the majority leader’s office. Hopefully, he will give the green light that the Appropriations Committee to move ahead with something like this, which would be very sensible, in my opinion. I think most people around here would love to see something actually happen under regular order.

These reductions are necessary, in my opinion, to get our fiscal house in order. Much more needs to be done beyond this $1.2 trillion—much, much more. I don’t think there is anybody who doesn’t want that deficit reduction greater than $1.2 trillion needs to occur. Right now we are focused on the cuts side. We focused on the income side at the end of the year.

As we move ahead and are able to deal with this regular order regular, where committees have looked at the impact, this is the best way to go forward.

Again, sequester will kick in tomorrow. I think we all understand that. There is a bill that would allow the executive branch to have the flexibility it needs to work through this in a way that is least harmful to the American people, and if that doesn’t work, another step with a continuing resolution in 3 or 4 weeks—there is another way of hitting this in an intelligent way.

I hope we have the opportunity to work this out in a way that is better for the American people. At the same time, I hope there will not back away at all from at least $1.2 trillion in spending reductions. I wish we would move later this year into real tax reform, which is really where all the money is.

To the American people, the reason we are moving to sequester and the reason we are cutting discretionary spending is we don’t have the courage in the Senate to deal with entitlements. When the word “entitlement” comes up, everybody runs for the hills. They know where the money lies: 62 percent of our spending. Which in 10 years, combined with interest, will be 90 percent of our spending.

The reason we are here today is this body has not come to terms with the fact that we need to reform entitlements for them to be there for future generations and certainly people who are getting ready to retire.

This situation is a shame, and so we are going through this pain again due to a lack of courage in the Senate to address the reality of the day. That’s a shame, and what you are going to see playing out is solely because of that.

I have a bill which would deal with that. LAMAR ALEXANDER, my colleague from Tennessee, is a cosponsor. It was based on Bowles-Simpson, Domenici-Rivlin—bipartisan concepts.

For some reason, when it comes to dealing with the real issues of America, this body runs for the hills. Hopefully, soon we will be brought back together and we will deal with this in a mature way, deal with the real issues our Nation is dealing with, solve them, put it in the rearview mirror, and all of us will come together and focus on those things that would make our country stronger.

I ask unanimous consent that all quorum calls before the votes at 2:30 p.m. today be equally divided.

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

Mr. CORKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have heard a lot of discussions recently about the author Bob Woodward and his comments about spending and the sequester. It is important for us to understand this. This is not an easy matter. We have a lot of confusion, I think, as to what has been happening in the past. So from my perspective, as ranking member on the Budget Committee, I wish for all of us to understand the issue that is at stake.

Here is what Bob Woodward said in his Washington Post Op-Ed earlier this week:

So when the President asked that a substitute for the sequester include not just spending cuts but also new revenue, he’s making the right call.

And when the President talks of spending cuts, he’s referring to some other spending cuts somewhere in the government so that they do not fall so hard on defense, for example.

But Bob Woodward goes on to say—referring to the President’s request for a substitute—that was not the deal he made.

So we need to all remember what happened was that in August of 2011, as the American government focused and spoke strongly in the 2010 election, the debt ceiling was reached. We couldn’t borrow any more money. Since we are borrowing almost 40 cents out of every dollar, it amounted to a 40-percent cut in spending, had we not raised the debt ceiling. So it was important to raise the debt ceiling, but it was also important to do something about the surging debt. So a bipartisan agreement was reached, and the agreement essentially said we will reduce our spending $2.1 trillion, and we will raise the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion.

The good news, for those who wanted to keep spending, was that we spread...
the spending cuts over 10 years. But we have already reached the debt ceiling again. We have already spent $2 trillion more than we took in. We have to deal with that again very soon.

I would like to say this to my colleagues and management. The debt ceiling was put in place to avoid future $7 trillion, which it is the debt of America by simply constraining the rate of growth in spending. It was not cutting spending. Except the way the sequester part of that agreement was reached, the cuts fell disproportionately on defense and maybe a few other programs. And over 10 years, defense would take a real cut. This isn't war costs. This is a fundamental problem.

What I would say to my colleagues is this: Please don't come in and say, there are loopholes we can close or we can tax the rich more here and we can do this, that, and the other in order to bring in more revenue and to spend more. You see? But we agreed to a new baseline in spending. It passed the House and the Senate and the President signed it into law. He agreed to it. And he was the one who insisted on the sequester, even though he has denied it since. He got that, he and his budget director, Mr. Lew, whom he just promoted to Secretary of the Treasury, $85 billion out of $3 trillion. He agreed to that. And closing loopholes is simply a tax increase, of course.

So if we agree at some point to close loopholes, it ought to be part of tax reform and it ought to be part of reducing the deficit, not funding new spending. Because, you see, we have agreed to this new baseline. When the President says don't do the sequester, the sequester amounts to $1.1 trillion out of the $3 trillion spending. So he is talking about increasing spending over the amount he just agreed to 19 months ago. He is talking about increasing spending at a time this Nation has never faced a more serious systemic financial debt crisis. And his excuse is that we will close loopholes.

But you see, reducing the amount of new debt we incur over 10 years from $9 trillion in to $7 trillion is not enough. The President would have the American people believe that a 2.4-percent reduction in Federal spending out of $3.5 trillion will cripple our government and irreparably damage our economy, even an economy that the President that we stand ready—and I am confident I can speak for the Republicans in this Chamber that we stand ready—to try and spread those cuts out in a way that is smarter and is less painful, because everybody should tighten their belt to help get this country on a sound path. We are willing to do that, but we should state where we agree and that we will tighten our belt to help get this country on a sound path. We are not willing to allow the President to breach his agreement—as Mr. Woodward said, the deal he made—that he signed, that is in law and that has created a new spending baseline. We should not give up on that 19 months after we agreed to it. What a mockery that makes of the integrity of our government and the commitment to fiscal responsibility.

Let's work together on this. We had a big tax increase in January and a major spending agreement in August of 2011. So now let's get on with work and operate in the world we are in. I don't believe we will avoid the sequester by raising taxes and increasing spending over the level to which we agreed. It won't happen. So we might as well get serious and figure out a way to help make this work in a more rational way.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today, as we debate proposals for avoiding the so-called sequester, we find ourselves in a uniquely awkward position. Not only is there general disagreement about what brought us here, who is responsible, who is to blame, et cetera, and we also disaggre agree about where "here" is to begin with.

President Obama has been touring the country giving speeches describing what will be and explaining why Republicans are to blame for it. This is, of course, par for the course for this President, whose motto seems to be: Why solve a problem when you can campaign on it? You would think, after having won the election, the President would be the first to acknowledge the election is over. But nearly 4 months after election day, the President's campaign road show continues.

The problem with the President's sequestration campaign is that it is false. It is out of touch with the facts. Everyone in Washington knows that, despite the President's efforts to put the blame on Republicans, the sequester was his idea to begin with. The record is clear and it is not in dispute. The idea for the sequester was pitched by the President's then-OMB Director Jack Lew as a negotiating tactic to get Republicans to vote in favor of raising the debt ceiling. Not only did the idea originate in the White House, the President threatened to veto House-passed legislation designed to replace the sequester.

Moreover, in these final weeks leading up to the March 1 deadline, the President spent more time on his national sequestration campaign than he has in sitting down with Republicans to reach an agreement on a replacement package. So if the sequester goes into effect—and at this point it appears it will—the American people should not blame Republicans in Congress, who have been working in earnest to replace it. No, the blame should fall squarely on President Obama, who proposed the idea in the first place and has refused to work on a passable solution.

So that is how we got here. The bigger, more complicated problem is determining where "here" actually is. The President and his allies have spent a lot of time misleading the American people as to that as well.

If you describe the sequester using the worst possible numbers, it is an $85 billion reduction from $3.5 trillion of yearly Federal outlays—yes, that is $85 billion out of $3.500 trillion. When all is said and done, it is a reduction of less than 2.5 percent from overall Federal spending. And, as the Congressional Budget Office has made clear, not all of the $85 billion in reduction will even take the form of reduced spending this year. Even if it did, keep in mind that $85 billion would represent less than 9 days of Federal spending, based on the rate of spending last year. Once again, that is if you describe it in the worst possible terms.

For the moment, let's go with those numbers.

The President would have the American people believe that a 2.4-percent reduction in Federal spending out of $3.6 trillion will cripple our government and irreparably damage our economy, even an economy that the President must have felt was strong enough to absorb a $600 billion tax hike back on New Year's Day. The ramifications of the 2.4-percent spending reduction are not that bad. But the President and his allies here in Congress, that the only alternative is to raise taxes yet again.

I will be the first to admit there are better, more responsible ways to reduce the deficit than the President's indiscriminate sequester. But these scare tactics don't even pass the laugh test. Does the President really expect the American people to believe our government is so fragile it cannot absorb a 2.4-percent spending cut—less than 2.5 percent of Federal spending—without inflicting massive damage on the American people and our economy? Apparently so.
Once again, I am describing the sequester in the worst possible terms just to demonstrate the outlandish nature of the President’s arguments. However, when you look at whether the sequester even represents a reduction in spending, you find the claims are even more extreme. When you look at whether we are cutting spending at all relative to past periods, you can easily see we are not, even with the sequester.

The so-called spending cuts in the sequester are supposed to come from reductions in discretionary spending levels. We should all remember that in fiscal year 2010, spending levels were highly elevated as a result of the President’s stimulus and other “temporary” spending measures passed in response to the financial crisis and recession. So, in other words, the sequester reduces spending only if you are measuring against an extremely high baseline that was, at that time, supposed to be temporary.

Whether something is an increase or decrease in spending depends on what you are measuring against. If you measure relative to a big number—as such as the Democrat-fueled spending of 2010—then proposed spending looks like a cut. But if you look at spending levels relative to more reasonable baselines, you will find that future spending will actually be up even with the sequester in place. For example, you will see what post-sequestration spending looks like relative to a more reasonable baseline.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, baseline estimates for post-sequester discretionary budget authority total $978 billion for fiscal year 2013. The average during the Bush years, in inflation-adjusted fiscal year 2013 dollars, was $957 billion. Neither of these figures includes spending on wars or emergencies, so this is an apples-to-apples comparison.

In adjusted current dollar terms, post-sequestration spending this year will be more than $20 billion higher than the average during the Bush years. Someone may have to refresh my memory, but I don’t believe the government ceased to function during the Bush years. I certainly don’t remember hearing anyone express concern about the elimination of basic governmental services. In fact, I don’t think anyone remembers the Bush years as being a time of spending restraint here in Washington. We have heard President Obama claim it was the extravagant spending of the Bush administration that, in part, caused our current budget woes. Yet now the President is telling the American people that a return to those spending levels will devastate our country, leaving children hungry and our border unprotected.

Not surprisingly, the President and the Democratic leadership’s solution to this problem is more tax hikes, which makes these claims about the impact of sequestration all the more transparent. Indeed, it appears that the President’s current campaign on the sequester is less about reaching an agreement to replace the sequester than it is about satisfying his drive to once again raise Americans’ taxes while also serving his desire to vilify Republicans, no matter what the costs to the American people.

I don’t minimize the negative impact the sequester may have in some areas. I think there are very few of us who would not like to see the President’s indiscriminate sequester approach with more responsible spending reduction alternatives. There are alternatives to the approach we are debating today. But whatever we do, we should do it through regular order.

Today we are yet again debating a bill that has bypassed the relevant committees of jurisdiction. Regular order has become the exception rather than the rule around here, which is extremely frustrating I think to both sides. There are consequences to skipping the established committee process. If you legislate through the relevant committee, it is not studied and vetted. It simply shows up out of the majority leader’s office before anyone has a chance to even look it over. Bypassing regular order is simply using backroom deals and forcing members of the committee process prevents Members from having to take tough votes in committee. But taking tough votes to enact legislation is part of being in the Senate—or at least it used to be. These days, the majority leader has to take a difficult vote. The majority leader has made sure of that.

I have a chart that has the title “Honest Leadership and Open Government.” You can see the large letters at the top and the small letters right against the podium Senator Reid is at. My friends on the other side of the aisle won the Senate majority in the last few years. Yet efforts continue to raise the profile of the Senate or at least it used to be. These days, the majority leader has to take a difficult vote. The majority leader has made sure of that.

I have and will continue to urge my colleagues to support the restoration of regular order here in the Senate because, in the end, it yields better legislative results, and it is a much more fair way to legislate and involves everybody, not just a few people in one office.

Despite the fact that the President and congressional Democrats just got over $500 billion in tax increases out of the fiscal cliff deal, the Democratic leadership’s bill that we are debating today contains even more tax increases.

The Congressional Budget Office wrote earlier this month that over the next 10 years, revenues as a percent of GDP will average 17.9 percent. Over the last 40 years, according to CBO, revenues have averaged 17.9 percent of GDP. So over the next 10 years, federal revenues are set to exceed the historical average.

At the same time, government spending, which is projected by CBO to reach about 23 percent of GDP in 2023—an historical average—will be on an upward trajectory and remain far in excess of the 40-year average of 21 percent. So the problem is not that the American people are undertaxed, it is that Washington is overspending.

Given this basic point, I have filed a motion to commit the Democratic leadership’s bill to the Finance Committee to strike all the revenue increases and replace them with spending cuts. And to help further the process, I have prepared a menu of spending cut options to select from. These proposals come from Dr. Tom Coburn’s book, “Back in Black: A Deficit Reduction Plan.”

During the 2008 campaign, the President promised to find spending cuts by going through the budget, line by line. Dr. Coburn has done what the President promised but failed to do. Today, I am drawing from a small body of Dr. Coburn’s hard work.

For instance, instead of the latest incarnation of the Buffett tax, we could, according to “Back in Black,” save $71 billion over 10 years by instituting a 5-year freeze on locality pay adjustments for Federal workers or we could reduce travel budgets of Federal agencies. That would save just over $43 billion over 10 years.

Another revenue increase in the majority leader’s bill that could be replaced with a spending cut is the elimination of what some Democrats have described as a tax break for shipping jobs overseas. Indeed, we have seen this proposal pop up several times over the last few years.

However, as some may recall, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation wrote a letter to Senator Specter and I before the January 7th vote that the proposal pop up several times over the last few years.

Under present law, there are no specific tax credits or disallowances of deductions solely for locating jobs in the United States or overseas.

I previously challenged my colleagues to come and point out to me if they thought that was incorrect. To date, no one has tried to meet that challenge. Yet efforts continue to raise the issue. The pulse of closing a loophole where no loophole exists.

One spending cut from Dr. Coburn’s book that could be used as a substitute for closing the Democrats’ phantom loophole is to reduce the Federal limousine fleet back to the level it was in 2008. According to Dr. Coburn’s book, the government owned 238 limousines in 2008. By 2010, that number had grown to 412. What changed in government between 2008 and 2010 that required an increase of over 73 percent in the number of limousines needed to shuttle the bureaucrats? If anyone knows, please let the American people know. Going back to the 2008 level of Federal limousines.
would save the government $115.5 million over 10 years.

There are numerous other places where we can cut spending immediately. Instead of pursuing the Democrats’ tax hike strategy or the President’s indiscriminate sequester, we should instead sensibly restrain spending through proposals such as these.

I anticipate that some of my friends on the other side will argue we should pursue these spending cuts in addition to passing more tax hikes. My response is that we should be saving all of these revenue raisers for future tax reform efforts.

There is a growing bipartisan consensus here in Congress in favor of comprehensive tax reform. The leaders in both the tax-writing committees are committed to this effort, and I believe we have a real opportunity to accomplish something on tax reform this year. However, if we start closing loopholes and eliminating preferences now in order to avoid the sequester, they won’t be there to help us lower marginal tax rates later on when we are working on tax reform, which will make an already difficult process that much harder.

Ultimately, if we follow the path my Democratic colleagues want us to take, we will be raising taxes on the American people while at the same time hampering future tax reform efforts. This is simply not the way to go, particularly if we have the additional rationale of reasonable spending cuts available to replace the President’s sequester.

As I said, whatever we do, we ought to do it through regular order. That is why I have filed this motion to commit and why I hope my colleagues will support it.

I want to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a way to restore the deliberative traditions of the Senate by allowing the committees to do its work. If we can return to regular order, the words “honest leadership and open government” will be more than a campaign slogan. The American people should expect nothing else.

I understand my unanimous consent will be objected to, and so I ask unanimous consent that I be immediately recognized to make this unanimous consent as soon as the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee arrives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Heitkamp). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, 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. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I thank my friend from Utah for his comments. It is important since we have two votes coming up starting in less than 30 minutes, that we talk a little bit about the background, where we are today and what we are going to be faced with in these votes.

Back about 5 weeks ago, when it looked as though sequestration was going to kick in, there was concern. I understand there is a lot of concern on the domestic side of the defense side, but my concern is mainly on the defense side. I am the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am concerned about what has been happening under this administration in the disarming of America and the devastation that has taken place already. A lot of people do not realize, under this administration we are now projecting cuts already to hit $467 billion in defense.

If sequestration is extended, I would raise that to $1 trillion, and $1 trillion over that period of time is, in fact, devastating. The Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, came out immediately and said: This cannot happen; we cannot adequately defend America if we allow this to take place. He was talking about sequestration.

Sequestration, I think people kind of lose sight of what it is. It is the equal of asking the Pentagon to share their accounts in order to come up with a savings, which I think is kind of interesting. Here we are talking about all this anguish we are going through right now just for $1.2 trillion, when you stop and realize in the President’s own budget, over 4 years he has a $5.3 trillion increase. So we are talking about 10 years to come up with $1.2 trillion when he was accountable for $5.3 trillion in 4 years. That is not even believable. When I say it back in my State of the Union, they shake their heads and think there must be some miscommunication, it cannot be right.

The problem has been, in this administration, over the past 4 years all the cuts have come from the military. They have not come from anywhere else. It is an oversimplification, but you can make the statement that they are cutting—I will yield to my friend from Utah because I understand he has a unanimous consent request. I will be happy to yield to you, if you ask unanimous consent the floor be returned to me.

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

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague for his courtesy. I appreciate it.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the two cloture votes today, it be in order for me to make a motion to commit S. 388 to the Finance Committee. The text of which is at the desk, and the Senate has agreed immediately to vote on the motion without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Montana. Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, this Senator was probably not paying enough attention. This is the Senator’s motion to recommit?

Mr. HATCH. It is the motion to recommit.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I respect my Ranking Member’s attempt to alter the leader’s bill to strike the revenue increases in this legislation.

However, I think time is at a premium and we need to consider the Reid legislation today.

Sending the bill to the Finance Committee will delay a solution to the sequestration cuts for weeks, if not months, and I believe most Members believe we should address the issue here and now. There is no time to waste.

We will have a full opportunity to discuss additional deficit reduction ideas in the coming weeks when we consider the budget resolution, the continuing resolution and the extension of the debt limit.

I agree we need to cut our debt and get our fiscal house in order. We know there are places to trim the fat in Federal programs.

To give families and businesses certainty, we must agree on a balanced, comprehensive plan to cut the debt that includes both revenue and spending cuts. The math will not work any other way.

A long-term balanced plan will bridge the budget battles and make real progress solving our deficit problem.

A balanced plan will also encourage businesses to invest, enable investors to return to the markets with confidence, and, most importantly, put Americans back to work in a growing economy.

And I look forward to working with Senator HATCH, taking on these fiscal challenges and crafting policies that create more jobs and spark economic growth.

The only way we will be able to get past these budget battles is by working together—Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate. We need to work together.

However, at this time I object to the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Look, the place is not being run on regular order. The committees are being ignored. The committees are established to be able to intentionally look at these matters
and hear both sides and hear the top experts in the country. I feel very badly that this simple motion has to be objected to. I feel badly because I know neither of the amendments that will be filed, that will be heard or voted on, are going to pass. One reason they will not is because some we have not followed the regular order.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?
Mr. HATCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. INHOFE. I asked unanimous consent to be recognized after the two of you went through this. Can I inquire as to about how much longer it will be? I am the author of the bill that is coming up in just a few minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Will the Chair indicate the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 22 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask which side has the 22 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority.

Mr. BAUCUS. I will be glad to yield time to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate that. It is my understanding, responding to my friend, that the other author of this bill, Mr. HATCH, will be heard for 2 minutes prior to the vote. I would like to be heard for a few minutes of time.

Mr. BAUCUS. At this time?
Mr. INHOFE. Right after his time, yes.

Mr. BAUCUS. I don’t fully understand. I am happy to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate that.

Prior to the time we propounded the unanimous consent request, I was talking about my frustration about what has been happening fiscally in this Senate during the last 4 years and the mere fact that under this administration we have increased deficits by $5.3 trillion. Now we are trying to come up with another bill that is going to do certain things. It does not make those distinctions.

He goes on to say that he wants that flexibility. This is the President asking for it on February 19, 2013. Here we come along with a bill that gives him that flexibility with certain restrictions so that he can’t pick and choose areas that we find are against the policy that has been set. I will give an example.

We had the National Defense Authorization Act. It was one that took months and months to put together. It took a long time to put together, and we made evaluations, with a limited budget, on what we could do. All this does is say if we have to make some changes from the across-the-board cut, let’s make that consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act.

In other words, all those weeks and months of work by the Senate Armed Services Committee and, I might say, the House Armed Services Committee would be in vain. Those cuts would be consistent with the intent, to make sure the President would do this.

A lot of people say we can’t trust the President; he is going to put more cuts in place and keep with what the Senate Armed Services Committee wants. But we have a provision called a congressional disapproval mechanism. That means if the President doesn’t do what the intent of this legislation is, we can go ahead and disapprove it.

We have those two safeguards. One is they have to follow the criteria that is consistent with the Senate Armed Services Committee, the national defense and which is the House and the Senate. To be sure we will be able to do that it has the disapproval mechanism.

In fact, I called each one of the five service chiefs and I said: Would it be less devastating if you were able to take the same amount of money out but take it out selectively, out of accounts where it would be not as significant?

They said: Yes, it would.

I said: Would you be able to prepare for this in the next 4 years?

The answer is yes. That is where we are today. They said they are able to do that.

The frustrating fact is this President—I am getting criticized on both sides. People are saying you are giving too much to the President. We are not because we have safeguards in here, which I will explain in a minute. But at the same time, the President comes out and says he will issue a veto threat against this bill. What does this do? It gives flexibility for the President. I am going to read something. This is a statement that President Obama said on February 19, 2013. He said:

Now, if Congress allows this meat-cleaver approach to take place, it will jeopardize military readiness; it will eviscerate job-creation investments in education and energy and medical research. It won’t consider whether we have safeguards in here, which I will explain in a minute. But at the same time, the President comes out and says he will issue a veto threat against this bill. What does this do? It gives flexibility for the President.

We would be able to do that in a period of 10 years. To me, people look at that and say: What is this all about? But that is not the reason I bring this up.

I bring this up because the amount of money that has come out of the military is actually a reduction. If you look at the increase in the spending in the last 4 years, it has all come out of defense accounts, so it is defense that has taken the hits on this. Government has expanded approximately 30 percent across the board. At the same time our military has been reduced in terms of our budget for defense accounts.

Anyway, when this came up a few weeks ago, I thought it was not going to happen. I thought we were going to have something come up and change this whole idea of having to make these reductions. So what I did at that time was draft a bill. The bill merely said if we are stuck with sequestration, let’s allow the chiefs—speaking of the military—that is included so they can look and see where we can take cuts and it will not be as devastating.

People do not realize the costs of this. If you take the same amount of money that we are talking about in sequestration and allow the service chiefs to massage this and make changes, give them flexibility to go ahead and do some that might otherwise be cut—the bill allows the President to listen to the advice of his military leadership and offset some of the devastating impacts of sequestration. If the sequester is allowed to take place and the congressional resolution is not fixed, the Department of Defense stands to waste billions of dollars through the cancellation of contracts.

So I think people don’t think about this. We make commitments backed by the United Sates of America that we are going to do certain things. A lot of these are contracts such that if they are terminated it could cost quite a bit of money.

The termination of multiyear contracts is something that we would be concerned about. Providing the Department of Defense flexibility to determine how these cuts will be implemented will let us take this into consideration.

At this point, I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania how much time he would like for his concluding remarks.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I will only ask for a minute or two to make my closing comments. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I appreciate that very much. He has been a great partner. I have given a background of what went on 5 weeks ago and our discussions with the service chiefs. I was hoping this day would not come and that we would not be faced with the continued devastation of our military, but the time is here. Tomorrow is the 1st of the month. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I have come up with a bill that will be voted on, and it will minimize the damage and still preserve the cuts that are mandated and are out there.

One of the problems we have not talked about is the continuing resolution. When I was talking to the different service chiefs, one was General Odierno, who is in the Army. He said that just as devastating as how the CR is set up, this corrects that problem at the same time. It is a thing that is not going to cost any more money. Believe me, a lot of my closest friends—for instance, in the House of Representatives—think it is a good thing that we are making these mandated cuts. They cannot argue with that, but we can at least minimize the damage in these cuts.

I will read something that shocked me when I saw the President had issued—I am not sure if it is a veto message. I am not sure if it is a veto message. I am told it was a veto message.

Here we have a bill that gives him flexibility with the restrictions we
talked about. Yet he says he is now going to veto it. It is worth reading this again, and we need to make sure we get this in the Record.

This is his quote on February 19, 2013. This is the President speaking.

Now if Congress allows this meat-cleaver approach to take place, it will jeopardize our military readiness; it will eviscerate job-creating investments in education and energy and medical research. It won’t consider whether we’re cutting some bloated program that has outlived its usefulness, or a vital service that Americans depend on every single day.

We are now giving him a vehicle that makes those distinctions so we have that flexibility. It has the safeguards to take care of the problems that have been brought up, I think it is not a good solution, but right now it is the only solution.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I would like to thank and compliment the Senator from Oklahoma, who has been a terrific leader and ally. I appreciate his hard work and the work product we have come up with.

At the end of the day, it is not complicated. We have to go ahead with indiscriminate across-the-board cuts that give us no ability whatsoever to establish priorities, to recognize that some spending is more important than others, or do we adopt this meat-cleaver approach and give to the President of the United States the flexibility for him to turn to his service chiefs and say to them: Folks, is there a better way to do this? I am sure they know best what their needs are. I am sure they can come up with a better set of spending cuts than these across-the-board cuts that are in law.

Similarly, on the nondefense side, any competent middle manager of any business in America knows that when they have to tighten their belt, they go through and prioritize. So when the President and the Secretary of Transportation go around the country saying: Oh, we are going to have to lay off air traffic controllers; we are going to have to shut down towers; we are going to have delays, none of it is necessary. It is not necessary if we pass this legislation because it would give the President the flexibility to cut the items that would not be disruptive to our economy, and it would not be disruptive in any meaningful way. I gave the example earlier of the FAA. The FAA would have more money postsequester than what the President even asked for. Obviously, what the President needs is the discretion to be able to make those cuts where they can be best borne.

After having a total budget that has grown 100 percent over the last 12 years, we can find the 2.3 percent that is needed now. These are flexibility measures. We would give the President for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Thereafter, the savings we will achieve will happen through the spending caps and, therefore, will be decided by the Appropriations Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support the Republican alternative.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, earlier this week I agreed with the Senate the consequences of sequestration for the budget of the Department of State and foreign operations and its impact on the security of the United States. Funding for the entire Department of State and foreign operations budget amounts to only about 1 percent of the Federal budget, not the 15 or 20 percent some mistakenly believe.

That 1 percent includes funding to operate our embassies and consulates in over 200 countries, to carry out diplomacy in dangerous environments like Syria, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, respond to humanitarian crises, and build alliances with security and trading partners. Sequestration would harm those efforts. It would diminish our ability to fund diplomatic security at a time when everyone agrees we need to do more to protect our Foreign Service officers overseas.

On the development side, sequestration will mean cuts to global health programs to combat AIDS and pay for vaccines for children, protect maternal health, and combat malaria and tuberculosis. It will also mean reductions for funding for disaster and refugee aid at a time when the international community’s response to drought, famine, and extremist violence around the world need assistance.

As has been pointed out repeatedly, sequestration was included in the Budget Control Act as an incentive to negotiate. The idea was that it would have such catastrophic consequences that rational minds would replace it with a thoughtful and balanced approach to deficit reduction.

That has not happened. To the contrary, just last week the Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader, Speaker Boehner, and the Senate Majority Leader, and the House and Senate Budget Committees and the bipartisan supercommittee to avoid the cuts adopted a resolution that sequestration should be the new balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Moreover, we must recognize that even in the American Dream, the future of children with disabilities, while putting two wars on the Nation’s credit card. We already have reduced the debt by $2.5 trillion, with the vast majority of those savings coming from spending cuts. Of course, most priorities in this budget were not adjusted or pruned. Over time, we cannot finish the job of deficit reduction through spending cuts alone.

We must understand that even in these difficult budget decisions, we cannot sacrifice the future of critical Federal programs in education, in health care, and in national security that affect hard-working families across the country, every single day. The American people want and expect us to take a balanced approach. They know it isn’t wise to protect endless corporate loopholes and tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans instead of investing in our schools, our factories, our roads, and our workers. Yes, they want us to get our books in order—but in a balanced way where everyone pulls equally.

Today the Senate has the opportunity to avoid this devastating sequester by voting for the American Family Economic Protection Act, which does just that. This balanced legislation will delay sequestration by replacing it with a combination of new revenues and targeted spending cuts. These spending cuts would reduce the deficit in a responsible way, eliminating unnecessary direct payments and farm subsidies and implementing reasonable and responsible defense spending reductions beginning when the war in Afghanistan is expected to end. This legislation would also generate revenue, equal to the amount of spending cuts included, by eliminating oil industry tax loopholes, denying deductions to companies that ship jobs overseas, and ensuring that millionaires do not pay a smaller share of their incomes in taxes than the typical middle-class family.

The American Family Economic Protection Act provides us with a clear, balanced proposal that would avoid the devastation of sequestration. I look forward to the opportunity to support this responsible approach to deficit reduction and hope all Senators will join me in doing the same.

If we choose to not act responsibly and pass the sequester today, we are afraid sequestration will go forward and would mean devastating cuts around the country and for Vermont.

Without action, sequestration would mean that Vermont schools would lose more than $2.5 million for primary and secondary education and the education of children with disabilities, while putting the jobs of teachers and aides at risk. Vermont would stand to lose more than $1 million in environmental funding to ensure clean water and air and protect our air quality as well as our drinking water. Vermont would lose roughly $2.6 million in funding for medical research.
and innovation funding from NIH and $400,000 in funding from the National Science Foundation, costing the State 53 jobs. Vermont would lose funding for the grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections, drug treatment enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives. Sequestration would mean Vermont would lose $101,000 in funding for job search assistance, referral, and placement, meaning 3,000 fewer people will get the help and skills they need to find employment, just when they need it most.

In Vermont, sequestration would impact public health. Fewer children will receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and hepatitis B due to reduced funding for vaccinations. Across-the-board cuts mean Vermont will lose about $270,000 in grants to help prevent and treat substance abuse programs. And the Vermont Department of Health will lose about $55,000 resulting in around 1,400 fewer HIV tests. Sequestration would mean the state would lose funding used to provide meals for seniors and services to victims of domestic violence.

If we do not pass the American Family Economic Protection Act today, our States will lose funding for community health centers, and strengthen the middle class—all things that President Obama and Democrats in both Houses of Congress are eager to do if only we had more cooperation from our friends across the aisle. We simply cannot cut our way out of this. We cannot allow an unbalanced approach that would once again require that deficit reduction be achieved solely through spending cuts, and would disproportionately impact low-income Americans and middle-class families and children. These cuts will be devastating to workers, small businesses, middle class families, and children.

The list of essential programs and services that will be affected by sequestration is long. So today, I would like to focus on just a few of the more than 50 agencies funded by the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, which I chair. My subcommittee helps small businesses get the loans they need. It keeps Wall Street watchdogs on the job. And it funds the agencies that stand up for consumers and stand guard against unscrupulous business practices.

But the largest single appropriation in my subcommittee goes to our Nation’s tax collector—the IRS. At about $12 billion, the IRS budget is a major expense. But cutting the IRS budget is short-sighted instead of reducing our deficit, shrinking the IRS makes our deficit larger.

That’s because short-changing the IRS makes it easier for tax cheats to avoid paying what they owe. Last year, the IRS collected about $400 billion in taxes owed were never paid.

Mr. President, I was a CEO for many years. If there is one thing I learned in my time at ADP, it is that you can’t run a company without revenues. And state and local governments can’t run without revenues. The sequestration plan Republicans insisted on will slash the IRS and sacrifice revenues. In fact, for every dollar the sequester cuts from the IRS, our deficit will increase by at least 80 cents.

These cuts make no sense. But these IRS budget cuts are just the beginning of our problems. Under sequestration, as many as 1,900 small businesses won’t get loans, which would mean 22,000 fewer jobs at a time when millions are looking for work. Wall Street watchdogs like the SEC and CFTC will be forced to go home, leaving investors on Main Street vulnerable to wolves on Wall Street. And cuts to the Judiciary could jeopardize one of the most important aspects of our life: the safety of our families. That is because we will have fewer probation officers to supervise criminal offenders in our communities. Courtrooms will be less safe because of cuts to their security systems. And cuts to mental health and drug treatment programs could lead to more offenders relapsing into lives of crime.

The Federal Bar Association agrees. They wrote in a letter last week to Chief Judge John K. Bush of the District of Connecticut that funding reductions could jeopardize the supervision of thousands of persons under pretrial release and convicted felons released from federal prisons, compromising public safety in communities across the Nation.

Mr. President, I voted against the legislation that put us on the path to sequestration because I was concerned about the effects of reckless cuts on everyday Americans. Just look at what sequestration will do to Head Start a program that helps our most vulnerable children learn how to learn: 70,000 kids could be kicked out of Head Start, including 1,300 in New Jersey.

We had a chance today to vote on a bill to replace these cuts with a balanced approach to deficit reduction, but our Republican colleagues insisted on protecting loopholes for the wealthy and big corporations. I hope that they will reconsider their position in the coming weeks, and work with us to undo these damaging cuts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask for an opportunity to respond to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then yield to the Senator from Iowa.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, we just met with Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood, a former Congressman from Illinois. He said the opposite of what the Senator from Pennsylvania said. The Secretary of Transportation said exactly the opposite of what the Senator just said.

The sequestration is going to force him to reduce the payroll in his department. The largest payroll source is the Federal Aviation Administration and the largest cohort within that administration is the air traffic controllers. Sequestration is going to go into effect in an announcement by the Department of Transportation within the next several days—if we don’t avoid it with a vote on this Senate floor—of restrictions on airports across the United States because of sequestered air traffic controllers.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I will when I am finished.

We know we are going to have to tell them they are only going to be able to work 4 days out of the week. It is mindless to stand on the Senate floor and say we can cut $1 billion out of the Department of Transportation and no one will feel it. Cove on. Get real. We have 7 months left in this year. These agencies are trying to come up with the savings, and the only places they can turn are very limited.

Ashston Carter, Deputy Secretary of Defense, just went through with what they are facing. These are not easy because the sequestration was never meant to be easy. It is hard.

Please don’t sugarcoat it and say there is a magic wand out there to find $700 million that is not essential to the safety and security of the United States because of what the Department of Transportation and that if the President would just look closely, I am sure we can do it. It is not that simple.

The Senator has been involved in the supercommittee, and he has been involved in looking at this budget. He knows that on a bipartisan basis we can find savings. There is money to be saved in every single agency of government, but you don’t do it with a heavy-handed sequester approach.

Please don’t suggest we are favoring the idea of air traffic control being limited in America. I want it expanded. Unfortunately, the sequestration is going to limit it in the State of Illinois.
and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I will yield for the Senator's question.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, it is hard for me to follow this. The Senator is doing an interesting job of making an argument, and what Senator INHOFE and I are offering is a way to minimize the damage. In the President's submitted request for the FAA, did he contemplate laying off air traffic controllers or closing towers? I know the answer. The President's budget—which he submitted to Congress and is a public document—requested a certain funding for the FAA.

Mr. DURBIN. For the next fiscal year?

Mr. TOOMEY. For the current fiscal year, the President's most recent request. The President's request was for less money than the FAA will have if the sequester goes through. I don't think it was planning to lay off air traffic controllers or closing towers. I know the answer. The President's budget—which he submitted to Congress and is a public document—requested a certain funding for the FAA.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, this is getting perilously close to a debate, which I will tell those in attendance never happens on the floor of the Senate. I will tell the Senator this time we are dealing with the CR and last year's appropriations for the Department of Transportation; that is what Secretary LaHood is using. He is using the Budget Control Act numbers. So the President's request, notwithstanding, is $1 billion has to be cut from the Department of Transportation, and the flexibility notwithstanding, the options are so limited at this point in time.

I will tell the Senator pointblank that I believe we need to reduce this deficit. Sequestration is a terrible way, but there is an alternative. There will be an alternative this afternoon, and we will ask the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the Senator from Oklahoma: Are they prepared to say we are going to limit the direct agriculture support payments to farmers who have had the most profitable years in their lives and don't need them? Are they prepared to say that people making $5 million a year in income ought to pay the same tax rate as the secretaries who work for them? If they are, we can avoid the worst parts of the sequestration. If they are not, be prepared, we are in for a pretty rough ride.

Mr. INHOFE. Would the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. This has been very interesting. This is not what I was going to speak on. I was going to speak on the amount of cuts we have already taken in our appropriations bill on Labor, Health, Human Services, Education, NIH, and Centers for Disease Control. I could not help but hear my friend from Pennsylvania talk about the President's budget as though that is controlling this. Would the Republican leadership think the President's budget was in the President's budget? I don't think so. They might want to select this or that or this or that, but are we now hearing from my friends on the other side that we should just carte blanche rubberstamp the President's budget? I sure hope not.

I remind my friends that the Constitution of the United States clearly says this body has two functions: taxing and spending—not the President and not the executive branch. The executive branch can propose whatever budget they want, it is up to us to decide both how to collect the taxpayers' money and how to spend it. It does not matter to me exactly what the President proposes. What I want to know is, how do you, how do Congressmen—feel about where we should be investing our money and on what we ought to be spending the taxpayers' money.

The idea that somehow the President's budget says this or that and that people can pick and choose whatever they want with it, I submit again, I will bet my friends on the other side will not say: We will just adopt the President's budget as it is and we will go with that. I don't think they are ready to do that. I would not even do that for a President of my own party.

I wish to talk a second, again, about sort of the intransigence on the part of my friends on the Republican side—not only in this body but in the other body—of not countenancing any other funding or raising of revenues. I keep hearing the Speaker say: We gave revenues last month, that we had $700 billion of revenues last month; now it is time to talk about spending cuts.

What the Speaker has done is he has drawn an arbitrary starting line of January 2013. What about last year and the year before when we adopted over $1.4 trillion in spending cuts that have already been adopted? What about the starting line there? That is when we started to address the $4 trillion we needed by 2020 to stabilize our debt. We have come up with about $1.4 trillion in spending cuts and about $700 billion in revenues last month; now it is time to talk about spending cuts.

What the Speaker has done is he has drawn an arbitrary starting line of January 2013. What about last year and the year before when we adopted over $1.4 trillion in spending cuts that have already been adopted? What about the starting line there? That is when we started to address the $4 trillion we needed by 2020 to stabilize our debt.

We have come up with about $1.4 trillion in spending cuts and about $700 billion in revenues. It is not the idea that we have already given up and that we have collected enough revenue. That is not it at all. Going forward we need a balance between revenues and spending cuts.

I want to read some of the things we have done in our own committee last year. We had $1.3 billion in cuts. We eliminated the education technology state grants, which a lot of people kind of liked. The Even Start Program was eliminated. The tech-prep education state grants were eliminated. The mentoring children of prisoners was eliminated; the foreign language assistance was eliminated; the civic education was eliminated; The Alcohol Abuse Reduction Program was eliminated. The career pathways innovation fund was eliminated.

Many of these programs were started by my friends on the Republican side and, in time, in the past, some were started by Democrats; most of them were started jointly with Republican and Democrats. What I am pointing out is that we have already cut a lot of things out of Health and Human Services, education, NIH, and the Centers for Disease Control. I can tell you Dr. Francis Collins, the head of NIH, warned that the sequester will slash another $1.6 billion from NIH's budget at the very time when we are on the cusp of having some good breakthroughs in medical research. A lot of medical researchers have been lined up and doing some great programs out there. Now all of a sudden they are going to have the rug pulled out from underneath them, but that is what is going to happen.

I might mention the kids with disabilities and what is going to happen with the funding for the IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I am told about 7,200 teachers, aides, and other staff who help our communities and our schools cope with kids with disabilities who come into schools—because under IDEA we are providing that kind of support—are going to be cut. But it is going to be cut.

So this idea that somehow we can keep cutting and cutting and cutting and we are going to get to some magic land where we can continue to function as a society just isn't so. We need revenues. That is what is in the bill the majority leader has proposed, revenues that will help us reach that point where we can have both spending cuts and revenues and stabilize our debt at a reasonable percentage of our GDP.

I yield the floor. The PRESIDENT pro Tempore, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call in relation to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 16.

The PRESIDENT pro Tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PROVIDE FOR A SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDENT pro Tempore. Under the previous order, the motion will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 16, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, a bill to provide for a sequester replacement.

The PRESIDENT pro Tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The 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, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, S. 16, an Inhofe/Toomey bill to cancel budgetary resources.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed on S. 16, a bill to provide for a sequester replacement, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 38, nays 62, as follows:

[Call Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Alexander
Barrasso
Baucus
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Cochran
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo

NAYS—62

Ayotte
Baldwin
Begich
BenNET
Blumenthal
Boozman
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carter
Casey
Collins
Coons
Cowan
Cruz
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gilbert
Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the ayes are 38, the nays are 62. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 16 is withdrawn.

AMERICAN FAMILY ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT OF 2013—MOtion T o PROCEED—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 18, S. 388, a bill to appropriately limit sequestration, to eliminate tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark Begich, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jack Reed, Sherrod Brown, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, and Harry Reid,Resolution for the adjournment of the Senate, June 16, 2011, as a result of the enactment of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2011, which provided for a sequester replacement, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Call Vote No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benen
Blumenthal
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Carter
Casey
Coons
Cowan
Benninger
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken

NAYS—49

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Cowen
Cruz
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gilbert
Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Warren). On this vote the yeas are 51, the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on my motion to proceed to the PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, S. 16, an Inhofe/Toomey bill to cancel budgetary resources for fiscal year 2013.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed on S. 16, a bill to provide for a sequester replacement, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 38, nays 62, as follows:

[Call Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Alexander
Barrasso
Baucus
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Cochran
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo

NAYS—62

Ayotte
Baldwin
Begich
Benen
Blumenthal
Boozman
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carter
Casey
Collins
Coons
Cowen
Cruz
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gilbert
Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the ayes are 38, the nays are 62. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 16 is withdrawn.

AMERICAN FAMILY ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT OF 2013—MONtern BUSINESS

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
would only generate $3 billion in revenue over the next 10 years, less than the government borrows on a single day. Kansans in particular, along with the rest of rural America, would be negatively impacted by any change in the tax code that reduces the value of the deduction for non-commercial aircraft. Farmers use general aviation aircraft to dust their crops, and rural small business owners rely on these planes to connect their businesses with the rest of the world. It makes no sense for a commercial jumbo jet liner to be depreciated on the same schedule as a farmer’s air tractor.

This distinction between general and commercial aircraft is neither a loophole nor unique, as the 5-year depreciation schedule is applicable to many other depreciable transportation assets, such as cars and trucks. If the President wants Congress to review the depreciation periods associated with certain assets, then why single out one specific industry instead of taking a comprehensive approach? Because attacking corporate jets is apparently a nice political sound bite. But political sound bites don’t solve our problems.

Because of the expiration of the Bush tax cuts on January 1 of this year, President Obama received $600 billion in tax hikes to help fund his vision for government expansion. Yet less than 2 months later he is back on the campaign stump asking American taxpayers for more.

While the amount of revenue our government currently brings in is near historical averages, spending remains well above those historical norms and is projected to escalate dramatically in the years ahead. It is long past time to address the real problem with meaningful spending reductions, and every moment spent talking about corporate jet loopholes is a wasted moment.

Americans expect leadership from their elected officials here in Washington, DC. If we fail to take action now and leave it for a future President and a future Congress to solve, we will reduce the opportunities of the next generation to experience the country and the chance that every American has the chance to pursue the American dream.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes as if in morning business.

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

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the last 2 days in the debate here, a lot has been said about the sequestration that presumably is going to happen tomorrow. I would like to speak on that subject because it is very important, particularly the history of sequestration and what has gone on here in recent weeks.

In August 2011 a compromise was reached to grant President Obama’s request to raise the debt ceiling by $2.1 trillion. I believe that was because we had a feeling that there ought to be a way to decrease by $1 in the ceiling. So that adds up to $2.1 trillion. In exchange for an increase in the debt ceiling, we Republicians in Congress asked for spending reductions. This all added up to the Budget Control Act passed on August 2, 2011. Decisions we are debating today were decided 18 months ago, so if you didn’t like them in 18 months, you had an opportunity to change them. But here we are at the last minute talking about some changes.

The Budget Control Act of August 2, 2011, included budget caps to cut about $900 billion in spending immediately—August 2, 2011—and then it set up a supercommittee to find at least $1.2 trillion in additional deficit reduction. History shows that the supercommittee could not reach an agreement. So the failure of the supercommittee to reach an agreement led to the sequestration we are now debating and facing tomorrow, which is, as we know, automatic reductions of $1.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

I didn’t support the Budget Control Act. I don’t criticize those who did, and to be fair, it was a bipartisan vote that got the Budget Control Act adopted. I knew at the time—and one of the reasons I voted against it—that the supercommittee was unlikely to reach an agreement and that it would ultimately only further delay difficult fiscal decisions that needed to be made. But at the time, the very bipartisan majority in the Senate and the House passed and President Obama signed the Budget Control Act—a bill to bring about $2.1 trillion in spending reductions over the next 10 years.

Most believe sequestration is a terrible way to reduce spending. I agree. There are surely better ways to reduce spending by the $85 billion that is going to happen this year—of which, by the way, only $44 billion is going to be spent between now and September 30. I don’t believe we are going to have a situation where every year there is going to be some decision made on whether to continue the $1.2 trillion, and I hope for the good of the country that continues, whether it is by across-the-board automatic cuts or maybe there will be a compromise that can be reached to do it in a more studied way.

The Republican-led House of Representatives, as we know after the 2011 decision, recognized that the automatic reductions weren’t the best way to do it. So last year they passed two bills to reorganize those cuts in a more structured way. Did the Senate consider those two bills? No. The Democratic-led Senate produced or considered no bill prior to today to avert the sequester.

So I think it is fair to say that for the last 18 months we could have been working together to find an agreement, nothing was done after the House of Representatives worked that agreement. Now we have all these crocodile tears flowing from the majority here in this chamber because a hardship this sequester may cause. Well, where have they been for the last 18 months? Why have they not proposed a single piece of legislation to avert sequestration until this very last minute? The two votes we just had today are an example.

Why has the Senate avoided regular order with such vigor? In other words, regular order—let the committees hold hearings; let the committees debate, vote a bill, send it to the Senate floor; debate, amend, and vote it to a conference with the House of Representatives. But no regular order. Under regular order, you work to compromise. But the Senate failed to meet with the House. So here we are at the eleventh hour to consider an alternative.

Just like their inability to produce a budget in nearly 4 years, this Senate majority has again failed to act. A budget is a very important part of fiscal discipline, but we haven’t had a budget debate for 3 years even though the 1974 law requires us to have such debate and passage.

Tomorrow the President is going to meet with leaders in the Congress to see what can be done about sequestration, but why the very same day sequestration is taking place? What has the President been doing? We have seen him traveling around the country generating mass hysteria about what might happen—and wouldn’t have had to do it if we had regular order here in the Senate in the meantime.

I would like to remind my colleagues that not only is the sequester a product that came from the White House, he explicitly pledged to veto a proposal to replace the cuts sometime when it was brought up in late 2011 and 2012. This is what the President said on November 2011:

Some in Congress are trying to undo these automatic spending cuts. My message to them is simple. No. I will veto any effort to get rid of those automatic spending cuts to domestic and defense spending. There will be no easy off-ramps on this one.

Now the President and the Democrats here in the Senate want us to agree we know that tax hikes on the American people rather than to cut the $3.6 trillion budget by just 2.4 percent, which they agreed to as part of the 2011 deal. Tax hikes were not included in that deal. They weren’t included because the spending is the problem, not revenues.

The President must be absolutely frustrated. He apparently can’t manage
It also is not clear to me why, when we are talking about reforming the Tax Code, we are now seeking to add an additional layer of complexity onto a Tax Code we already agree is too complicated.

At the end of the day, all the Buffett rule will accomplish is siphoning off more job-creating capital and investment for Main Street so that we can spend it here in Washington, DC. I hope we all know that government consumes wealth, it does not create wealth. The wealth is created outside of this city of Washington, the seat of our government. We have to take that into consideration. It takes capital to create jobs. If you want to get unemployment down, you do not take capital out of the private sector.

In addition to the Buffett rule, the other side has resurrected another proposal voted down by this body less than a year ago. This proposal has to do with businesses deducting ordinary and necessary business expenses. The rhetoric from the other side is that their proposal would close a loophole that incentivizes companies to ship jobs overseas. The problem is no such provision exists. The deduction for ordinary and necessary business expenses is a mainstay of our Tax Code. It is an income-deriving provision that accounts for the cost of doing business. What the proposal before us actually does is target companies doing business on a worldwide basis.

This proposal would close a loophole that incentivizes companies to ship jobs overseas. The problem is no such provision exists. The deduction for ordinary and necessary business expenses is a mainstay of our Tax Code. It is an income-deriving provision that accounts for the cost of doing business. What the proposal before us actually does is target companies doing business on a worldwide basis.

The final tax increase included in the other side’s proposal today is more of a budget gimmick than a serious proposal to help pay for the delay in the sequester. It would subject oil from tar sands to taxes that support the oilspill liability trust fund. However, if the revenue raised from this proposal is dedicated to this trust fund, how can it at the same time be dedicated to deficit reduction? If we are going to get serious about deficit reduction, we need to put an end to this double-counting charade.

The only spending the other side is willing to cut is farm subsidies. Using farm subsidies for sequester replacement puts the Agriculture Committee in quite a tough position. I want to remind my colleagues, though, that when we wrote a farm bill last year that passed the Senate by a bipartisan majority—it didn’t pass the House of Representatives—but we cut $23 billion from that. We did away with direct payments, we maintained the crop insurance program, we put money in other programs and in food stamps as well.

At the end of the day, though, there will be money saved in the farm bill. If, given that opportunity, we can provide savings from a lot of programs, we should. We showed that ability last year. We all know the farm bill faced challenges in both the House and the Senate. The challenges probably still exist in that Chamber, but we should not put ourselves in a position where we cannot even get a bill through the Senate.

For those of us who support the farm bill, we should be very concerned that this plan the Democrats are putting forward to avoid sequestration could seriously undermine the ability to pass a farm bill in either Chamber this time around. We just had an opportunity to vote on the Democrats’ tax increase. This was the first vote of the Senate on an alternative to sequestration and the first alternative offered by the Senate majority. Over a period of 18 months, they had an opportunity to offer that alternative, just as the House Republicans offered us two alternatives we never took up.

We also had the opportunity to vote on one alternative from the Republican side of the aisle, but both of these votes were for show. I hope we can now work together in a bipartisan way, in regular order, to make sensible spending reductions. It is time to end the incessant talk of more tax hikes on the American people expect us to do so. It is time to end the constant campaigning and do the work to make American life better than the present generation has known.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. 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. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator
from Louisiana. Mr. VITTER, be allowed to speak following my remarks. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TOO BIG TO FAIL

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I welcome Senator VITTER and his cooperation in this matter. I appreciate the work he has done on the issue. He and I are trying to address the concentration of the financial system in this country and what that means to the middle class, what it means to business lending for small businesses, and again what it means to the potential of too big to fail. It is something Senator VITTER has been a leader on for a number of years. Both of us are members of the Senate Banking Committee.

More than 100 years ago, in 1899, one of my predecessors, Senator John Sherman, a Republican, and author of the Sherman Antitrust Act—who actually lived in my hometown of Mansfield, OH, and was the only other Senator from that city who served here—said: I do not single out Standard Oil Company . . . [s]till, they are controlling and can control the market so absolutely as they choose to do it; it is a question of their will. To consider whether, on the whole, it is safe in this country to leave the production of property, the transportation of our whole country, to depend upon the will of a few men sitting at their council board in the city of New York, for there the whole machine is operated?

At the time, Senator Sherman was speaking about the trusts—specifically Standard Oil and other trusts as well—that were large, diverse industrial organizations with outsized economic and political power, not just economic power but also political power. His words are as true as they are today. Today our economy is being threatened—and threatened by multitrillion-dollar—that is trillion dollar—financial institutions. Wall Street megabanks are so large that should they fail, they could take the rest of the economy with them.

If this were to happen, instead of failure, taxpayers are likely to be asked again to cover their losses and to bail them out just as we did 5 years ago. This is a disastrous outcome because it transfers wealth from the rest of the economy into these megabanks and suspends the rules of capitalism and perpetuates the moral hazard that comes from saving risk-takers from the consequences of their behavior.

Just as Senator Sherman spoke against the trusts in the late 19th century, today people across the political spectrum—both parties and all ideologies—are speaking about the dangerous, concentrated wealth of Wall Street megabanks.

In 2009, another Republican—and one a little more familiar to a modern audience—Alan Greenspan said: If they’re too big to fail, they’re too big . . . in the case of Standard Oil. . . . Maybe that’s what we need to do.

If anyone thought the biggest banks were too big to fail before the crisis, then I have bad news: They have only gotten bigger. These are the six largest banks and their growth patterns in 1995–18 years ago—had combined assets that were 18 percent of GDP. Today they have combined assets of $42 trillion, or 28 percent of GDP. Over that time, 37 banks merged 33 times to become the top 4 largest behemoths, which now range from $1.4 trillion in assets to the largest, Bank of America and JPMorgan Chase, which is around $2.3 or $2.4 trillion in assets. That is $9 trillion in assets. Once the beginning of the fiscal crisis, three of these four megabanks have grown through mergers by an average of more than $300 billion.

The 6 largest banks now have twice the combined assets of the rest of the 50 largest U.S. banks. These 6 banks—Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America—combined assets of 6 banks, are larger than the largest 50 megabanks were if we add up the assets of banks 7 through 50, the bank that resulted would only be half the size of a bank made from the assets of the top 6.

As astonishing as these numbers are, they don’t tell the whole story. Many megabank supporters argue that U.S. banks are small relative to international banks.

But as Bloomberg reported last week, FDIC Board member Tom Hoenig has exposed a de facto standard in our accounting system that allows U.S. banks to actually shrink themselves on paper. Under the accounting rules applied by the rest of the world, the 6 largest banks are 39 percent larger than we think they are. That is a difference of about $4 trillion. If that is the case, instead of being 63 percent of GDP under international accounting rules, these 6 banks are actually 102 percent of GDP. Let me say that again. These six biggest banks are slightly larger than the entire size of our economy. When measured against the same standard as every other institution in the world, we see the United States has the three largest banks in the world. These institutions are not just big, they are extremely complex.

According to the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, the 5 largest U.S. banks now have 19,654 subsidiaries. On average, they have 3,900 subsidiaries each and operate in 60 different countries. These institutions are not just massive and complex—I don’t object so much to that—it is they are also risky.

According to their regulator, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency—and I met with them today—one of these institutions has adequate risk management. Let me say that again. In stress tests, not one of the largest 19 banks has shown adequate risk management.

It is simply impossible to believe that these behemoths will not get into trouble again. We saw what happened with one of the best managed banks with a lot of employees—some 16,000, 17,000, 18,000 employees in my State alone—at one site with 10,000 employees in Columbus: JPMorgan Chase, a well-managed bank with a very competent CEO but a bank that not so long ago lost $6 billion or $7 billion of a megabank’s failure. He said that more drastic steps “could yet prove necessary.”

Governor Dan Tarullo, from the Federal Reserve, threw his support behind a proposal first introduced by the Presiding Officer’s predecessor, Senator Ted Kaufman, and me to cap the nondeposit liabilities of the megabanks some 3 years ago in this body. If men are not radicals; they are some of the Nation’s foremost banking experts.

History has taught us we never see the next threat coming until it is too late and almost upon us. When we passed the Dodd-Frank Act, it contained tools that regulators can use to rein in risk taking.

Unfortunately, many of these rules have stalled, and most will not take effect for years, because it is not just the megabanks but a political powers so often having their way in this city and with regulators all over the country.

Dodd-Frank focuses on improving regulators’ ability to monitor risks and enhancing the actions that regulators can take if they believe the risk has grown too great. Over the last 5 years alone we have seen faulty mortgage-related securities, we have seen foreclosures, we have seen big losses from risky trading, money laundering, and LIBOR rate rigging.

Until the Dodd-Frank rules take effect, the rest of us more or less have to stand by idly as megabanks take more risks that almost inevitably and eventually lead to failure.

We shouldn’t tolerate business as usual, monitoring risk until we are once again near the brink of disaster. We need to learn from history. We should correct our mistakes by dealing with the problem head on. That means preventing the anti-competitive concentration of banks that are too big to fail and whose favored status encourages them to engage in high-risk behavior.

How many more scandals will it take before we acknowledge that we can’t rely on regulators to prevent subprime lending, dangerous derivatives, risky proprietary trading, financial instruments that nobody understands, in- cluding the people running the banks in many cases, and even fraud and manipulation.
Wall Street has been allowed to run wild for years. We simply cannot wait any longer for regulators to act. These institutions are too big to manage, they are too big to regulate, and they are surely still too big to fail.

We need a financial market to fix itself because the rules of competitive markets and creative destruction don’t apply to Wall Street megabanks as they do to businesses in Louisiana or Delaware or Ohio. Megabank’s shareholders and creditors have no incentive to end too big to fail. As a result, they will engage in ever-riskier behavior. In the end, they get paid out when banks are bailed out.

Taking the appropriate steps will lead to more midsized banks—not a few megabanks—creating competition, increasing lending, and providing incentives for banks to lend the right way.

If there is one thing the people in Washington love it is community banks. Senator VITTER has been very involved in helping community banks deal with regulations and other kinds of rules. Cam Fine, the head of the Independent Community Bankers of America, has been calling for the largest banks to be downsized because he sees that his members, the community banks—there might be 50 million, 100 million, or less than that in assets—are at a disadvantage.

Just about the only people who will not benefit from reining in these megabanks are a few Wall Street executives. Congress needs to take action now to prevent future economic collapses and future taxpayer-funded liabilities.

Before yielding, I wish to thank Senator VITTER, who recognizes this problem with an acuity that most don’t have, and for joining me in doing something about it. In a similar way, we have those concerns echoed in the real world outside Congress and outside this institution. Senator Brown alluded to some of it, but let me flesh that out.

We have, for instance, the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, Dan Tarullo. He was appointed by President Obama. He was a prominent figure in drafting and implementing Dodd-Frank. He recently lamented:

"...to the extent that a growing systemic footprint increases perceptions of at least some residual too-big-to-fail quality in such a firm—

Meaning a megabank—

notwithstanding the panoply of measures in Dodd-Frank and its regulations, there may be funding advantages for the firm, which reinforces the impulse to grow.

In a little more blunt terms, our colleague, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN, who is also a figure in coming up with Dodd-Frank, said recently in our Banking Committee hearing with Chairman Bernanke:

I’d like to go to the question about too-big-to-fail; that we haven’t gotten rid of it yet. And I think we have the double problem, and that is that the big banks—big at the time that they were bailed out the first time—have gotten bigger, and at the same time that investors believe that too-big-to-fail out there, that it’s safer to put your money into the big banks and not the little banks, in effect creating an insurance policy for the big banks that the government is creating this insurance policy—not there for the small banks.

In a similar way, we have those concerns echoed in the real world outside this body on the right as well.

Recently, George Will said:

By breaking up the biggest banks, conservatives will not be putting asunder what the free market has joined together. Government nurtured these behemoths by weaving an improvident safety net and by practicing crony capitalism.

Peggy Noonan, another well-known conservative, has said:

If you are conservative you are skeptical of concentrated power. You know the bullying and bossism it can lead to. . . . Too big to fail is too big to continue. The megabanks are far too much power in Washington and too much weight within the financial system.

So I do think there is a real and growing consensus in this body, in Washington, and in the real world, as I have suggested by those observers’ quotes, and I think we need to build on that consensus and act in a responsible way.

Senator BROWN and I have been doing that, first with joint letters to Chairman Bernanke and others, focusing on the need for significantly greater capital requirements for the biggest banks. We think this would be the best and first way we should try to rein in too big to fail, to put more protection between megabank failure and the taxpayer, more incentive for the megabanks to perhaps diversify, perhaps break up, or at least correctly price their size and risk to the financial system.

We are following up on that initial work that was reflected in letters and specific suggestions to Chairman Bernanke with legislation that is quite far along, and I know we will be talking about more both today and in the near future.

With that, let me invite Senator Brown to round out his comments, and then I will have a few more words to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I know Senator ALEXANDER is waiting to speak. I thank Senator VITTER for his work on this issue. I remember the first discussions Senator VITTER and I had about this when he was asking some tough questions of a couple of regulators—it might have been the Secretary of the Treasury as well as a couple of other regulators—on capital standards and how important it was that, as he just mentioned, these banks have the kinds of capital standards, have the kinds of capital reserves that are so important in making sure these banks are healthy. Probably most of us in our lives have seen the movie “It’s a Wonderful Life,” and we know what happens to a bank that is not capitalized; a small-town example of a bank that served the country in ways that community banks do. It is a very different story today, perhaps.

But I think his insight into the importance of capital reserves and then continuing these discussions, we both came to the realization that, as he pointed out, people all across the political spectrum—some of my more Democratic colleagues, people such as George Will and others—have been very involved as business leaders and speaking out on issues that matter.
So I thank Senator Vitter for his work. We will be working on legislation, and I am hopeful more of my colleagues see how important this issue is so we can continue to work together.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VITTER. Again, I thank Senator Brown for his partnership. Senator Brown, with those posters, made crystal clear the facts. The fact is that since the financial crisis, the megabanks have only continued to grow in their dominance, and in market share. In fact, that has accelerated significantly.

Some folks will say: Oh, well, that was a preexisting trend. That is because of a number of factors.

It is certainly true there are a number of factors at issue. But the growth has only accelerated since the crisis and Dodd-Frank. It has not let up. In addition, there have been several recent studies that actually quantify the fact that too big to fail is a market advantage, is, in essence, a taxpayer subsidy, as Elizabeth Warren suggested, for the megabanks.

An FDIC study released in September says that. It says:

The Dodd-Frank-Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 was explicitly intended to, in part, put an end to the TBTF [too big to fail] de facto policy.

But it concludes that:

The largest banks do, in fact, pay less for comparable deposits. Furthermore, we show that some of the difference in the cost of funding cannot be attributed to either differences in balance sheet risk or any non-risk factors. The remaining unexplained risk premium gap is on the order of 45 bps [basis points]. Such a gap is consistent with an economically significant “too-big-to-fail” subsidy paid to the largest banks.

Another recent study and working paper is an IMF working paper. It simply attempted to quantify that taxpayer too-big-to-fail subsidy. According to that study, before that financial crisis, the subsidy:

... was already sizable, 60 basis points. ... It increased to 80 basis points by the end of 2009.

Then, most recently, Bloomberg has tried to put pen to paper and refine that calculation, and Bloomberg’s calculation is $53 billion—$33 billion subsidy of the five biggest U.S. banks, specifically because of artificially cheap rates created by the market believing they are too big to fail. I do like big size and dominance in market share, period. But certainly—certainly—we should not have government policy that is driving it, that is exacerbating it. It seems to me that or market would be a solid consensus left and right, Democrat and Republican. Senator Brown and I are following up on our previous work and drafting legislation. Of course, we are not ready to introduce that today. But it would fundamentally require significantly more capital—banks and would distinguish between megabanks and other size banks; namely, community banks, mid-sized banks, and regional banks. The largest banks would have that significantly higher capital requirement.

It would also try to walk regulators away from Basel III and institute new capital rules that do not rely on risk-weighted assets but instead are transparent and can be understood and are transparent and cannot be gamed the way we think Basel III can be manipulated and gamed. Requiring this would do one or both of two things. It would better ensure the taxpayer against bailouts and it would push the megabanks to restructure because they would be bearing more cost of that risk to the financial system.

In addition, we are contemplating and discussing another section of this bill that would do something that I think is very important to do at the same time: create an easier—not a lax but a more appropriate regulatory framework for clearly smaller and less risky financial institutions such as community banks.

Again, I thank Senator Brown for his partnership. I thank him for his words today. I look forward to continuing to work on this project, as I believe a true bipartisan consensus continues to grow on this issue.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I will speak briefly, and then I will certainly yield to Senator Alexander.

I appreciate very much Senator Vitter’s words and comments and insight. I wish to expand for 2 or 3 minutes on one thing he said about the subsidy that these largest six banks get.

We can see again on this chart that 18 years ago these six banks’ total assets were 18 percent; 18 years ago it was 18 percent of GDP. Today, through mergers and growth—and I would argue unfair competition in many cases—they are over 60 percent. But what Senator Vitter said, which I think is important to expand on a bit, is the subsidy. As Senator Alexander said it was about $33 billion a year in subsidies they get because of government action or inaction, frankly. It is interesting, that $33 billion, when we are talking about the sequester today is about $85 billion, is not relevant, except putting it in some context.

But the reason they have this $33 billion subsidy, $85 billion subsidy or so— $383, $345, $85 billion—or they have the advantage, when they go in the capital markets of getting the advantage of 50, 60, 70, 80 basis points—and 80 basis points is eight-tenths of 1 percent in interest rate advantage—is because the capital markets believe their investments in these banks are not very risky because it has been subsidized because we have not fixed this too-big-to-fail problem for the Nation’s banks.

So it is not a Senator or a conservatively Republican or a progressive Democrat from Louisiana or Ohio making this case that they are getting this advantage; it is the capital markets that have decided, yes, these are too big to fail, so we are going to lend them money at lower rates than we would lend to the Huntington or Key or Third Federal or FirstMerit in Ohio.

Fundamentally, that is the issue; that is our actions or inactions that have given these banks a competitive edge that nobody through acts of government—whether you are a liberal or a conservative—should believe it should be part of our economic system and our financial system.

I thank Senator Vitter and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased to stand with so many colleagues not only here on the Senate side but over in the House to recognize an accomplishment—an accomplishment of the Congress. I think it is important to recognize that in these times that are so contentious, where a lot of messages go back and forth but at the end of the day we haven’t governed, we haven’t done what we had hoped legislatively, we haven’t really helped people, today we can be proud that we have worked to help people, particularly women, and that is through final passage of the Violence Against Women Act. It has been a long time coming.

We successfully moved that legislation through this body last year. I was a proud cosponsor, an early cosponsor. This ought not to be a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. It ought not be a political issue. It is an issue that should bother all of us when we cannot stand together and help those who have been victims of domestic violence. If
BEGGICH, to get an update on that meeting, and I heard that it was good and the Secretary listened. I hope the Secretary listened not only with his ears but with his eyes as he saw the tears of those people, with his soul as he heard their fears, their anxieties. So I hope that the Secretary appreciates that when he says his highest moral responsibility is to the Native and Indian people, he is able to translate that into action, into positive action for these people in King Cove.

I would like to share with you in the few minutes I have remaining some of the stories the Secretary heard this morning.

'The community of King Cove is out in the Aleutians, about 600 air miles from Anchorage. It is about a $1,000 roundtrip ticket to get to Anchorage. Why do you need to get to Anchorage? King Cove has a medical clinic, it has a physician's assistant. If you have anything more serious than a need to get to a physician, you must leave the village for care in Anchorage, so you need to make that trip. A community such as King Cove has real mountains. It is tough to get in and out by road. In fact, the Coast Guard, which is our friend to do five rescues last year, says that getting in and out of the King Cove airstrip is one of the worst places in Alaska because of the terrain, the weather, the wind shear that come off the mountains, the turbulence and a helicopter goes down. It is just a bad-case scenario. Fixed wing, helicopter—it doesn't make any difference. It is tough.

There is an option. King Cove is on the water, but the waters in King Cove are not always calm. In this picture, unfortunately, it seems almost tropical looking with the blue waters. This is the dock in King Cove. You might not be able to see it from where you are sitting, Mr. President, but each one of these runs up this steep metal ladder is about 2 feet. So if you were down here in your boat, if you had been delivered by crab boat to King Cove—about a 2½ or 3 hour ride across waters that can be about 20 feet high in the surf and you have this steep metal ladder to go up, you have the volume of traffic you have in your State or that I have in the more urban areas of Alaska. We are talking about a connector road to be used for noncommercial uses.

There is a simple answer, and a simple answer is a 10-mile, one-lane gravel road with a cable along the length of the road so that you can go off the road and go joyriding in the refuge.

We are talking about a small community of less than 1,000 people being attached to another community where there are less than 100 people. You are not going to have the volume of traffic you have in your State or that I have in Anchorage. It is about a $1,000 roundtrip ticket to get to Anchorage.

We are talking about a small community of less than 1,000 people being attached to another community where there are less than 100 people. You are not going to have the volume of traffic you have in your State or that I have in Anchorage. It is about a $1,000 roundtrip ticket to get to Anchorage.

There is a simple answer, and a simple answer is a 10-mile, one-lane gravel road with a cable along the length of the road so that you can go off the road and go joyriding in the refuge.

We are talking about a small community of less than 1,000 people being attached to another community where there are less than 100 people. You are not going to have the volume of traffic you have in your State or that I have in Anchorage. It is about a $1,000 roundtrip ticket to get to Anchorage.
So I stand before you today with a call—a call to Secretary Salazar, a call to this administration to listen to the people. Listen to the people who have lived in an area for a thousand-plus years who want to continue to call this place home and who are looking for very specific accommodations—very basic accommodations.

We have refuges all over this country. I got an e-mail from a friend of mine who said, as I am sending you this text, I am driving through a refuge in Florida. Driving through refuge in Florida. It is a paved road. There are signs along the road. There are two lanes and it is a refuge. We are asking for a 10-mile, 1-lane gravel, basically emergency access road for the people of King Cove.

Sometimes I think because King Cove is so far out of the way—at the end of the world as far as some people are concerned—it is kind of out of sight, out of mind, and that maybe what is going on in this part of the country the birds are more important than the people. There is sensitive habitat out there, I agree, and we need to be responsible in how we protect habitat. But we can protect habitat and we can protect the human beings who live there or coexist side by side and do it respectfully. The people in King Cove respect the land more than you and I can ever appreciate, because if they fail to respect the land, they don't live.

So when we talk about how we can reach an accommodation, the people of King Cove say, we are asking for a simple level of safety, and in order to gain this level of safety, we are willing to give up our lands. We are willing to give up other lands we own in exchange for this small corridor. So when we are talking about this trade, this land conveyance exchange we signed off on in 2009, it is a 300-to-1 exchange. The Federal Government gets 300 times more than the Aleuts get—300 times more—or basically 56,000-plus acres going to the Federal Government. This will be the first new wilderness created in Alaska since INILKA back in the 1980s.

What is being asked for is this small corridor, basically 206 acres, all told. Yet the Fish and Wildlife Service has said, Nope, 300-to-1 isn't good enough for us. They think there are other alternatives. They say: Well, why can't they go another way? Why can't they go another way? They actually went out, when they heard their stories, when they heard their stories, his heart was moved to respect the people of King Cove, to respect the Alaska Natives, to respect them as much as he has shown respect for the public lands he has been entrusted to protect these past 4 years. Here is an opportunity to issue this best-interest finding and to reverse the decision from the Fish and Wildlife Service which says that no action is the way we go forward.

No action compromises the safety of these Americans. That is not acceptable.

We will keep working. We will keep fighting. But I believe that in the end, right will prevail and the people of King Cove will have their safety.

With that said, Mr. Secretary, I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND assumed the Chair.)

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, tomorrow we will begin commemoration of Women's History Month—an annual occasion to celebrate and honor the many contributions of women to American history, culture, and society. Since our Nation's founding, generations of women have fought injustice and broken down barriers at home, in the workplace, and in their communities in pursuit of the American dream. Women's History Month, we remember these struggles, celebrate our collective progress, and renew our commitment to protecting the rights of all women.

Earlier this month, the Senate came together in the best tradition of the Chamber to pass the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act with a strong bipartisan vote. This bill would not have passed without the strong leadership and support of every woman currently serving in the Senate. And today the House of Representatives passed our bipartisan bill to help survivors of rape, domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking. On the eve of Women's History month, Congress's actions will prevent terrible crimes and help countless victims rebuild their lives.

A few days from now, on March 3, 2013, we will mark the centennial celebration of the 1913 women's suffrage procession—a watershed moment in the struggle for women's right to vote. On March 3, 1913—the eve of the inauguration of President Wilson—more than 5,000 women from every State in the Union assembled in Washington, DC, to march for the right to vote. They did so in the face of widespread opposition to their cause, and some were hospitalized after violence erupted along the parade route. A century later, this courageous public act is recognized as the key turning point that led to the ratification of the 19th amendment to the Constitution, giving women the right to vote in 1920.

In the coming days, we will witness the arc of American history, as thousands of women retrace the steps of the heroines of 1913, by reenacting the Women's Suffrage March. This "Centennial Women's Suffrage March" will be led by the women of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated—the only African-American women's organization to participate in the 1913 march. I commend Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated. UniteWomen.org, the American Association of University Women, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the many other women's organizations that will join forces to reenact this historic event. I also commend the many government and private sector institutions that will support this event, including the National Archives and Records Administration, the National Park Service, the National Women's History Museum, and the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History.

Like the many Americans who will commemorate the women's suffrage march this weekend, I celebrate the progress that we have made towards justice, fairness, and equality for women—and for all of our citizens. But, while we have made remarkable strides towards gender equality, gender discrimination still exists. According to a recent study by the American Association of University of Women, full-time working women who are recent college graduates earn, on average, just 82 percent of what their male counterparts earn. According to a recent study by the American Association of University of Women, full-time working women who are recent college graduates earn, on average, just 82 percent of what their male counterparts earn. According to a recent study by the American Association of University of Women, full-time working women who are recent college graduates earn, on average, just 82 percent of what their male counterparts earn. This 18 percent wage gap directly affects the economic stability of American families. A Center for American Progress report on women in the workplace found that in 2010 nearly two-thirds of all American women are breadwinner for their family or shared that financial responsibility with a spouse or a partner.
As we celebrate Women's History Month, the courageous acts of the American heroines of 1913 should inspire us all to work to eliminate the gender inequalities that still exist in our society today. I join all Americans in celebrating the countless contributions women have made to our nation's history and culture and in working towards a more just and fair society for future generations of American women and girls.

**REMEMBERING LORI ACTON**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it is with deep regret and grief that I inform my fellow senators of the passing of my personal friend, Lori Acton. Mrs. Acton was a dynamic and dedicated woman whose absence in the community of Laurel County will be immediately and acutely felt.

Lori is someone who cannot be replaced. As the executive director of the Laurel County Public Library, she was a passionate leader who was visionary without being reckless, infectiously funny without being frivolous, direct and driven without being rude or mean-spirited, and a tireless worker who fully immersed herself in the work and work she participated in. Her work with the library spanned nearly three decades, but the impact of her influence and passion cannot be measured by the usual metrics. Indeed, as one local writer noted, "Lori is someone who cannot be replaced." This is true of her and the community cannot be seen by those who do not know her."

Her vision and leadership, as well as the library's impact on the community of Laurel County, will be remembered for generations to come. Countless testimonies from those who knew her speak to what an incredible leader she was.

Lori made an impact on people's lives. Not only did the library benefit from her enthusiastic approach to fostering a love of reading and learning, but her presence and constant smile became signatures of her community. Countless testimonies from those who knew her speak to her incredible impact she had as both a librarian and a friend.

At this time, I ask that we join together with the community of Laurel County, KY, in mourning the loss of my friend Mrs. Lori Acton. I believe that others can aspire to emulate Lori's character, enthusiasm, love and involvement with the community she lived in.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article lauding Lori from the Laurel County-area publication the Sentinel Echo appear in today's Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(From the Sentinel Echo, January 30, 2013)

**LAUREL LIBRARY DIRECTOR DIES MONDAY**

(By Jeff Noble)

CORBIN.—For more than a quarter-century, Lori Acton gave people of all ages a window to the world and beyond by opening the doors to them at the Laurel County Public Library.

On Wednesday, her colleagues and friends remembered Acton as a passionate advocate for inspiring others through the library's staff, service, and outreach programs. "Lori was the library's director since 1985, died Monday at her home in London. She was 57."

"The library was more than a job to Lori—it was her passion. She worked tirelessly to make the library a place everyone could come and enjoy and learn. From babies to seniors, she wanted this library to offer whatever it could to enrich their lives and the community. We plan on working our hardest to make sure that Lori's vision to the future continues," the library's deputy director, Peggie Wrights, said Wednesday.

Another who knew Acton said she was "driving force in moving the library from its 4th Street location to its present home on College Park Drive in London, which opened in 2003. "Her visionary leadership, enthusiasm, and energy have been pivotal in creating a model of what a library can become in the 21st century," said R. W. Dyche III, president of the Laurel County Public Library's Board of Trustees.

In a phone interview Wednesday, Dyche said two traits made Acton stand out above the crowd. "Number one, she was full of enthusiasm. Lori pursued all goals with enthusiasm. It was her determination that led directly to the opening of the new library. Second, she had a positive attitude about life. Half of them was she was not afraid to hire extremely talented people to work for her. She'll be remembered as a very happy person, so pleased to help people in Laurel and surrounding areas with their educational needs."

"To honor her memory, the main library and their branches in Corbin and North London were closed Tuesday. A picture of Acton, along with the dates of her birth and death in white letters over a black background, was posted on the home page of the library's website."

Kathryn Hardman was one of Acton's closest friends. Together, the two worked on improving literacy in the county, and also were active in community activities as members of the London Rotary Club.

She said in a phone interview Wednesday the news of Acton's passing still echoing over London and Laurel County. "We're all pretty shocked. It's incomprehensible. She had a lot of friends in the community, she was part of our community for 28 years. The community mourns this loss," noted Hardman, who is the executive director of Laurel County Adult Education.

Hardman pointed out that because of Acton's direction, the library spearheaded the creation of the program in 1986 to promote adult literacy on the board of directors of the Saint Joseph London Foundation.

There were other roles in Acton's life. Hardman added, "Her most significant role was as mother, wife, daughter, sister, and friend."

"We've been having lunch for 25 years. We talked about our careers, our community, our nation, our families, and of course, politics. We both loved to talk about politics. It would be fair to say we both had strong opinions." Acton's role as a Rotary member was extensive. At the time of her passing, she was looking forward to working on the annual Rotary International Dinner, a project Acton had headed for the past five years, and is sponsored by both the London and Corbin Rotary clubs.

That passion Acton had with the library extended to her planning the dinner and to helping worthy causes, said Corbin Rotary Club member the Rev. John Burkhart.

"Lori had a lot of energy, high spirits, and she laughed a lot. She was very polite, social, and she was an extremely talented person. She was lively, she'd ask a lot of questions to the speakers, and was very actively involved. Lori wasn't a wallflower."

On Wednesday, this message was posted on the library's Facebook page: "Lori Acton had an unwavering passion for this library, always striving to give her community what she felt was needed and deserved. Her enthusiasm, leadership and commitment will be missed by all of us. Please remember her family and friends in your thoughts and prayers."

Several who knew Acton responded in kind. One person wrote, "Lori was a wonderful librarian and inspired me to become a librarian. I will miss seeing her on my visits home."

Another said, "I smile (through) my tears when I think of Lori. She just ALWAYS had a smile and a laugh when you saw her. Always making you feel real special. How I loved her passion for life."

Lori Holsworth Acton was a native of Sterling, Colorado, located northeast of Denver near the Wyoming border. She is survived by her husband and four children. Her mother, two sisters, and a brother also survive. Visitation is at 11 a.m. Saturday at House Rawlings Funeral Home in London, with funeral services Saturday at 1 p.m. in the funeral home's chapel with the Rev. Wade Arp officiating. Burial will follow at A.R. Dyche Memorial Cemetery in London, with House Rawlings Funeral Home in charge of arrangements.

**REMEMBERING JACK SIZEMORE**

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to reflect on the loss of Mr. Jack Sizemore, an exemplary citizen of Kentucky and a genuinely good man. Mr. Sizemore, of Laurel County, was laid to rest on February 12, 2013, and is survived by his wife, 7 children, 20 grandchildren, 16 great-grandchildren, and two sisters.

In other words, "Let me tell you what Jack Sizemore did for me" are commonly heard in Jack's beloved town of London, and represent just how sorely his presence will be missed. His legacy of goodwill is firmly established after years working in the Laurel County Detention Center, as he chose to build a reputation as a jailer who "liked the job he was doing and [who] took care of the prisoners in a humane way and with the utmost courtesy." This testimony comes from his former supervisor Ed Parsley, who admits that "you don't find many men like that." Jack was known to always have people laughing, and the community he loved so much has looked back and seen all the ways he touched their lives. The health problems that plagued his final years cannot begin to take attention away from his legacy and reputation.

At this time, I ask that my colleagues in this United States Senate join me in honoring Mr. Jack Sizemore. Along with the condolences to his family and friends, we simultaneously offer our gratitude and praise of this truly wonderful man.
I also ask unanimous consent that an article on the life and service of Mr. Jack Sizemore that appeared in the Laurel County-area publication the Sentinel Echo be included in the RECORD. There being no objection, the following article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the Sentinel Echo, February 15, 2013

FORMER JAILER REMEMBERED AS ‘GOOD MAN’

(By Nita Johnson)

LAUREL COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—A former Laurel County jailer, chief administrator of the jail, and deputy sheriff was laid to rest on Tuesday after ongoing health problems.

Jack Sizemore, 76, died Saturday at his home from frontotemporal dementia, which left him unable to communicate with others. Sizemore left a legacy of goodwill for his family, friends and co-workers.

Edd Parsley worked with Sizemore after Parsley was appointed as jailer in 1997. Sizemore stayed on as chief administrator of the Laurel County Detention Center when Parsley was elected to a four-year term as jailer.

"Jack worked for me for six years as chief administrator of the jail, and he was one of those people that if you told him to do something, you could very well rest assured that he would carry it out," Parsley said. "He liked the job he was doing and he took care of the prisoners in a humane way and with the utmost courtesy. You don't find many men like that.

Describing Sizemore as "a good man," Parsley reviewed Sizemore's background that made him invaluable at the jail.

"He was experienced in law enforcement. He was a deputy under several sheriffs," Parsley said. "He realized what had to be done and did it. He served this county well as a jailer, chief administrator and deputy." Barb Rudder, who has worked in the booking department of the jail for nearly 20 years, said Sizemore was "a good person to work with."

"He always used to have people laughing and he would tell everyone that I was his baby sister," she said.

After Sizemore retired, Rudder said she visited him during his illness the past two years.

"It's a sad loss for the community and for his family," she said.

That loss is indeed sad for Madgel Miller, who was one of Sizemore's stepchildren.

"Jack was my stepdad, but we didn't use 'step' in our family," Miller said. "He had seven kids, 20 grandchildren, 16 great-grandchildren, some of whom were step, but step was never considered in the family."

Sizemore faced several health issues during the latter part of his life, Miller said, including a quadruple bypass in 2006.

"But that was very well and since he did, we were expecting him to have a long retirement."

But other health problems came with the frontotemporal dementia, which affects one's communication skills.

"It is a rare form of dementia, but he and my mother never had a problem communicating. He loved my mother unconditionally, and they had their own form of communicating."

But the past several months had taken its toll on the family, Miller said, and Miller said by Christmas, Sizemore was very ill.

"He had a rapid decline from it [dementia]. Last week, he had a real hard time of it, and my mother got his doctor's appointment for him." Miller added. "He was in the hospital Wednesday because the doctor said he was weak and dehydrated. But he was able to walk in the hospital. He went home Friday and had a good night with family, and some friends came over. He couldn't communicate with us. He died in his sleep that night, with Mom and me beside him."

Choking back tears, Miller described Sizemore as a man with "a good heart" who was also "very intelligent." Miller said many people had come to tell the family how Sizemore had touched their lives.

"It was good to hear people say, 'Let me tell you what Jack Sizemore did for me,' and it was stories that he never told. Jack was always private, but these were about what he did for people," Miller said. "I remember when I was going to college, he would tell me, 'This is a good place to raise kids. This is a good place to live.' He loved this town."

Hearing the impact that her father had had on the people he dealt with during his lifetime, Miller said Sizemore's goodwill towards others was reinforced.

"He was a very private person and didn't tell people about the dementia," she said. "He knew how and how to keep his own life private and personal. We made the arrangements quickly because he would rather be remembered in better times. Knowing Jack Sizemore, he would have had it no other way."

SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in 2005, I was honored to join Congress-

man JOHN LEWIS on a trip to Selma, AL, for a ceremonial walk over the E-

mund Pettus Bridge to mark the 40th anniversary of the tragic events that be-

come known as ‘Bloody Sunday.’

In March of 1965, Congressman Lewis, Rev. Hosea Williams, and 600 other brave civil rights activists led a voting rights march over that bridge.

These brave men, women, and children were marching for civil rights and voting rights. All they would receive that day, however, were beatings and bruises from police batons as they were turned back and chased down by State troopers.

A few days after "Bloody Sunday," President Johnson addressed the Na-

tion and called on the House and the Senate to pass the Voting Rights Act. Then, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law, guaranteeing that the fundamental right to vote would never again be canceled out by clever schemes—like poll taxes and literacy tests—devised to keep African Americans from voting.

The Voting Rights Act is the cornerstone of the civil rights movement and one of the most effective laws on the books when it comes to protecting the right to vote for all Americans.

On Wednesday, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in Shelby County v. Holder, a case challenging the constitu-

tionality of section 5, which is the very heart of the Voting Rights Act.

That section requires jurisdictions in all or part of 16 States with a history of discrimination to get approval from the Department of Justice or a Federal court before making any changes to congressional districts or voting proce-

dures.

This is not the first time that the Su-

preme Court has heard a challenge to the Voting Rights Act. Though it has been subject to four prior Supreme Court challenges, the Voting Rights Act has always emerged intact and on sound legal and constitutional ground.

Since the Voting Rights Act was signed into law in 1965, the Voting Rights Act has been reauthorized—in 1970, 1975, 1982, and most recently in 2006—Congress has done so with the broad bipartisan support and over-

whelming majorities that are all too rare these days.

That is because protecting the right to vote should not be a partisan prerogative. It is not a Democratic or Repub-

lican issue. It is a fundamental right for every eligible voter, and it is a core value of our American democracy.

In 2006, the House of Representatives voted 390 to 33 in favor of reauthorizing the law. The Senate voted unani-

mously, 98 to 0, to reauthorize the law. And the final bill was signed into law by President George W. Bush.

There was good reason for this biparti-

san support for reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act. Congress developed an extensive record, holding 21 hear-

ings, reviewing more than 15,000 pages of papers, hearing from more than 100 witnesses about the need to reauthorize the law.

Conservative Republican Congress-

man JIM SENSENBIJNEN is one ex-

ample. Congressman SENSENBIJNEN was the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee when Congress reauthorized the Voting Rights Act. He strongly be-

lieves that section 5 is constitutional, and he has filed a brief asking the Su-

preme Court to uphold the law.

My hope is that the Supreme Court will look at the extensive evidence Congress reviewed in 2006 and defer to the judgment of an overwhelming major-

ity of the House and a unanimous Senate. The Court should affirm the constitu-

tionality of this critical tool for protecting the right to vote.

We all acknowledge the progress that our great country has made on civil rights and voting rights issues. The current occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., is a symbol and timely reminder that our Nation has indeed grown to be more perfect—and more inclusive in many ways—than just a few genera-

tions ago.

But the Voting Rights Act has not, however, a perfect union. And some of the jurisdictions covered by the Voting Rights Act have both a demonstrated history and a con-

temporary record of implementing discrimi-

natory restrictions on voting.

The Voting Rights Act has been es-

sential in ensuring the progress we have made as a nation over the last five decades.

And as my Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights found during a series of hearings last Congress that the Voting Rights Act remains a relevant and crit-

ical tool in protecting the right to vote.
After a careful analysis of new voter ID laws in Texas and South Carolina, the Department of Justice used its authority under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act to object to the implementation of new photo identification requirements.

In Texas, according to the State’s own data, more than 790,000 registered voters did not have the ID required to vote under the new Texas law.

The law would have had a disproportionate impact on Latino voters because 38.2 percent of registered Hispanic voters did not have the type of ID required by the law.

In South Carolina, the State’s own data indicated that almost 240,000 registered voters did not have the identification required to vote under the State’s new law.

That included 10 percent of all registered minorities in South Carolina who would not be able to vote under the new law.

That is more than 1 million registered voters who would have been turned away from the polls in Texas and South Carolina if the Department of Justice did not have the authority to object to those photo identification laws under the Voting Rights Act.

Opponents of the Voting Rights Act claim that some of the jurisdictions covered by the law should no longer be subject to it.

They rarely mention, however, that the Voting Rights Act itself contains a provision allowing jurisdictions to “bail out” or be excused from coverage under the law if they demonstrate compliance with the law for the previous 10 years.

In 2006, the Supreme Court clarified and expanded this bailout provision.

As a result, more than 190 jurisdictions declared that they had bailed out of coverage under the Voting Rights Act. The fact that so many jurisdictions have been excused from coverage under the law proves two very important points.

First, the Voting Rights Act is having its intended effect. States and localities that previously had a record of discriminating against minority voters are no longer doing so thanks to the scrutiny of the Voting Rights Act.

Second, the Voting Rights Act is not over-inclusive. Jurisdictions that can prove they are not discriminating—over a reasonable period of time—will be excused from coverage under the law.

The Voting Rights Act is not about who wins an election. It is not about political advantage. It is about ensuring that every eligible American can vote and that their vote will be counted.

As long as there continues to be evidence that some people are being denied the right to vote, we have an obligation to remedy that problem.

The Voting Rights Act has done its job of protecting the right to vote for almost 50 years. This Congress did its job in 2006 by developing an extensive record and reauthorizing the law in an overwhelming and bipartisan manner.

It is my hope the Supreme Court will now do its job and affirm the constitutionality of this critical law.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS TORNADO ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this week marks the 1-year anniversary of the deadly tornado that devastated the towns of Harrisburg and Ridgway in Saline and Gallatin Counties.

I visited both of those towns right after the tornado.

I have seen my fair share of tornado damage in my life. But when I visited Harrisburg and Ridgway, I saw some things I have never seen before. I expected to see some trees blown down and shingles torn off roofs. Instead, I saw entire houses lifted from their concrete foundation and tossed on top of the neighboring house.

The loss of homes and property was really difficult but the real tragedy lies in the lives that were claimed by this tornado. Eight people died as a result of this violent storm: Randy Rann, Donna Rann, Jayllyn Ferrell, Mary Osman, Linda Hull, Greg Swierc, Don Smith and R. Blaine Mauney.

But despite this incredible loss, when I visited Harrisburg and Ridgway, what I didn’t see were broken spirits. Instead, from the very minute this disaster took place, people came together to rebuild. To rebuild stronger. The outpouring of support was amazing almost 6,000 people pitched in before it was all over.

And I can’t say enough about the tireless efforts the emergency personnel who were there from the minute that the sirens went off. They were there to help under the most extraordinary circumstances.

I went to Harrisburg 5 weeks after my first visit and I was amazed at how much better the community looked. Today, both communities have made incredible progress moving forward, thanks again to everyone engaged in the rescue and cleanup at every level, and during this entire past year.

I also want to recognize the hard work and dedication of: Jonathan Monken, head of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency; Eric Gregg, Mayor of Harrisburg; Becky Mitchell, Mayor of Ridgway; State Senator Gary Forby; and State Representative Brandon Phelps. They were there when their constituents and their communities needed them the most.

Today, when I see how much the residents of Harrisburg and Ridgway have done to rebuild their communities over the past year, I am proud to be from Illinois and proud to be part of this great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO DIANNE JONES

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend and exceptional Illinoisan who recently passed away.

In 1949, a young woman from New York moved to Chicago to attend college at Roosevelt University. Her name was Dianne Jones, and she stayed for the next 63 years.

After graduating from Roosevelt, Dianne decided she wanted to teach, and she began planting her roots in the civil rights and labor communities. Along with her husband Linzey, she fought for civil rights and equality by helping to organize two Chicago-area chapters of the NAACP. Dianne then led the successful effort to desegregate the city’s Rainbow Beach, and she even attended the 1963 March on Washington where Martin Luther King, Jr. delivered his famous “I Have a Dream” speech.

As a teacher, Dianne established herself as an advocate for educators and children by helping to found one of the first teachers unions in Illinois. She later served as that union’s local president, as well as vice president of the Illinois Federation of Teachers. As a teacher and an advocate, Dianne spent her life fighting to promote equality, justice, civil rights and education in Illinois. And she enjoyed it.

Once, when asked about her career, Dianne said, “Everyone should get to work at what they would volunteer to do.”

Dianne Jones was one of the lucky people who got to do just that. Those roots that she planted 50 years ago have continued to grow and multiply ever since.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 113th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator SHELBY, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE RULES—113 TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS

A. Call of the Committee.

There shall be no call of the Committee except by the Chairman.

B. Quorum.

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony, other than sworn testimony by the Committee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum.

For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of
sworn testimony by any subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee’s consideration of said bill and report.

VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by Senators to a Committee markup shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markups.

VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriations bill, is hereby authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriations bill.

IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, the Special Committee on Aging has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 113th Congress pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying rules for the Special Committee on Aging be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY

S. Res. 4, §104, 95th Congress, 1st Session (1977)

(a) There is established a Special Committee on Aging (hereafter in this section referred to as “special committee”) which shall consist of nineteen Members. The Members and chairman of the special committee shall be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the Members and chair- man of a standing committee of the Senate. After the date on which the majority and minority Members of the special committee are initially appointed on or affect the effective date of title I of the Committee System Reorganization Amendments of 1977, each time a vacancy occurs, such membership of the special committee, the number of Members of the special committee shall be reduced by one until the number of Members of the special committee is equal to the number of Members of the special committee as initially appointed on or affect the effective date of title I of the Committee System Reorganization Amendments of 1977.

Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the following rules be reported for the Special Committee on Aging be printed in the RECORD.

IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

1. Meetings. The Committee shall meet to conduct Committee business at the call of the Chairman. The Members of the Committee may call special meetings as provided in Senate Rule XXVI (d).

2. Notice and Agenda:

(a) Written or Electronic Notice. The Chairman shall give the Members written or electronic notice of any Committee meeting, accompanied by an agenda enumerating the items of business to be considered, at least 5 days in advance of such meeting.

(b) Shortened Notice. A meeting may be called not less than 24 hours notice if the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or, if the Chairman is not present, the Majority Member present shall preside.

II. CONVENING OF HEARINGS

1. Notice. The Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be held at least one week before its commencement. A hearing may be called on not less than 24 hours notice if the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or, if the Chairman is not present, the Majority Member present shall preside.

2. Presiding Officer. The Chairman shall preside over the conduct of a hearing when present, or, whether present or not, may delegate authority to preside to any Member of the Committee.

3. Witnesses. Witnesses called before the Committee shall be given, absent extraordinary circumstances, at least 48 hours notice, and all witnesses shall be furnished with a copy of these rules upon request.

4. Oath. All witnesses who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn unless the Committee waives the oath. The Chairman, or any Member, may request and administer the oath.

5. Testimony. At least 48 hours in advance of a hearing, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall submit his or her testimony by any method of electronic communication in a format determined by the Committee and sent to an electronic mail address specified by the Committee, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member determine that there is good cause to begin the hearing on or before the commencement. A witness shall be allowed no more than five minutes to orally summarize his or her testimony. The printed testimony of all witnesses in closed sessions shall be treated as a standing committee of the Senate.

6. Counsel. A witness’s counsel shall be permitted to be present during his testimony at any public or closed hearing or depositions or staff interview to advise such witness of his or her rights, provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the government, or of a corporation or association, the Chairman may rule that representation by counsel outside the government, corporation, or association creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness shall be represented by personal counsel not from the government, corporation, or association.

7. Transcript. An accurate electronic or stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in closed sessions and public hearings. Any witness shall be afforded, upon request, the right to review that portion of such record, and for this purpose, a copy of a witness’s testimony in a public or closed session shall be provided to the witness. Upon inspecting his or her transcript, within a time limit set by the committee, a witness may request changes in testimony to correct errors of transcription, grammatical errors, and obvious
errors of fact. The Chairman or a staff officer designated by him shall rule on such request. 

8. Impugned Persons. Any person who believes that evidence presented, or comment made by a Member or staff, at a public hearing or at a closed hearing concerning which there have been public reports, tends to impugn his or her character or adversely affect his or her reputation may:

(a) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the evidence or comment, which shall be placed in the hearing record; and
(b) request the opportunity to appear personally before the Committee to testify in his or her own behalf.

9. Adjourn. Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee, the Ranking Member shall be entitled to call at least one witness to testify or produce documents, with respect to the matter under consideration at the hearing. Such request must be made before the completion of the hearing or, if subpoenas are required to call the minority witnesses, no later than three days before the hearing.

10. Conduct of Witnesses, Counsel and Members of the Audience. If, during public or executive sessions, his or her counsel, or any spectator conducts him or herself in such a manner as to prevent, impede, disrupt, or disrupt, prevent with the administration of such hearing the Chairman or presiding Member of the Committee present during such hearing may request the Sergeant at Arms or a staff officer designated by him or her, pursuant to Senate Rule XXVI(5)(b). Immediately after any such request the Sergeant at Arms or a staff officer designated by him or her, pursuant to Senate Rule XXVI(5)(b), shall be entitled to escort the person concerned to the Committee meeting following a poll for a quorum for the conduct of such hearing.

III. CLOSED SESSIONS AND CONFIDENTIAL MATTER

1. Procedure. All meetings and hearings shall be open to the public unless closed. To close a meeting or hearing or portion thereof, a motion shall be made and seconded to go into closed session of whether the meeting or hearing will concern Committee investigations or matters enumerated in Senate Rule XXVI(6). Immediately after such discussion, the meeting or hearing or portion thereof may be closed by a vote in open session of a majority of the Members of the Committee present.

2. Witness Request. Any witness called for a hearing may submit a written or an electronic request to the Chairman no later than twenty-four hours in advance for his or her examination to be closed or open session. The Chairman shall inform the Committee of any such request.

3. Confidential Matter. No record made of a closed session, or material declared confidential by a majority of the Committee, or report of the proceedings of a closed session, shall be made public, in whole or in part in by summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

IV. BROADCASTING

1. Control. The Chairman or a staff officer may, at any time, direct the broadcasting or rebroadcasting of any meeting or hearing open to the public may be covered by television, radio, or still photography. Such coverage must be conducted in an orderly and unobtrusive manner. The Chairman or staff officer may for good cause terminate such coverage in whole or in part, or take such other action to control it as the circumstances may warrant.

2. Request. A witness may request of the Chairman, on grounds of distraction, harassment, personal safety, or physical discomfort, that during his or her testimony cameras, microphones, and lights shall not be directed at him or her.

V. QUORUMS AND VOTING

1. Reporting. A majority shall constitute a quorum for reporting a resolution, recommendation to the Senate, and for Committee Business. A third shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of Committee business, other than a final vote on reporting, providing a minority Member is present.

2. Hearings. One Member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of the swearing of witnesses, and the taking of testimony at hearings.

3. Polling. Said Committee may poll (1) internal Committee matters; (2) Committee business; (3) internal Committee matters; (4) other Committee business which has been designated for polling at a meeting.

4. Procedure. The Chairman shall circulate polling slips to Members specifying the matter being polled and the time limit for completion of the poll. If any Member so requests in advance of the meeting, the matter shall be held for meeting rather than being polled. The clerk shall keep a record of polls. If the Chairman determines that the polled matter is one of the areas enumerated in Senate Rule XXVI(5)(b), and any other Member so requests, the matter shall be confidential. Any Member may request a Committee meeting following a poll for a majority vote on the polled decision.

VI. INVESTIGATIONS

1. Authorization and Conduct. All investigations shall be conducted on a bipartisan basis by Committee staff. Investigations may be initiated by the Committee staff upon the approval of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member. Staff shall keep the Committee fully informed of the progress of continuing investigations, except where the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him or her agree that there exists temporary cause for more limited knowledge.

2. Subpoenas. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, together, shall authorize a subpoena. Subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials shall be issued by the Chairman, or by any other Member of the Committee designated by him. Prior to the issuance of each subpoena, the Ranking Minority Member, and any other Member so requesting, shall be notified regarding the identity of the person to whom the subpoena will be issued and the nature of the information sought, and its relationship to the investigation.

3. Investigative Reports. All reports concerning investigations stemming from Committee investigations shall be printed only with the approval of a majority of the Members of the Committee.

VII. DEPOSITIONS AND COMMISSIONS

1. Notice. Notices for the taking of depositions in an investigation authorized by the Committee shall be authorized and issued by the Chairman or by a staff officer designated by him. Such notices shall specify a time and place for examination, and the name of the staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. Unless otherwise specified, the deposition shall be in private. The Committee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness’s failure to appear unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a Committee subpoena.

2. Counsel. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their rights, subject to the provisions of Rule III(6).

3. Procedure. Witnesses shall be examined under oath administered by an individual authorized by the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him. If a witness objects to a question, and refuses to testify on the basis of relevance or privilege, the Committee staff may proceed with the deposition, or may at that time or at a subsequent time, seek a ruling by telephone or otherwise on the objection from a Member of the Committee. If the Chairman overrules the objection, he or she may direct the matter to the Committee or the Member may order the witness to answer the question, but the Committee shall not initiate procedures leading to civil or criminal enforcement unless the witness refuses to testify after he or she has been ordered and directed to answer by a Member of the Committee.

VIII. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Establishment. The Committee will operate as a Committee of the Whole, reserving to itself the right to establish temporary subcommittees at any time by majority vote of the Committee. The Ranking Majority Member shall be ex officio Member of all subcommittees.

2. Jurisdiction. Within its jurisdiction as defined by the Standing Rules of the Senate, each subcommittee is authorized to conduct investigations, including use of subpoenas, depositions, and commissions.

3. Rules. A subcommittee shall be governed by the rules of the Committee, except that its quorum for all business shall be one-third of the subcommittee Membership, and for hearings shall be one.

IX. REPORTS

Committee reports incorporating Committee findings and recommendations shall be printed only with the prior approval of a majority of the Committee, after an adequate period for review and comment. The printing, as Committee documents, of materials prepared by staff for informational purposes, or the printing of materials not originating with the Committee or staff, shall require prior consultation with the minority staff; these publications shall have the following language printed on the cover of the document: “Note: This document has been printed for informational purposes. It does not represent either findings or recommendations formally adopted by the Committee.”

X. AMENDMENT OF RULES

The rules of the Committee may be amended or revised at any time, provided that not less than a majority of the Committee present so determine at a Committee meeting preceded by at least 3 days notice of the amendments or revisions proposed or via polling, subject to Rule V(4).

HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, Senate Standing rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the
Mr. CARPER. Madam President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 27, 2013, a majority of the members of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee’s Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Management adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

(1) SUBCOMMITTEE RULES.—The subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(2) QUORUMS.—For public or executive sessions, a meeting of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony in any given case or subject matter. One third of the Members of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Subcommittee business other than the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony in cases in which one member of the minority is present. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

(3) TAKING TESTIMONY.—All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

(4) SUBCOMMITTEE SUBPOENAS.—Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by him or her, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, provided that the Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her of disapproval of the subpoena within 24 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her, no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member waive the 48 hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 27, 2013, a majority of the members of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee’s Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce, as follows:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE

1. Subcommittees. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Quorums.

A. Transaction of routine business. One third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term “routine business” includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Subcommittee other than reporting to the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs any measures, matters or recommendations.

B. Taking testimony. Any Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.

C. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittees subpoenas. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance and/or production of any witness, document, or other material at a hearing, provided that the Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her of disapproval of the subpoena within 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

A written notice of intent to issue a subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him or her, immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member waive the 48 hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her of disapproval of the subpoena within 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

A. Transaction of routine business. One third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term “routine business” includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Subcommittee other than reporting to the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs any measures, matters or recommendations.

B. Taking testimony. Any Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.

C. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

A written notice of intent to issue a subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him or her, immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs waive the 48-hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.
C. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing, provided that the Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by her/him of such request. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

Immediately upon authorization of the issuance of a subpoena under these rules, a written notice of intent to issue the subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

When the Subcommittee or its Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires the committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 27, 2013, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs’ Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations adopted the following rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. No public hearing connected with an investigation may be held without the approval of either the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the approval of a majority of the Members of the Subcommittee. In all cases, notification to all Members of the intent to hold hearings must be given to the Members in writing not later than 72 hours before the date of the hearing. The Ranking Minority Member should be kept fully apprised of preliminary inquiries, investigations, and hearings. All inquiries, investigations, or hearings initiated by the Subcommittee Majority staff upon the approval of the Chairman and notice of such approval to the Ranking Minority Member shall be recorded in the Record. Preliminary inquiries may be undertaken by the Minority staff upon the approval of the Ranking Minority Member and notice of such approval to the Senate Majority staff. Investigations may be undertaken upon the approval of the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Minority Member with notice of such approval to all Members.

No public hearing shall be held if the Majority Members unanimously object, unless the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs by a majority vote approves of such public hearing.

Senate Rules will govern all closed sessions conducted by the Subcommittee (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(b), Standing Rules of the Senate).

2. Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by him or her, with notice to the Ranking Minority Member or the Chair of the Full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs waive the 48-hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.

3. The Chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the Subcommittee. This authority may be delegated by the Chairman to any other Member of the Subcommittee when necessary.

4. At least three Members of the Subcommittee shall designate a staff officer to serve as its Chair. In the absence for any reason of the Chair of the Subcommittee, a written request therefor, addressed to the Chairman, immediately thereafter, the clerk of the Subcommittee shall notify the Chairman of such request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of such request, the Chairman fails to call the requested special meeting, which shall be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of such request, a majority of the Subcommittee Members may file in the office of the Subcommittee written notice that such special meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the Subcommittee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of such notice, the clerk shall notify all Subcommittee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the Chairman is not present at such meeting or at any other special meeting, the Ranking Majority Member present shall preside.

5. For public or executive sessions, one Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Subcommittee business other than the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony, provided that one member of the majority is present. No witnesses at a public or executive hearing who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

6. For public or executive sessions, a witness, his or her counsel, or any spectator conducts himself or herself in such a manner as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration of such hearing, the Chairman or presiding Member of the Subcommittee present during such hearing may request the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of any other legislative or law enforcement official to eject said person from the hearing room.

8. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness at any public or executive hearing, and to advise such witness while he or she is testifying, of his or her legal rights; provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the government, or of a corporation or association, the representation by counsel from the government, corporation, or association, or by counsel representing other witnesses, creates a conflict of interest, such witness may only be represented during interrogations by staff or during testimony before the Subcommittee by personal counsel retained for that purpose, or by personal counsel not representing other witnesses. This rule shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event of the interest of the government, corporation, or association, or by counsel for other witnesses, is such that the personal interests of counsel are in conflict.


9.1 Notice. Notices for the taking of depositions in an investigation authorized by the Subcommittee shall be authorized and issued by the Chairman. The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee shall be kept fully apprised of the authorization for the taking of depositions. Such notices shall specify a time and place for the taking of the deposition, and shall be addressed to the witness or to the designated officer of the Subcommittee Member or Members or staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. The deposition shall be in private. The Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness’ failure to appear unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a written subpoena.

9.2 Counsel. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their legal rights, subject to the provisions of Rule 8.

9.3 Procedure. Witnesses shall be examined under oath administered by an individual authorized by the Chairman to administer oaths. Questions shall be propounded orally by Subcommittee Members or staff. Objections by the witness as to the form of questions shall be noted for the record. If a witness objects to a question and refuses to testify on the basis of relevance or privilege, the Subcommittee Members or staff may order the witness to answer the question. If the Chairman or designated Member overrules the objection, he or she may refer the matter...
to the Subcommittee or he or she may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to civil or criminal enforcement. The witness refusing to testify after he or she has been ordered and directed to answer by a Member of the Subcommittee.

4. Hearing. The Subcommittee staff shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded. If it is transcribed, the witness shall be furnished with a copy for review and to the provisions of Rule 2. The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in his or her presence and that he or she understands and agrees to the testimony. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall then be filed with the Subcommittee.

6. Other witnesses. Members of the Subcommittee present and voting shall have access to all material in the files of the Subcommittee. The Chief Counsel for the Majority shall work under the direction and authority of the Chairperson or a Majority Member by letter, or the Ranking Minority Member by resolution, are authorized to report such violation to the proper State, Federal, or executive branch of law enforcement. The information concerning the matters contained in his or her sworn statement upon said person agreeing to appear personally before the Subcommittee and to testify concerning the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded. If it is transcribed, the witness shall be furnished with a copy for review.

7. No Subcommittee report shall be released to the public unless approved by a majority of the Subcommittee and after no less than 10 days following such request by Members of the Subcommittee unless for such notice and opportunity to comment has been waived in writing by a majority of the Minority Members.

11. A witness may request, on grounds of physical discomfort, that during the testimony. The individual administering the oath shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded. If it is transcribed, the witness shall be furnished with a copy for review and to the provisions of Rule 2. The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in his or her presence and that he or she understands and agrees to the testimony. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall then be filed with the Subcommittee.

12. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept and secret and will not be released for public information without the approval of a majority of the Subcommittee.

13. Interrogation of witnesses at Subcommittee hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the Subcommittee by Members and authorized Subcommittee staff personnel only.

14. Any person who is the subject of an investigation in public hearings may submit to the Chairman of the Subcommittee questions in writing for the cross-examination of witnesses called by the Subcommittee. With the consent of a majority of the Members of the Subcommittee present and voting, these questions, or paraphrased versions of them, shall be put to the witness by the Chairman or a Member of the Subcommittee, or by counsel of the Subcommittee.

15. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified as providing testimony or other evidence presents at a public hearing, or comment made by a Subcommittee Member or counsel, tends to defame him or her or otherwise adversely affect his or her reputation, may (a) request to appear personally before the Subcommittee to testify in his or her own behalf, (b) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony or other evidence or comment complained of, such request and such statement shall be submitted to the Subcommittee for its consideration and action.

16. All testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released for public information without the approval of a majority of the Subcommittee.

17. No Subcommittee report shall be released to the public unless approved by a majority of the Subcommittee and after no less than 10 days following such request by Members of the Subcommittee unless for such notice and opportunity to comment has been waived in writing by a majority of the Minority Members.

18. The Ranking Minority Member may select for appointment to the Subcommittee staff a Chief Counsel for the Majority and such other professional staff members and clerical assistants as he or she deems advisable. The total compensation allocated to such Minority staff members shall not be less than one-third the total amount allocated for all Subcommittee staff salaries during any given year.

19. When it is determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, or by a majority of the Subcommittee, that there is reason to believe that a violation of law may have occurred, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, or the Subcommittee by resolution, are authorized to report such violation to the proper State, local and/or Federal authorities. Such letter or report may rectify the basis for the determination of reasonable cause. This rule is not authority for release of documents or testimony.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise to discuss an amendment I have filed to the bills dealing with sequestration. I join Senator KINSA as a cosponsor.

Our amendment is the fiscal year 2013 Department of Defense appropriations bill that was approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee by a bipartisan vote of 30 to 0 on August 2, 2012.

There is a good reason to avoid the meat-ax approach to budgeting that will occur under sequestration.

At the same time, we must recognize that a continuing resolution also presents real challenges for those trying to carry out the necessary functions of the Federal Government, including providing for the national defense. Continuing resolutions have become far too common. This year, however, we should not blind us from the harm these stop-gap measures cause to the effective and efficient functioning of government.

A yearlong continuing resolution would be just as devastating as sequestration. I am not alone in that judgment. After a New York Times editorial that claimed the Pentagon can easily absorb the cuts of sequestration, Deputy Secretary of Defense Ash Carter wrote the following in a letter published on February 27, 2013:

Good management is undermined by sequestration and by something that your editorial does not mention but that is as much to the point—the fact that there are no new appropriations bills and are living under last year's law. These two factors together lead to dangerous absurdities like having to curtail civilian training, funding submarines and air planes' flying. Our military will therefore not be fully ready to meet contingencies other than Afghanistan.

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and the White House have also repeatedly warned that the effects of sequestration or a yearlong continuing resolution will be devastating to our national security and defense industrial base.

On January 14, 2013, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the heads of each military service signed a letter warning that "the readiness of our Armed Forces is at a tipping point" and the unfolding budget conditions, including the continuing resolution, are causing this readiness crisis.

Regardless of what happens with sequestration, a continuing resolution presents two major problems.

First, the readiness of our military will be put at risk unless the Department of Defense is able to transfer funds from investment accounts into readiness accounts. Under the continuing resolution, the Department cannot do this. That is why the letter signed by seven four-star generals said the current budget uncertainty will 'inevitably lead to a hollow force.'

Second, a yearlong continuing resolution prevents the Pentagon from performing the three responsibilities crucial for national security: increasing production rates for existing weapons, starting new programs not previously funded the year before, and signing multiyear procurement contracts that provide significant savings while reducing the unit cost for taxpayers. The current national security budget is at a tipping point.

There are several examples of these multiyear procurement contracts that cannot move forward without an appropriations bill. For example, Congress authorized the Navy to procure 10 destroyers during the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act. The Navy has the bids for these ships in hand and the Navy is
"Rick" DeBobes is retiring from his position as staff director of the Senate Armed Services Committee, effective February 28, 2013. On this occasion, it is fitting to recognize Rick’s 50 years of uniformed and civilian service to our Nation.

Rick began his career as a naval officer, serving 26 exemplary years in jobs that included directing the International Negotiations Branch of the Navy’s Judge Advocate General, commanding the Naval Legal Service Office, and as the legal advisor and legislative assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, where he helped craft policies that have shaped our modern joint military force. Such a career, in and of itself, illustrates a commitment to causes greater than self-interest.

Rick’s devotion to service and excellence continued long after he left active duty. Upon his retirement from the Navy, he joined the Senate Armed Services Committee as counsel, advising committee members on issues relating to national security strategy, defense policy, foreign affairs, and Department of Defense organization and management. Rick’s authoritative analyses and counsel to members distilled complex issues and often served as a basis for common understanding and problem solving. Few were surprised then, when in 2003 he was asked by Senator Carl Levin to be the committee’s ranking member. Rick and Senator Mikulski and Senator Shelby, share my concern that continuing resolutions are not the way to govern. I am also encouraged about reports that the House of Representatives may consider a bill next week which includes a full-year defense and a full-year veterans affairs and military construction budget.

At least as far back as 1974, Congress has never failed to pass a Department of Defense appropriations bill. Nor is it not the time for troops in the field and the looming threat of sequestration, to establish a dangerous precedent of denying our military services the support they need to accomplish the mission we have asked them to perform.

This year’s continuing resolution hurts our military readiness now and, even more, in the future.

It is time to show the American people that we can act responsibly before the very last minute. The men and women who serve our country are performing every task we have asked of them. It is long overdue for Congress to do the same, so I urge the Senate to act to replace the current CR with a full-year Department of Defense appropriations bill as our amendment would provide.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD D. DEBOBES

Mr. McCaIN. Madam President, today I honor an exceptional public servant and patriot. After a lifetime of service to our Nation, Richard D.
Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I rise to honor and remember the full life of Marlene “Linny” Fowler for her exceptional service to her community, commonwealth and country.

Marlene was born in New York City, the only child of Harold and Miriam Oberkötter. Though she was raised in Harrington Park, N.J., Marlene spent her adult life living in Pennsylvania. Marlene, known affectionately as Linny, was a renowned philanthropist, artist and a pillar of her adopted community. Today I wish to honor her as such.

As a philanthropist, her influence can been seen across Northeast Pennsylvania, particularly in Bethlehem, the city she had called home since 1965. Upon the passing of her father Harold, a late UPS chief executive, Marlene became one of the wealthiest individuals in the Lehigh Valley. Choosing to eschew large homes or fancy cars, Marlene instead gave generously to support the arts and education and children. She helped to establish a childcare center and Hispanic Youth Center at Northampton Community College as well as the college’s Southside campus, which proudly bears her family name. Her generosity also helped send hundreds of students to colleges and universities that they would otherwise have been unable to afford to attend. Even with her health failing, Marlene worked hard to maintain her involvement with the community up until her passing. Although she kept the total of her generosity a secret, by her own admission she gave away tens of millions of dollars over the course of her life.

As an artist, Marlene was trained in the art of stained glass, which she taught throughout her life. She also maintained a studio at the Banana Factory in Bethlehem, an institution she helped fund. As a pillar of her community, Marlene made sure her philanthropic efforts always had a human touch. She worked with needy families and non-profit directors in the living room of her own home, investing herself as much as her money. Even as recent economic difficulties forced her to scale back some of her giving, she still continued to keep track of all the youth she helped send to school.

As Marlene’s family and friends mourn her loss, I pray that they will be comforted by the knowledge that this great Nation will never forget the generosity of Marlene “Linny” Fowler. May she rest in peace.

Afterschool and summer programs are a vital part of our country’s education tapestry. They provide engaging, hands-on learning experiences that stimulate student interest, develop crucial skills, and drive home the relevance of STEM to our daily lives. Out-of-school learning opportunities help children develop the academic and life skills, such as problem-solving and determination, which are crucial in STEM fields. Additionally, these programs provide opportunities for mentors and role models to engage with children.

High-quality afterschool STEM learning programs are having a significant impact on the young people who participate in them. A recent study shows participants in afterschool and summer programs have improved attitudes toward STEM fields and careers, increased STEM capacities and skills, search and partnerships so that all from high school and pursuing a STEM major in college.

One of these exemplary programs is the Woodcraft Rangers Program in Los Angeles. CAMM exposes middle school students to cutting-edge STEM activities, including robotics. This highly engaging program also allows students to configure high-tech robotics, enhancing their STEM skills, unlocking their imaginations, and exposing them to real-world problem-solving situations. Afterschool and summer programs are uniquely positioned to deliver valuable enrichment activities that help children gain valuable creativity, critical thinking, and team-building skills.

In addition to programs that serve children and youth directly, organizations such as the Afterschool Alliance are working to advance policies, research, and partnerships so that all children can access rich STEM education experiences through out-of-school programs.

Private companies are also embarking on educational endeavors. Warner Cable’s Connect a Million Minds, CAMM initiative, to promote youth interest and performance in STEM fields during out-of-school time. Businesses like Time Warner Cable know that investing in STEM education now helps ensure a robust workforce in the future, and they know that afterschool, summer, and other out-of-school programs are key venues for students to develop the problem-solving, team-building, and creative skills necessary for a strong STEM workforce.

I applaud the afterschool and summer learning programs, advocacy organizations, and community partnerships that are working to advance our students’ achievement and our country’s future through enriching out-of-school learning. To support the work of these organizations, I hope that the Senate can come together to reauthorize the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program—the only Federal program dedicated to supporting afterschool and summer learning.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

STEM EDUCATION

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the great work that afterschool and summer learning programs in California and across the country are doing to engage children and youth in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, STEM, education.

TRIBUTE TO JIM SYMINGTON

• Mrs. McCASKILL. Madam President, I ask the Senate to join me today in honoring the work of Jim Symington, a friend and dedicated public servant who is retiring this year. In the summer of 1974 I came to Washington as an intern for Congressman Jim Symington. That experience I learned from this great leader were instrumental in my success as a political candidate and public official.

As a member of a family steeped in public service, Jim earned his military service, Jim earned his Bachelor’s degree from Yale University and his law degree from Columbia Law School.

Jim served for 2 years following law school as the assistant city counselor for St. Louis before going into private practice. In 1958, Jim entered the Foreign Service where he served as assistant to the United States ambassador for the United Kingdom. Upon his return to Washington, Jim served our Government in various positions including administrative assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy and the Chief of Protocol for the Department of State.

In 1968 Jim was elected to represent St. Louis, Missouri’s 2nd Congressional District, where he served four terms. During his time in Congress, Jim served on the House Commerce Committee and the Committee on Science and Technology. He also served as the chair of the Subcommittees on Space Science and Applications; Science, Research & Technology; and International Cooperation. He was an active voice on space exploration during a time when space exploration was a central topic. Upon leaving Congress in 1977, Jim returned to private law practice, and has had a distinguished legal career at Nossaman LLP. O’Connor & Hannan here in Washington, DC. However Jim Symington has never been an ordinary practicing lawyer. He and his wife Sylvia have been friends, mentors, and highly respected members of a small group of true leaders in our America’s Capitol for many years. They are always in dinner partners or leaders of a civic endeavor. Together, their wit, intelligence, and musical prowess has constantly reminded the most powerful in our Nation that there is always more to learn and it is very dangerous to take yourself too seriously.

It is my honor to call Jim a mentor and friend. Like no other man I know, I also realize that the number of people who count on his friendship would be a record for a town where Harry Truman famously noted that if you wanted a friend you should turn to a canine. I am thankful for his friendship, advice and service to Missouri and this great
country. While these comments mark his retirement from the practice of law, I am confident that he will continue to be a bright light of intellect, humor, and friendship for many years to come in our Nation’s Capital.

I ask that the Senate join me in honoring Jim Symington on the occasion of his retirement from the practice of law.

ALASKA LEGISLATURE CENTENNIAL
• Ms. MURKOWSKI, Madam President, I rise today to mark a significant event in Alaska’s history as we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the convening of the Alaska State Legislature.

Compared to the States that my colleagues represent, Alaska is a relatively young State, so it is remarkable that our legislature has existed for only 100 years. However, creating our State and providing a legal framework for our governance was an easy process. Secretary of State William H. Seward acquired Alaska from Russia for $7,200,000 on March 30, 1867. The First Organic Act of 1864 established the District of Alaska and provided for a Governor and judicial branch but no legislative body to be the people’s voice. It was not until after several petitions by Alaskans of all backgrounds that Congress passed the Second Organic Act giving Alaska territorial status and a legislative body. Our first elections were held November 12, 1912. They produced the first of many civil servants who would have the honor to serve in the Alaska Legislature. We did not yet have a capitol building, so eight senators and 16 representatives convened at the Elk’s Lodge in Juneau, AK. That year, the first territorial legislature passed 83 laws—laws that began building our State and uniting us as Alaskans.

While Alaska may have been just a territory and seen by many as a vast wilderness separated from the rest of the country, our territorial legislature led the Nation in passing the first law in the Nation giving women the right to vote. This was 1913. The 19th amendment wouldn’t be ratified for another 7 long years. The great Nell Scott was the first woman to serve in the first territorial legislature, way before other daughters of this country would.

The territorial legislature also led the nation on Title 7. It passed an antidiscrimination bill providing for full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations for all Alaskans. It is noteworthy that before statehood, Alaska’s Legislature acted in response to the passionate advocacy of Roy and Elizabeth Peratrovich long before Congress would on Dr. Martin Luther King and Rosa Parks’ advocacy.

Before a territorial referendum in 1946 that began the legal quest for statehood, the Alaska Legislature had been advocating for statehood at least as early as 1900.

This past January, the 28th Session of the Alaska State Legislature convened, consisting of 20 senators and 40 representatives. Under house speaker Mike Chenault, and senate president Charlie Huggins, they continue to provide representation to an estimated 731,449 residents of Alaska. The Alaska Legislature has worked for the past 100 years to give Alaskans the opportunity to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and they will continue to do so for many years to come. I extend my congratulations and heartfelt appreciation to the senators and representatives as well as all support staff to our legislature on this special anniversary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
At 2:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:


The message also announced that pursuant to S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Co-Chairman.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. PETRI of Wisconsin, Mr. CRENSHAW of Florida, Mr. LATTA of Ohio, Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama, and Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 3166(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise: Ms. Heather Wilson of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

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–505. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Applicable Federal Rates—March 2013 (corrected)” (Rev. Rul. 2013–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–506. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Dual-Use Notice” (Notice 2013–13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–507. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Temporary Shelter Assistance for Victims of Hurricane Sandy” (Notice 2013–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–508. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2013 Census Counts for Individual Census Areas: 2012–2014” (Notice 2013–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–509. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2013 Census Counts for Individual Census Areas: 2012–2014” (Notice 2013–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–510. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Permitted Disparities in Employer Contributions or Benefits” (Rev. Rul. 2013–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 14, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–511. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Eurex Deutschland GmbH: Secondary Market for Options” (Rev. Proc. 2013–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 14, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–512. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Applicable Federal Rates—March 2013” (Rev. Rul. 2013–14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–513. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2013 Census Counts for Individual Census Areas: 2012–2014” (Rev. Rul. 2013–14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–514. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Update to Notice 2000–45” (Rev. Proc. 2013–20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–515. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2013 Census Counts for Individual Census Areas: 2012–2014” (Rev. Rul. 2013–14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.
Sample Notice to Interested Parties (Announcement 2013–15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–516. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Custom, Immigration, and Naturalization Service, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of the Port Limits of Green Bay, WI” (602 Dec. 15–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 5, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–517. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs and Public Affairs, U. S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report responding to a GAO report entitled “Agricultures Could Benefit from a Shared and More Comprehensive Database on U.S. Efforts”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–518. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–010); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–519. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of waiver authority for Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–520. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report certifying for fiscal year 2013 that the Foreign Agricultural Service has signed agreements or arrangements with international organizations which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or organizations affiliated agency grants any official benefits from a member or any such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–521. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2012 through November 30, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–522. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–001); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–523. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–020); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–524. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–000); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–525. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–013); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–526. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–013); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–527. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–528. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–007); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–529. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–000); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–530. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a performance report relative to the “User Fee Act for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–531. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Developmental Disabilities Programs for fiscal years 2009–2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.


EC–533. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the “Reorganization and Delegation of Authority; Technical Amendments” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–534. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the “Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–535. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the “Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities” (RIN1820–AB46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–536. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the “Establishment of the Elkon Oregon Viticultural Area” (RIN1513–AB88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–537. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the “Establishment of the President of the Senate on February 21, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–538. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the “Exemption of Privacy Act System of Records of the Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, Inmate Central Records System (JUSTICE/ BOP–005)” (CFCCLO Order No. 001–2013) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 21, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–539. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Indiana Uplands Viticultural Area and Modification of the Ohio Valley Viticultural Area” (RIN1513–AB88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–540. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Indiana Uplands Viticultural Area and Modification of the Ohio Valley Viticultural Area” (RIN1513–AB88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–541. A communication from the Acting General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities” (RIN1820–AB46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–542. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the “Report to Congress on the Refugee Resetlement Program for Fiscal Year 2009”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–543. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Indiana Uplands Viticultural Area” (RIN1513–AB88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–544. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Indiana Uplands Viticultural Area” (RIN1513–AB88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–545. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Indiana Uplands Viticultural Area” (RIN1513–AB88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 20, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–546. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Changes To Implement the First Inventor to File Provision of the ‘America Invents Act’ (RIN0651–AC77) received during adjournment of the Senate
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in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2013; to the Committee on
Judiciary.
EC-547. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting,
pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative
Fuels Vehicles for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
EC-548. A communication from the Direc-
tor of the Regulation Policy and Manage-
ment Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Vet-
erans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law,
the report of a rule entitled "Grants for the
Rural Veterans Coordination Pilot (RVCPI)"
(RIN2000–A035) received in the Office of the
President of the Senate on February 25, 2013;
to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
EC-549. A communication from the Direc-
tor of the Regulation Policy and Manage-
ment Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Vet-
erans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law,
the report of a rule entitled "VA Homeless
Providers Grant and Per Diem Program"
(RIN2000–AN81) received in the Office of the
President of the Senate on February 25, 2013;
to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
The following reports of committees were submitted:
By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on
Rules and Administration, without amend-
ment:
S. Res. 64. An original resolution authoriz-
ing committees by the Senate for the period March 1, 2013, through Sep-
tember 30, 2013.
EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEE
The following executive reports of
nominations were submitted:
By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on
Judiciary:
Shelly Deckert Dick, of Louisiana, to be
United States District Judge for the Middle
District of Louisiana.
William H. Orrick, III, of the District of
Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.
Nelson Stephen Roman, of New York, to be
United States District Judge for the Southern
District of New York.
David Medine, of Maryland, to be Chair-
man and Member of the Privacy and Civil
Liberties Oversight Board for a term expir-
ing January 29, 2018.
LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD for a term expir-
ing September 30, 2013.
By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. CO-
LINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. LAUTENBERG,
Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Mr.
REEED, Mr. KING, Mrs. GILLIBRAND,
Mr. BABSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms.
WARREN):
S. 401. A bill to amend the Internal Rev-
ence Code of 1986 to provide for an invest-
ment tax credit related to the production of
electricity from offshore wind; to the Com-
mittee on Finance.
By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr.
MERKLEY):
S. 402. A bill to provide for the addition of
certain real property to the reservation of
the Siletz Tribe of Oregon; to the Com-
mittee on Indian Affairs.
By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr.
KIRK):
S. 403. A bill to amend the Elementary
and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address
and take action to prevent bullying and har-
asement of students; to the Committee on
Health, Education, and Pensions.
By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms.
CANTWELL):
S. 404. A bill to preserve the Green
Mountain Lookout and the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National
Forest; to the Committee on Energy and
Natural Resources.
By Mr. GEGGERSLEY (for himself, Mr.
SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN,
Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCAR, and Mr.
BLUMENTHAL):
S. 405. A bill to provide for media coverage
of Federal court proceedings; to the Com-
mittee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr.
HARKIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr.
DURBIN):
S. 406. A bill to amend the Higher Edu-
cation Technology Program to establish
review requirements; to the Committee on
By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. LAN-
DER, Mr. BOXER, Mr. KLOBUCAR, and
Mr. BINGaman):
S. 407. A bill to provide funding for con-
struction and major rehabilitation for
projects located on inland and intracoastal
waterways of the United States, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Envi-
ronment and Public Works.
By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED,
Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):
S. 408. A bill to amend title XVIII of the
Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful
benefit and lower prescription drug prices
under the Medicare program; to the Com-
mittee on Finance.
By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs.
BOXER):
S. 409. A bill to add Vietnam Veterans
Day as a patriotic and national observance;
to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 410. A bill to amend the Internal Rev-
ence Code of 1986 to impose a tax on certain
trading transactions; to the Committee on
Finance.
By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr.
CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr.
CUBANAS):
S. 411. A bill to amend the Internal Rev-
ence Code of 1986 to extend and modify the
railroad track maintenance credit; to the
Committee on Finance.
By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr.
CHAMBLISS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VITTER,
Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HARKIN, Mr.
HEINRICH, Mr. LAUTEN-
BERG, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr.
ISAKSON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COWAN, Mr.
MCDOUGAL, Mr._oauth, and Mr.
MURPHY):
S. 412. A bill to authorize certain major
medical facility leases for the Department of
Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes;
to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr.
BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms.
KLOBUCAR):
S. 413. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime
Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to in-
clude human trafficking as a part 1 violent
crime for purposes of the Edward Byrne Me-
morial Justice Assistance Grant Program; to
the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. NELSON:
S. 414. A bill to amend the Water Resources
Development Act of 2000 to provide for ex-
panded project implementation relating to
the consortium for the Granjeones del
Mar Embalse restoration plan; to the Com-
mittee on Environment and Public
Works.
By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr.
COCHRAN, Ms. GILLIBRAND, and Mr.
Pryor):
S. 415. A bill to clarify the collateral re-
quirement for certain condemnation
proposals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 416. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde
Reservation Act to make technical correc-
tions, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on Indian Affairs.
By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mrs.
SHAHSEN):
S. 417. A bill to reduce the number of non-
essential vehicles purchased and leased by
the Federal Government, and for other pur-
poses; to the Committee on Homeland Secu-
ritv and Governance.
By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr.
BLUMENTHAL):
S. 418. A bill to require the Federal Trade
Commission to prepare a report regard-
ing the collection and use of personal infor-
mation obtained by tracking the online ac-
tivity of an individual, and for other pur-
poses; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr.
LEAHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms.
CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN,
Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JOHN-
son of South Dakota, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKE-
FELLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of
New Mexico, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr.
WYDEN):
S. 419. A bill to limit the use of cluster
munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Rela-
tions.
By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr.
TESTER):
S. 420. A bill to amend the Internal Rev-
ence Code of 1986 to provide for the logical
flow of return information between partner-
ships, corporations, foundations, and indi-
viduals to better enable each party to submit
 timely, accurate returns and reduce the need
for extended and amended returns, to provide
for modified due dates by regulation, and to
conform the automatic corporate extension
period to longstanding regulatory rule; to
the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr.
McCONNELL, Mr. CORRIG, and Mr.
PAUL):
At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed) was added as a cosponsor of S. 113, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certain determinations on behalf of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Boxer, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Udall) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

At the request of Mr. Harkin, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Brown) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military decorations or medals.

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons) was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Nelson) was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez) was added as a cosponsor of S. 254, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources by the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the dissemination of such materials and resources by State educational agencies to identify more at-risk families.
At the request of Mr. Leahy, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate immigration fraud in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. Harkin, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Inhofe), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Manchin) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Kirk) were added as cosponsors of S. 309, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. Klobuchar, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Cochran) and the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer) were added as cosponsors of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. Sanders, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Schatz) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to reauthorize and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 320

At the request of Mr. Johanns, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Chambliss) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Cochran) were added as cosponsors of S. 320, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for congressional review of agency guidance documents.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. Baucus, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 345

At the request of Mrs. Shaheen, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCain) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Coats) were added as co-sponsors of S. 345, a bill to reform the Federal sugar program, and for other purposes.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. Cochran, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. Murkowski), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Moran) were added as cosponsors of S. 370, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving supplemental programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Boozman (for himself and Mr. Merkley):

S. 400. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to include the Corps of Engineers as a Federal land management agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. Boozman. Mr. President, today Senator Merkley and I are introducing the Corps of Engineers Recreation Improvement Act. This legislation enables the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to reinvest recreation fees to improve facilities where the funds are collected. Our bill creates an incentive for the Corps to maintain good facilities and to provide quality recreational opportunities on our public lands. The Corps currently collects recreation fees at many sites. This legislation would not change the way the Corps determines use fee rates. Existing law provides that users of specialized sites, facilities, equipment, or services provided by Federal expense shall be assessed fair and equitable fees. Section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 also provides that no entrance fees shall be charged by the Corps. Our bill is not intended to and does not make any changes in that regard.

In Arkansas, recreation on our public Corps-operated lands is an important driver of economic activity, job opportunities, and tourism. In fiscal year 2012, over $4.2 million in revenue was collected at Corps recreation sites in Arkansas. When citizens spend money at Corps recreation sites in Arkansas, Oregon, or other States, many of them expect that their money will be invested on-site to improve facilities and create recreation opportunities. Our bill would ensure those expectations are met.

The Corps of Engineers Recreation Improvement Act would also enable the Corps to participate in the inter-agency America the Beautiful Pass program to allow customers an alternative payment option at sites where entrance or amenity fees are charged. This includes the distribution and sale of the passes and the retention of a portion of the revenue for the sales of those passes. It would also allow the Corps to distribute Military Passes. This will make it easier for our men and women in uniform and their families to acquire passes. The Corps currently honors these passes but the Corps is not allowed to distribute the passes. Providing the ability for the Corps to offer passes to customers is a commonsense solution that will encourage continued use of Federal recreation sites.

By Mr. Wyden (for himself and Mr. Merkley):
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 “Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL, APPELLATE AND DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) PRESIDING JUDGE.—The term “presiding judge” means the judge presiding over the court proceeding concerned. In proceedings in which more than 1 judge participates, the presiding judge shall be the senior active judge so participating or, in the case of a circuit court of appeals, the senior active circuit judge so participating.

(b) AUTHORITY OF PRESIDING JUDGE TO ALLOW MEDIA COVERAGE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) AUTHORITY OF APPELLATE COURTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), the presiding judge of an other cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, including Judiciary Chairman Leahy, will greatly improve public access to federal courts by letting federal judges open their courtrooms to television cameras and other forms of electronic media.

The Sunshine in the Courtroom Act is full of provisions that ensure that the introduction of cameras and other broadcasting devices into courtrooms goes as smoothly as it has at the state level. First, the presence of the cameras in Federal trial and appellate courts is at the sole discretion of the judges, it is not mandatory. The bill also provides a mechanism for Congress to study the effects of this legislation on our judiciary before making this change permanent through a three-year sunset provision. The bill protects the privacy and safety of non-party witnesses by giving them the right to have their faces and voices obscured. The bill prohibits the televising of jurors. Finally, it includes a provision to protect the due process rights of each party.

We need to open the doors and let the light shine in on the Federal Judiciary. This bill improves public access to and therefore understanding of our Federal courts. It has safety provisions to ensure that the cameras won’t interfere with the proceedings or with the safety or due process of anyone involved in the cases. Our states have allowed news coverage of their courtrooms for decades. It is time we join them.

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. 405. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Sunshine in the Courtroom Act, a bipartisan bill which permits judges at all federal court levels to open their courtrooms to television cameras and radio broadcasts.

Openness in our courts improves the public’s understanding of what happens inside our courts. Our judicial system remains a mystery to too many people across the country. That doesn’t need to continue. Letting the sun shine on federal courtrooms will give Americans an opportunity to better understand the judicial process. Courts are the bedrock of the American justice system. I believe that granting the public greater access to an already public proceeding will inspire greater faith in and appreciation for our judges who pledge equal and impartial justice for all.

For decades, States such as my home state of Iowa have allowed cameras in their courtrooms with great results. As an example, the District of Columbia prohibits trial and appellate court coverage entirely. Nineteen states allow news coverage in most courts; sixteen allow coverage with slight restrictions; and the remaining fifteen allow coverage with stricter rules.

The bill I am introducing today, along with Senator Schumer and five
By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE): S. 408. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week TIME Magazine published an extensive piece that took a close look at the hidden costs within our health care system and how the Medicare program, which is widely disparaged these days, is effective in controlling costs.

We as a nation will spend $2.8 trillion for America's seniors—and for our entire health care system. And that should start with changes to Part D.

Today, I am introducing with Senators WHITEHOUSE and JACK REED the Medicare Prescription Drug Savings and Access Act.

Our bill would save taxpayer dollars by giving Medicare beneficiaries the choice to participate in a Medicare Part D prescription drug plan run by Medicare, not private insurance companies.

Seniors want the ability to choose a Medicare-administered drug plan, so let's give them this option.

In 2016, Americans spent approximately $200 billion on prescription drugs. That figure is projected to double over the next decade. However, patients in the United States spend 50 percent more than other developed countries for the same drugs.

Our bill would save taxpayer dollars by giving Medicare beneficiaries the choice to participate in a Medicare Part D prescription drug plan run by Medicare, not private insurance companies.

As these people enter the program, Medicare should be allowed to control costs.

According to the TIME article, many hospitals routinely overcharge patients and reap profits at the expense of the Federal Government's purse. In 11 years, Medicare's hospital insurance fund will start paying out more in benefits than it takes in.

Meaningful reforms that lead to better health care at lower costs are good for America's seniors—and for our entire health care system. And that should start with changes to Part D.
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Savings from negotiating on behalf of seniors in Medicare could be used to further reduce costs in the program and ensure the program is there for future generations.

America’s health care system is burdening families and hindering our ability to future.

The Affordable Care Act takes important steps to begin bringing down costs in the private market and in Medicare, but there is more we can do. This proposal is a simple and common sense option that should be available for seniors.

Allowing Medicare to manage a prescription drug plan and negotiate prices, taxpayers will save money and seniors will get high quality drug coverage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and letters of support be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material has been ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 408

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 “Medicare Prescription Drug Savings and Choice Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 2 of part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1860D-11 (42 U.S.C. 1395w-111) the following new section:

“MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OPTION.”

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 2 of part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1860D-11 (42 U.S.C. 1395w-111) the following new section:

“SEC. 1860D-11A. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, for each year (beginning with 2014), in addition to any plans offered under section 1860D-11, the Secretary shall offer one or more Medicare operated prescription drug plans (as defined in subsection (c)) with a formulary that consists of the entire United States and shall enter into negotiations in accordance with subsection (b) with pharmaceutical manufacturers to reduce the net acquisition cost of covered Part D drugs for eligible Part D individuals who enroll in such a plan.

(b) NEGOTIATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 1860D-11(i), for purposes of offering a Medicare operated prescription drug plan under this section, the Secretary shall negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers with respect to the net acquisition costs of covered Part D drugs in a Medicare operated prescription drug plan and shall encourage the use of more affordable therapeutic equivalents to the extent such practices do not override medical necessity as determined by the prescribing physician. To the extent practicable and consistent with the previous sentence, the Secretary shall implement strategies similar to those used by other Federal purchasers of prescription drugs, and other strategies, including the use of a formulary and formulary incentives in subsection (e), to reduce the purchase cost of covered Part D drugs.

(c) MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘Medicare operated prescription drug plan’ means a prescription drug plan that offers qualified prescription drug coverage and access to negotiated prices described in section 1860D-2(a)(1)(A). Such a plan may offer supplemental prescription drug coverage in the same manner as other qualified prescription drug coverage offered by other prescription drug plans.

(d) MONTHELY BONUS.—"(1) QUALIFIED PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—The monthly beneficiary premium for qualified prescription drug coverage and access to negotiated prices described in section 1860D-2(a)(1)(A) to be charged under a Medicare operated prescription drug plan shall be uniform nationally. Such premium for months in the succeeding year shall be based on the average monthly per capita actuarial cost of offering the Medicare operated prescription drug plan for the year involved, including administrative expenses.

(2) SUPPLEMENTAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—Insofar as a Medicare operated prescription drug plan offers supplemental prescription drug coverage, the Secretary may adjust the amount of the premium charged under paragraph (1)."

(e) USE OF A FORMULARY AND FORMULARY INCENTIVES.—"(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the operation of a Medicare prescription drug plan, the Secretary shall establish and apply a formulary (and may include formulary incentives) under clause (i) in accordance with this subsection in order to:

(A) increase patient safety;

(B) increase appropriate use and reduce inappropriate use of drugs; and

(C) reward value.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF INITIAL FORMULARY.—"(A) IN GENERAL.—In selecting covered Part D drugs for inclusion in a formulary, the Secretary shall consider clinical benefit and price.

(B) ROLE OF AHRQ.—The Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality shall be responsible for assessing the clinical benefit of covered Part D drugs and making recommendations to the Secretary regarding which drugs should be included in the formulary. In conducting such assessments and making such recommendations, the Director shall—

(I) consider safety concerns including those identified by the Federal Food and Drug Administration;

(II) use available data and evaluations, with priority given to randomized controlled trials, to examine clinical effectiveness, comparative effectiveness, safety, and enhanced compliance with a drug regimen;

(III) use the same classes of drugs developed by the United States Pharmacopeia for this part;

(iv) consider evaluations made by—

(I) the Director under section 1013 of the Medicare Prescription Drug Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003;

(II) state and local entities, such as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(III) other private and public entities, such as the Drug Effectiveness Review Project and Subtitle XIX; and

(iv) recommend to the Secretary—

(I) those drugs in a class that provide a greater clinical benefit, including fewer safety concerns or a greater risk of side-effects, than another drug in the same class that should be included in the formulary;

(II) those drugs in a class that provide less clinical effectiveness, including greater safety concerns or a greater risk of side-effects, than another drug in the same class that should be excluded from the formulary, and

(III) drugs that have the same or similar clinical benefit for which it would be appropriate for the Secretary to competitively bid (or negotiate) for placement on the formulary.

(C) CONSIDERATION OF AHRQ RECOMMENDATIONS.—"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after taking into consideration the recommendations under subparagraph (B)(v), shall establish a formulary, and formulary incentives, to encourage use of covered drugs in a Medicare operated prescription drug plan that—

(I) have a lower cost and provide a greater clinical benefit than other drugs;

(II) have a lower cost than other drugs with the same or similar clinical benefit; and

(III) drugs that have the same cost but provide greater clinical benefit than other drugs.

(2) FORMULARY INCENTIVES.—The formulary incentives under clause (i) may be in the form of one or more of the following:

(I) Tiered copayments;

(II) Reference pricing;

(III) Prior authorization;

(IV) Step therapy;

(V) Medication therapy management;

(VI) Generic drug substitution;

(VII) FLEXIBILITY.—In applying such formulary incentives the Secretary may decide not to impose any cost-sharing for a covered part D drug for which—

(I) the elimination of cost sharing would be expected to increase compliance with a drug regimen;

(II) compliance would be expected to produce savings under part A or B both.

(D) LIMITATION ON FORMULARY.—In any formulary established under subsection (a), the formulary may not be changed during a year, except—

(A) to add a generic version of a covered part D drug that entered the market;

(B) to remove such a drug for which a problem is found; and

(C) to add a drug that the Secretary identifies as a drug that treats a condition for which there has not previously been a treatment option or for which a clear and significant benefit has been demonstrated over other covered part D drugs.

(E) ADDING DRUGS TO THE INITIAL FORMULARY.—

(A) USE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall establish and appoint an advisory committee (in this paragraph referred to as an ‘advisory committee’)—

(I) to review petitions from drug manufacturers, health care provider organizations, patient groups, and other entities for inclusion of a drug in, or other changes to, such formulary; and

(ii) to recommend any changes to the formulary established under this subsection.

The advisory committee shall be composed of 9 members and shall include representatives of physicians, pharmacists, and consumers and others with expertise in evaluating prescription drugs. The Secretary shall select members based on their knowledge of pharmaceuticals and the Medicare population. Members shall be deemed to be special Government employees for purposes of applying the conflict of interest provisions under section 208 of title 18, United States Code, and no waiver of such provisions for such a member shall be permitted.

(C) CONSULTATION.—The advisory committee shall consult, as necessary, with physicians who are specialists in treating the disease for which a drug is being considered.

(D) REQUEST FOR STUDIES.—The advisory committee may request the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality or any academic or research institution to study and make a report on a petition described in subparagraph (A)(i) in order to assess—

(I) the impact of a drug on outcomes; and

(ii) comparative effectiveness;

(iii) safety; and
"(iv) enhanced compliance with a drug regimen.

(E) Recommendations.—The advisory committee shall make recommendations to the Secretary:

(i) whether a covered part D drug is found to provide a greater clinical benefit, including fewer safety concerns or less risk of side-effects, than another drug in the same class that is currently included in the formulary and should be included in the formulary;

(ii) whether a covered part D drug is found to provide a less clinical benefit, including greater safety concerns or a greater risk of side-effects, than another drug in the same class that is currently included in the formulary and should not be included in the formulary;

(iii) whether a covered part D drug has the same or similar clinical benefit to a drug in the same class that is currently included in the formulary and whether the drug should be included in the formulary.

(F) Limitations on review of manufacturer petitions.—The advisory committee shall not review a petition of a drug manufacturer under subparagraph (A)(ii) with respect to a covered part D drug unless the petition is supported by the following:

(i) Raw data from clinical trials on the safety and effectiveness of the drug.

(ii) Any data from clinical trials conducted controls on the drugs that are the current standard of care.

(iii) Any available data on comparative effectiveness of the drug.

(iv) Any other information the Secretary requires for the advisory committee to complete its review.

(G) Response to recommendations.—The Secretary shall provide timely notice to beneficiaries regarding recommendations of the advisory committee and the Secretary shall modify the formulary established under this subsection accordingly. Nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary from adding to the formulary a drug for which the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality or the advisory committee has not made a recommendation.

(H) Notice of changes.—The Secretary shall provide timely notice to beneficiaries and health professionals about changes to the formulary or formulary incentives.

(I) Informing beneficiaries.—The Secretary shall provide timely notice to beneficiaries about the availability of a Medicare operated prescription drug plan or plans including providing information in the annual handbook distributed to all beneficiaries and adding information to the official public Medicare website related to prescription drug coverage available through this part.

(J) Application of all other requirements for prescription drug plans.—Except as specifically provided in this section, any Medicare operated prescription drug plan shall meet the same requirements as apply to any other prescription drug plan, including the requirements of section 1860D–4(b)(1) relating to assuring pharmacy access.

(K) Availability of the Medicare operated prescription drug plan.—A Medicare operated prescription drug plan (as defined in section 1860D–4) shall be offered nationally in accordance with section 1860D–11A.

(2)(A) Section 1860D–3 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–103(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

(1) an initial review and determination made by the Secretary; and

(2) for appeals denied during the initial review and determination, the option of an external review and determination by an independent entity selected by the Secretary.

(B) Consultation in development of procedures.—In developing the appeals process under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with consumer and patient groups, as well as other key stakeholders to ensure the goals described in subparagraph (A) are achieved.

Alliance for a Just Society, February 28, 2013.
Reduce Pharmaceutical Prices—Do Not Cut Benefits

Dear President Obama and Senator/Representative:

We have noted with great concern that federal budget discussions have included cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Medicaid. We wish to be clear: We strongly oppose such an approach and believe it to be both unnecessary and a non-growth policy for an economy that remains stagnant.

Medicare and Medicaid not only provide critical protections against the economic deprivation caused by illness, especially for older Americans; they also create jobs and build an economy that is invigorating. Cutting these programs leads this country in the wrong direction.

We cannot continue to unravel these critical programs for working older Americans; they are the future of our communities and programs to which there is a source for reductions that will not harm beneficiaries: the cost of prescription drugs.

The U.S. pays more for prescriptions than any nation in the world. Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries pay more for medicines than do our veterans and the clients of the National Indian Health Service. Why do these differences in cost persist? They do so because other countries, the VA, and the IHS negotiate the prices for prescriptions, while Medicare and Medicaid programs do not.

According to the Center for Economic and Policy Research, savings to the federal government over the next decade could be as high as $541.3 billion. The saving to the states would be as high as $72.7 billion, and savings would go to beneficiaries. These amounts are far in excess of the demand for expenditure reductions being suggested by the most stringent deficit reduction advocates.

We are more than 275 national and state organizations, and we are opposed to cutting health care benefits for the elderly and the poor. However, saving money by negotiating drug prices would be beneficial to the entire health care system, in addition to saving money for the federal government and the states. Such a policy would be key to moving forward without some compromise to maintain the quality Medicare and Medicaid programs, to move forward without some compromise to quality Medicare and Medicaid programs, to move forward without some compromise to quality Medicare and Medicaid programs.
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national committee to preserve

social security & medicare,


Hon. Dick Durbin,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. Janice Schakowsky,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Durbin and Representative Schakowsky:
On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and
Medicare. I am writing to express our support for the Medicare Prescription Drug Savings and Choice Act. We applaud this effort because it would improve the Medicare program for seniors and reduce federal spending on prescription drugs.

We understand that your legislation would create one or more Medicare-administered drug plans with uniform, government-providing seniors with the opportunity to purchase drugs directly through the Medicare program. In addition, your legislation would require the federal government to use its purchasing power to negotiate lower prices on prescription drugs for beneficiaries who enroll in the Medicare-administered plan. The Department of Veterans Affairs and many state governments are able to deliver lower drug prices because of price negotiation, and we believe that the federal government should be able to receive the best price available for Medicare prescription drugs.

Finally, we appreciate that your legislation establishes an advisory committee to assess a public formulary and streamlines the Medicare Part D appeals process, which will help all beneficiaries.

Thank you for your continued leadership on Medicare, particularly for identifying ways to reduce Medicare spending without shifting costs to beneficiaries. We look forward to working with you to enact this important legislation.

Sincerely,

MAX RICHTMAN,
President and CEO.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 411. Provided in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am joining my colleagues Senators CRAPO, WYDEN, and MORAN in introducing the Short Line Railroad Rehabilitation and Investment Act of 2013, legislation to extend for 3 years the Section 45G short line freight railroad tax credit.

In the 112th Congress, I introduced a 6-year extension of this credit. Despite the often contentious atmosphere of the 112th Congress, during which my colleagues found little they could agree on, the short line rail credit was a bipartisan success story, with my legislation attracting more than 50 bipartisan cosponsors.

"Short line" railroads are small freight rail companies responsible for bringing goods to communities that are not directly served by large, transcontinental railroads. Supporting small railroads allows the communities surrounding them to attract and maintain businesses and create jobs. The evidence of the success of this credit can be found in communities across America.

This credit has real impact for the people of my state. West Virginia is the second biggest producer of railroad ties in the country. Since the credit was enacted, it is estimated that 750,000 railroad ties have been purchased above what would otherwise have been purchased with no incentive. Those railroad ties translate directly into jobs. This credit does not create just West Virginia jobs though. The ties, spikes, and rail this credit helps fund are almost entirely American made.

Over 12,000 rail customers across America depend on short lines. This credit creates a strong incentive for short lines to invest private sector dollars in railroad rehabilitation and track rehabilitation and improvements. Unfortunately, it is now scheduled to expire at the end of 2013.

We were unable to enact a full 6-year extension of this important tax credit last Congress, but released that this credit was extended through the end of 2013 as part of the December 31st fiscal cliff deal.

This Congress I want to do more. This credit, and the short line railroads that serve all of our constituents, deserve a meaningful extension. If this credit is allowed to expire at the end of the year, private-sector investments in infrastructure in our communities will fall by hundreds of millions of dollars. This would extend the 45G credit through 2016, providing the important long-term planning certainty necessary to maximize private-sector transportation infrastructure investment. Over 50 members of this body sponsored legislation in the last Congress extending this credit and I hope there will be similar support again this year. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

By Mr. CORKYN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 413. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include human trafficking as a part 1 violent crime for purposes of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORKYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be ordered to be printed in the RECORD in a form similar to the last Congress extending this credit.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, section 1. Short title. This Act may be cited as the "Human Trafficking Reporting Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS. Congress finds the following:

(1) Human trafficking is a form of modern-day slavery.

(2) According to the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, "severe forms of trafficking in persons" means—

(A) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age;

(B) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person, for the purpose of labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery;

(3) There is an acute need for better data collection of incidents of human trafficking across the United States in order to effectively combat severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(4) The State Department's 2012 Trafficking in Persons report for all countries reports the following:

(A) The United States is a "source, transit and destination country for men, women, and children, subjected to forced labor, debt bondage, domestic servitude and sex trafficking;"); and

(B) The United States needs to "improve data collection on human trafficking cases at the federal, state and local levels".

(5) The International Organization for Migration has reported that in order to effectively combat human trafficking there must be reliable and standardized data, however, the following barriers to data collection exist:

(A) The illicit and underground nature of human trafficking;

(B) The reluctance of victims to share information with authorities;

(C) Insufficient human trafficking data collection and research efforts by governments world-wide.

(6) A 2009 report to the Department of Health and Human Services entitled Human Service Infrastructure in the United States: A Review of the Literature found that "the data and methodologies for estimating the prevalence of human trafficking globally and nationally are not well developed, and therefore estimates have varied widely and changed significantly over time".

(7) The Federal Bureau of Investigation collects national crime statistics through the Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

(8) Under current law, State and local governments receiving Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance grants are required to share data on part 1 violent crimes with the Federal Bureau of Investigation for inclusion in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

The addition of "severe forms of trafficking in persons" to the definition of part 1 violent crimes will ensure that statistics on this heinous crime will be compiled and available through the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report.

SEC. 3. HUMAN TRAFFICKING TO BE INCLUDED IN PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES FOR PURPOSES OF BYRNE GRANTS. Section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES TO INCLUDE HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—For purposes of this section, the term 'part 1 violent crimes' shall include severe forms of trafficking in persons, as defined in section 103(8) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(b))."

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 415. A bill to clarify the collateral requirement for certain loans under section 7(d) of the Small Business Act, to address assistance to out-of-State small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak on an issue that is of great importance to my home State of Louisiana: Federal disaster assistance. As you know, along the Gulf Coast, we were again hit hard during hurricane season. This is following the devastating one-two punch of Hurricanes
Katrina and Rita of 2005 as well as Hurricanes Gustav and Ike in 2008. Unfortunately, our region also has had to deal with the economic and environmental damage from the Deepwater Horizon disaster in 2010 and more recently Hurricane Isaac. For this reason, as Chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship ensuring Federal disaster programs are effective and responsive to disaster victims is one of my top priorities. While the Gulf Coast is permanent, as the Midwest has tornadoes, California experiences earthquakes and wildfires, and the Northeast sees crippling snowstorms. So no part of our country is spared from disasters—disasters which can and will strike at any moment. This certainly hit home when the northeast was struck by Hurricane Sandy in October of last year. With this in mind, I believe the Federal government is better prepared and has the tools necessary to respond quickly, effectively following a disaster.

In order to give the U.S. Small Business Administration, SBA, better tools to respond after a future disaster, I am proud to file the Small Business Disaster Reform Act of 2013. I want to thank my colleague Senator THAD COCHRAN for cosponsoring the bill and for helping me to make improvements. I am also appreciative that Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and Senator MARK PRYOR also have cosponsored the legislation. This bill will make two important improvements to SBA’s disaster assistance programs for businesses. The first provision builds off of SBA disaster reforms enacted in 2008 and ensures that SBA is responsive to the needs of small businesses seeking smaller amounts of disaster assistance. These are the businesses that are burdened with items on their primary personal residential homes when they could conceivably provide sufficient business assets as collateral for the loan. The second provision in the bill also authorizes the SBA Administrator to allow out-of-state Small Business Development Centers, SBDCs, to provide assistance in to small businesses located in Presidentially-declared disaster areas. This provision removes a limitation that, for disasters such as Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Sandy, would allow experienced SBDC counselors to come in to a disaster area while local SBDCs are being stood back up following a catastrophic disaster. Lastly, to ensure that out-of-state SBDCs are not left paying out of pocket for assisting in these disaster areas, there also is legislative language in Section 4 encouraging the SBA to ensure it reimburses SBDCs for these disaster-related expenses provided they were legitimate and there are funds available.

In particular, Section 2 of the bill that I am filing today would clarify that, for SBA disaster business loans less than $200,000 that SBA is required to utilize assets other than the primary residence if those assets are available to use as collateral towards the loan. The bill is very clear though that these assets should be of equal or greater value than the amount of the loan. Also, to ensure that this is a targeted improvement, the bill also includes additional language that this bill in no way requires SBA to reduce the amount of collateral it seeks on these types of loans. I want to especially thank my former Ranking Member Olympia Snowe for working with me to improve upon previous legislation on this particular issue. The proviso that I am re-introducing, as part of this disaster legislation, is a direct result of discussions with both her and other stakeholders late last year. I believe that this bill is better because of improvements that came out of these productive discussions.

I note that this provision is similar to Section 204 of S. 2731, the Small Business Administration Disaster Recovery and Reform Act of 2009 that Senator BILL NELSON and I introduced during the 111th Congress. A similar provision was included in the House of Representatives twice that Congress. H.R. 3854, which included a modified collateral requirement under Section 801, passed the House on October 29, 2009 by a vote of 389-32. The provision also passed the Senate on December 6, 2009 by a voice vote as Section 2 of H.R. 3743. During the 112th Congress, this provision passed the Senate on December 28, 2012 by a vote of 62-32 as part of H.R. 1, the Senate-passed Disaster Relief Appropriations Act. However, it was not included in H.R. 152, the House-passed Disaster Relief Appropriations Act that subsequently was enacted into law. Despite the setback earlier this year, I remind my colleagues that this provision has a history of bipartisan support and has previously passed both chambers of Congress.

Section 2 addresses a key issue that is serving as a roadblock to business owners interested in applying for smaller SBA disaster loans. After the multiple disasters that hit the Gulf Coast, my staff has consistently heard from business owners, discouraged from applying for SBA disaster loans. When we have inquired further on the main reason for this situation, the top concern related to SBA requiring business owners to put up their personal home as collateral for smaller SBA disaster loans for their business. This requirement is understandable for large loans between $70,000 and $2 million. However, business owners complained about this requirement being instituted for loans of $200,000 or less. I can understand their frustration. Business owners, in many cases who have just lost everything, are applying to SBA for their business. SBA then responds by asking them to put up their $400,000 personal home as collateral when the business may have sufficient business assets available to collateralize the loan. While I also understand the need for SBA to secure the loans, make the program cost effective, and minimize risk to the taxpayer, SBA has at its disposal multiple ways to secure loans.

Furthermore, SBA has repeatedly said publicly and in testimony before my committee that it will not decline a borrower for a lack of collateral. According to a July 2012 correspondence between SBA and my office, the agency notes that “SBA is an aggressive lender and its credit thresholds are well below traditional bank standards... SBA does not decline loans for insufficient collateral.” SBA’s current practice of making loans is based upon an individual/business demonstrating the ability to repay and income. The agency declines borrowers for an inability to repay the loan. In regards to collateral, SBA is required to utilize assets other than the primary personal residence worth $300,000 or more for a business loan of $200,000 or less when there are other assets available for SBA.

This provision does not substantively change SBA’s current lending practices and it will not have a significant cost. I believe that this legislation would not trigger direct spending nor would it have a significant impact on the subsidy rate for SBA disaster loans. Currently, for every $1 loaned out, we costs approximately 10 cents on the dollar. Most importantly, this bill will greatly improve the SBA disaster loan programs for businesses ahead of future disasters. If a business owner to the SBA for a loan of less than $200,000 to make immediate repairs or secure working capital, they can be assured that they will not have to put up their personal home if SBA determines that the business has other assets to go towards the loan. However, if businesses seek larger loans than $200,000 or if their business assets are not suitable collateral, then the current requirements will still apply. This ensures that the many small businesses seeking smaller amounts of recovery loans are able to secure these loans without significant burdens on their personal property. For the business owners we have spoken to, this is some basic equity to one of the Federal government’s primary tools for responding to disasters.

To be clear, while I do not want to see SBA tie up too much of a business’ collateral, I also believe that SBA should have the ability to put up business assets towards its disaster loan. SBA should consider that first before attempting to bring in personal
residences. It is unreasonable for SBA to ask business owners operating in very different business environments post-disaster to jeopardize not just their business but also their home. Loans of $200,000 or less are also the loans most likely to be repaid by the businesses, so personal homes should be collateral of last resort in instances where a business can demonstrate the ability to repay the loan and that it has other assets.

As previously mentioned, there are also safeguards in the provision that ensures that this provision will not reduce the quality of collateral required by SBA for these disaster loans nor will it reduce the quality of the SBA’s general collateral requirements. These changes will assist the SBA in cutting down on waste, fraud and abuse of these legislative reforms. In order to further assist the SBA, I believe it is important to clarify what types of non-financial assets, specifically, would be considered and what safeguards should be reviewed. For example, I understand that SBA’s current lending practices consider the following business assets as suitable collateral: commercial real estate; machinery and equipment; business inventory; and furniture and fixtures.

Section 3 of this bill removes an unnecessary prohibition in the Small Business Act that currently prohibits SBDCs from other states to help out in areas impacted by disasters. In particular, this provision authorizes the SBA Administrator to allow out-of-state SBDCs to provide assistance to small businesses located in Presidentially-declared disaster areas. This is because, as you may know, SBDCs are considered to be the backbone of the SBA’s Office of Entrepreneurial Development efforts, and are the largest of the agency’s OED programs. SBDCs are the university based resource partners that provide counseling and training to more than 600,000 small business clients annually. From 2007 to 2008, the counseling and technical assistance services they offered lead to the creation of 58,501 new jobs, at a cost of $3,462 per job. Additionally, they estimated that their counseling services helped to save 88,889 jobs. These centers are even more critical following natural or manmade disasters. That is because SBDCs help impacted businesses in navigating Federal disaster programs and programs creating new business plans following a disaster. For that reason, we must ensure that there is continuity to have SBDC counselors on the ground in disaster areas.

For example, right after Hurricane Katrina our SBDCs in Louisiana were severely limited in what they could do because of the widespread damage to homes and facilities utilized by their counselors. On the other hand, their counterparts at the Florida SBDCs had a wealth of expertise and were willing to assist but were prohibited from providing assistance to small businesses outside their geographic area. In 2012, we experienced similar challenges following Hurricane Sandy but SBDCs in Louisiana, Florida or elsewhere were prohibited from helping their counterparts in the Northeast even if they wanted to help recovery in New York or New Jersey so that would not impact their operations back home. For smaller scale disasters, local SBDCs will respond to disasters in their own areas. However, for large scale, catastrophic disasters, this provision could make a significant difference for impacted small businesses.

In fact, on December 13, 2012, my committee received excellent testimony from Jim King, Chairman of the Commission of Small Business Development Centers, ASBDCs, and State Director of New York State Small Business Development Center. Mr. King outlined the symbiotic relationship between different SBDC state chapters and how they currently assist each other across disasters. He specifically noted that, “I was also privileged to have the opportunity to work with the SBDC in Louisiana following Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and visited New Orleans as one of five State Directors invited to New York’s Jersey Shore to be there, Mary Lynn Willkerson, to evolve a strategy for recovery. I should note that Mary Lynn has returned the favor many times over since Hurricane Sandy devastated our area, with materials, information and support, which has been greatly appreciated.” He also later noted that “Starting almost immediately after the disaster, staff in other states and programs began reaching out with offers of assistance and words or experiences of support . . . The experiences gained from disasters in Florida, Texas, Colorado, Louisiana and many other places reinforce the value of the SBDC network in meeting the needs of small business in times of disaster.” I believe that these current SBA out-of-state SBDCs left-strength has been greatly appreciated by enacting this legislation. C.E. “Tee” Rowe, President/CEO of ASBDC noted this in his February 10, 2013 letter to my office, noting that, “Allowing SBDCs to share resources across state lines or other boundaries for the purposes of disaster recovery is a common sense proposal, little different from utilities sharing linemen.” At the same time, however, I encourage SBDC chapters across the country to establish partnerships with their counterparts in other disaster areas so that their SBDC counterparts can be there post-disaster. SBDC chapters that are unfortunately, battle hardened from multiple disasters should not be the only chapters that bear fruit from these partnerships with their counterparts.

Furthermore, I note that Section 3 of the bill has already been passed out of committee and has been approved by the full Senate during past sessions of Congress. So this provision has a strong chance of enactment. During the 110th Congress, this provision was approved unanimously by the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee on May 7, 2007 as Section 104 of S. 163, the “Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvement Act of 2007.” S. 163 was subsequently passed by the full Senate by unanimous consent on August 3, 2007. Unfortunately, this provision was not enacted into law before the adjournment of the 110th Congress. In the 111th Congress, this provision was again approved unanimously by the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee on July 2, 2009 as Section 1229 of the “Entrepreneurial Development Act of 2009” but was not enacted into law before the adjournment of that Congress. Lastly, during the 112th Congress, the provision received 57 strong bipartisan votes on July 12, 2012 as Section 433 of Senate Amendment 2521 to S. 2237, the “Small Business Jobs and Tax Relief Act of 2012.” My Republican colleagues Senators Snowe, Collins, Vitter, Scott Brown, and Heller all voted in support of the amendment. Although it was not ultimately enacted into law, the provision was subsequently included in separate pieces of legislation introduced by Senator Olympia Snowe and myself. This provision was included as Section 4 of S. 3422, the “SUCCESS Act of 2012” that I introduced on July 25, 2012 as well as Section 433 of S. 3572, the “Restoring Tax and Regulatory Certainty to Small Business Act of 2012” that Senator Snowe introduced on August 2, 2012.

Lastly, Section 4 is a new provision that I worked with my colleague Senator Cochran to include in the legislation. This section addresses past instances where SBDCs were not sufficiently reimbursed post-disaster by the SBA for disaster-related expenses. Section 3 provides clear Congressional intent that, in authorizing the SBA to allow out-of-state SBDCs to assist in disaster areas outside their geographic location, the agency must also ensure that the out-of-state SBDCs are reimbursed for the assistance they provide in these areas. If the SBA approves for these SBDCs to deploy staff or resources to a disaster area, the agency must in turn ensure that it reimburses SBDCs for these expenses provided they were legitimate and there are funds available to do so. I thank Senator Cochran for bringing this to my attention on behalf of his local SBDCs, and look forward to working closely with him to enact this provision into law.

In closing, I believe that these commonsense disaster reforms will greatly benefit businesses impacted by future disasters. First, the major proposals in this legislation are neither new nor untested. Next, this approach has already received support from the following groups from across the country: the Association of Small Business Development Centers, the International Economic Development Council, the Southeastern Economic Development Association, the St. Tammany Economic Development Foundation, the Northeast Louisiana Economic Development Council, and the National Economic Development Council. These four organizations have declared their support of this proposal.

In closing, I believe that these commonsense disaster reforms will greatly benefit businesses impacted by future disasters. First, the major proposals in this legislation are neither new nor untested. Next, this approach has already received support from the following groups from across the country: the Association of Small Business Development Centers, the International Economic Development Council, the Southeastern Economic Development Association, the St. Tammany Economic Development Foundation, the Northeast Louisiana Economic Development Council, and the National Economic Development Council. These four organizations have declared their support of this proposal.
Congress assembled, representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Small Business Disaster Reform Act of 2013.”

**SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF COLLATERAL REQUIREMENTS.**

Section 7(d)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(6)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“Provided further. That the Administrator, in obtaining the most available collateral for a loan of not more than $200,000 under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) relating to damage or destruction of the property of, or economic injury to, a small business concern, shall not require the owner of the small business concern to use the primary residence of the owner as collateral if the Administrator determines that the owner has other assets with a value equal to or greater than the amount of the loan that could be used as collateral for the loan: Provided further. That nothing in the preceding proviso may be construed to reduce the amount of collateral required by the Administrator in connection with a loan described in the preceding proviso or to modify the standards used to evaluate the quality (rather than the type) of such collateral.”

**SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE TO OUT-OF-STATE SMALL BUSINESSES.**

Section 21(b)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(b)(3)) is amended—

1. (i) by striking “at the discretion” and inserting—

“Provided further. That the Administrator, in obtaining the most available collateral for a loan of not more than $200,000 under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) relating to damage or destruction of the property of, or economic injury to, a small business concern, shall not require the owner of the small business concern to use the primary residence of the owner as collateral if the Administrator determines that the owner has other assets with a value equal to or greater than the amount of the loan that could be used as collateral for the loan: Provided further. That nothing in the preceding proviso may be construed to reduce the amount of collateral required by the Administrator in connection with a loan described in the preceding proviso or to modify the standards used to evaluate the quality (rather than the type) of such collateral.”

2. (ii) to strike “at the discretion” and inserting—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the discretion of the Administrator, the Administrator may authorize a small business development center to provide assistance, as described in subsection (c), to a small business concern located outside of the State, without regard to geographic proximity, if the small business concern is located in an area for which the President has declared a major disaster under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), during the period of the declaration.

(i) Continuity of Services.—A small business development center that provides counselors to an area described in clause (i), shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure continuity of services in any State in which the center also provides disaster recovery services.

(ii) Access to Disaster Recovery Facilities.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent practicable, permit the personnel of a small business development center to use any site or facility designated by the Administrator for use to provide disaster recovery assistance.”

**SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that, subject to the availability of funds, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that a small business development center is appropriately reimbursed for any legitimate expenses incurred in carrying out activities pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(b)(3)), by this Act.

**ASSOCIATION OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS,**

Burke, VA, February 16, 2013.

**HON. MARY L. LANDRIEU,**
Chair, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 415

Chair, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Landrieu:

Thank you for giving the Association of Small Business Development Centers (ASBDC) the opportunity to comment on your proposed legislative amendments to the disaster assistance provisions in the Small Business Act (15 USC 631 et seq.).

While Congress has taken a significant step in addressing the resource issues following Sandy and other disasters, there are still restrictions in the SBDC assistance authority and the US Small Business Administration’s disaster recovery authority that could complicate future disaster recovery efforts. We applaud your efforts to deal with those issues.

Under section 21(b)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 USC 648(b)(3)) SBDCs are limited in their ability to provide services across state lines. This prevents SBDCs dealing with disaster recovery in New York and New Jersey, from being able to draw upon the resources available in our nationwide network of nearly 1,000 centers with over 4,500 business advisors. It likewise prevents states with great experience in disaster recovery assistance like Louisiana and Florida, from providing assistance to their colleagues.

Your proposed legislation amends that SBDC geographic service restriction for the purposes of providing disaster support and assistance. Our Association wholeheartedly endorses your effort to remove SBDCs to share resources across state lines or other boundaries for the purpose of disaster recovery is a common sense proposal, little different from SBDCs working collaboratively overseas. In addition, we would like to note that this provision has been supported by the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship twice in previous Congresses.

In addition, the ASBDC wishes to express its support for your proposals to amend the collateral requirements in the disaster loan programs for businesses carrying out activities as collateral, will promote the recovery of the local economies in need following the 2005 hurricane season, the BP Gulf oil spill and other disaster-related incidents by providing economic development recovery assistance. We have continued our work in this area through technical assistance projects and partnerships with federal agencies and other non-governmental organizations. Our profession is invested in helping our country prepare for and respond to disasters, much as you and your colleagues on the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship. To this end, we support proposed changes that will allow the SBA to more effectively deliver disaster recovery assistance to local businesses in need of federal aid.

Thank you again for kind attention and continuing support of small business.

Sincerely,

C.E. "TEE" Rowe,
President/CEO, ASBDC.


HON. MARY L. LANDRIEU,
Chair, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, U.S. Senate.

HON. JAMES E. RISCH,
Ranking Member, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Landrieu and Senator Risch:

On behalf of the International Economic Development Council (IEDC), please agree that this change will not undermine your proposed target of $300 million or less, and instead allowing business owners are understandably reluctant to place their personal homes up as collateral in order to secure an SBA disaster loan to rebuild their business. Consequently, SBA loans put in place to help businesses rebuild following a disaster go underutilized. As lawmakers, you have a responsibility to protect the taxpayer, which is why we understand the need for posting collateral of equal or greater value to the amount of the loan. To this end, we support proposed language that eliminates the specific requirement of using a home as collateral to guarantee a loan of $200,000 or less, and instead allowing business owners to use collateral as collateral, will promote greater utilization of the loans. This is an idea we can all get behind; one that will lead to greater, faster economic recovery.

When disaster strikes, we should do everything in our power to bring the full resources of the federal government to bear in the impacted community. This includes, most especially, bringing in top experts who can immediately begin helping businesses and local economies recover. The national network of over 1,100 Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs) could be a source of assistance to small business owners. Unfortunately, current rules prevent SBDC’s from assisting their counterparts in other jurisdictions. For those communities in the Mid-Atlantic and New England impacted by Sandy are not able to benefit from the enormous
amount of knowledge and experience in storm recovery held by SBDCs in Florida and the Gulf region. Certainly, we can all agree that disasters warrant an extraordinary reponse you that requiring must include qualified expertise from all corners of the federal government.

Forty to sixty percent of small businesses that close as a result of a disaster do not re-open. This is an unacceptably high number. We would not accept that level of loss in homes and we should not accept that level of loss in jobs; our communities cannot sustain such losses and duty dictates we make certain they don’t have to. By enacting common sense legislation like that which is under consideration here, and freeing the flow of capital and expertise, we are taking concrete steps to give our small businesses and local economies the greatest chance to recover.

IEDC is your partner in the work of job creation. We thank you for your leadership in support of small business and stand ready to offer our assistance in this and future efforts.

Sincerely,
PAUL L. KRUTKO, Chairman, International Economic Development Council and President and CEO, Ann Arbor SPARK.

ST. TAMMANY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION, Mandeville, LA, February 19, 2013.

Hon. MARY LANDRIEU, Chair, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Landrieu: The St. Tammany Economic Development Foundation thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments to the disaster assistance provisions in the Small Business Act (15 US 631 et seq.). As we learned from Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and most recently Isaac, the sooner our small businesses are able to recover, the better it is for the region, the state and the nation.

We fully endorse the proposed amendment to Section 1 of the bill regarding collateral on business disaster loans. If approved, no longer would small business owners have to use their personal primary residence for collateral towards SBA disaster loans less than $200,000 if other assets are available. During a widespread disaster, the primary residence of business owners may also be impacted and requiring them to use their home as collateral would create an onerous burden and/or be financially unbearable. Eliminating this collateral requirement opens up assistance to those impacted by disaster, speeding recovery for businesses and a region’s economy.

The second proposed change to Section 2 of the Small Business Act would allow Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs) to provide technical assistance to impacted small businesses beyond the current 250 mile limitation. The Louisiana Small Business Development Centers (LSBDCs) have successfully worked with countless small businesses, including those devastated by Hurricane Katrina, Rita, Gustav and Ike, and most recently the BP oil spill. The experience and expertise that the LSBDCs have shared with the SBDCs in the rebuilding area over the last five years would have enhanced their capabilities to cope with Superstorm Sandy. In times of disaster, it is essential to collaborate and pool resources in order to speed up delivery of much needed assistance.

For these reasons, the North Louisiana Economic Partnership fully endorses the proposed amendments to the current SBA legislation that would open up, enhance and efficiently deliver disaster assistance to small businesses.

Sincerely,
SCOTT MARTINEZ President, North Louisiana Economic Partnership.

BAY AREA HOUSTON, ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP, Houston, TX, February 13, 2013.

Hon. MARY LANDRIEU, Chair, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Landrieu: As the President of the North Louisiana Economic Partnership, I feel that the innovative spirit of Texas has allowed us to be a strong economic engine, adding nearly 800,000 new jobs. When disaster strikes the Gulf Coast, as it did with Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav, and Ike, our small businesses are hit hard. The sooner they are able to recover the better it is for the region, the state, and the nation.

This is why I am writing to support your proposed legislative amendments to the disaster assistance provisions in the Small Business Act (15 US 631 et seq.) and to thank you for your leadership in support of small business and stand ready to offer our assistance in this and future efforts.

Sincerely,
Brenda Bertus, Executive Director, St. Tammany Economic Development Foundation.
disaster recovery assistance and should not be prevented from providing assistance to their colleagues outside of Louisiana in the event of disaster. Therefore, we fully support this provision.

About 85% of the members of the Chamber SWLA are small businesses. We applaud your efforts to protect, to help every company in the wake of disasters and thank you for continuing to be a strong advocate on their behalf.

Sincerely,

GEORGE SWIFT
President/CEO,
SWLA Economic Development Alliance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):
S. 418. A bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe regulations regarding the collection and use of personal information obtained by tracking the online activity of an individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Do-Not-Track Online Act of 2013. This bill is a critical step towards furthering consumer privacy. It empowers Americans to control their personal information online and provides them with the ability to prevent online companies from collecting and using that information for profit.

Do-not-track is a simple concept. It allows consumers, with a simple click of the mouse, to tell every company in the ecosystem that participates in the vast online ecosystem, “Do not collect information about me. I care about my privacy. My personal information is not for sale. And I do not want my information used in ways I do not expect or approve.” Under this bill, online companies would have to honor that user declaration or face penalties enforced by the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe regulations.

The key to this bill is its simplicity. For over a decade in the Senate Commerce Committee, which I chair, we have tried to legislate consumer privacy in or opt-out of those information collection practices. Yet, today, privacy policies are still far too long, too complicated, and too full of technical legalese for any reasonable consumer to read, let alone understand. The failures of these notices are even clearer when placed on the exploding number of mobile devices on which consumers have grown to rely. My bill avoids this messiness of “rabbit holes” of policy considerations and creates an easy mechanism that gives consumers the opportunity to simply say “no” to anyone and everyone collecting their online information. Period.

Let me also say a few words about what this bill does not do. My bill would not “break the Internet,” as I am sure we will hear from opponents. The truth is that my bill makes it simple to provide the service requested. The FTC has made statements publicly refusing to honor new do-not-track browser features. My bill would put an end to this gamesmanship and nonsense.

My bill is only part of the ongoing discussion on consumer privacy in Congress. It is simple, yet powerful. It allows consumers, if they choose, and I should emphasize that many will not make such a choice, to stop the mind-boggling number of online companies from collecting vast amounts of their information. It gives consumers an easy-to-use tool that will implement their choices effectively in a complex, rapidly-changing online world. It prohibits those lurking in the cyber-shadows from profiting off of the personal, private information of ordinary Americans. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this and other privacy legislative efforts in the Commerce Committee and on the Senate floor.

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:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Do-Not-Track Online Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. REGULATIONS RELATING TO "DO-NOT-TRACK" MECHANISMS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act,
the Federal Trade Commission shall promulgate—

(1) regulations that establish standards for the implementation of a mechanism by which an individual is simply and easily indicated whether the individual prefers to have personal information collected by providers of online services, including by providers of mobile applications or services; and

(2) rules that prohibit, except as provided in subsection (b), such providers from collecting personal information on individuals who have indicated a preference to have personal information collected or not collected by such providers, on an individual basis, in a manner that does not undermine an individual’s preference, expressed via such mechanism, not to collect such information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—The Federal Trade Commission shall promulgate the standards and rules required by this section in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT OF “DO-NOT-TRACK” MECHANISMS.

(a) ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(1) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A violation of a rule promulgated under section 2(a)(2) shall be treated as an unfair and deceptive act or practice in violation of section 5(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(1)(B)) regarding unfair or deceptive acts or practices.

(2) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the Federal Trade Commission shall enforce this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made applicable to this Act.

(B) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), any person who violates this Act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(C) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—The Federal Trade Commission shall enforce this Act with respect to an organization that is not organized or operated for its own profit or that of its members as if such organization were a person over which the Commission has authority pursuant to section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)).

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of any person subject to a rule promulgated under section 2(a)(2) in a practice that violates the rule, the attorney general may, as parens patriae, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States—

(1) to enjoin further violation of such rule by such person;

(2) to compel compliance with such rule;

(3) to obtain damages, restitution, or other compensation on behalf of such residents;

(4) to obtain such other relief as the court considers appropriate; or

(5) to obtain civil penalties in the amount determined under paragraph (2).

(B) CIVIL PENALTIES.

(1) CALCULATION.—Subject to subparagraph (B), for purposes of imposing a civil penalty under paragraph (1)(E) with respect to a person subject to a rule promulgated under section 2(a)(2), the amount determined under this paragraph is the amount calculated by multiplying the number of days that the person is not in compliance with the rule by the amount not greater than $16,000.

(B) MAXIMUM TOTAL LIABILITY.—The total amount of civil penalties that may be imposed with respect to a person that violates a rule promulgated under section 2(a)(2) shall not exceed $15,000,000 for all civil actions brought against such person under paragraph (1)(E).

(c) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—Beginning on the date on which the Bureau of Labor Statistics first publishes the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, any provision of this Act relating to any period after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the amounts specified in sub-paragraphs (A) and (B) shall be increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index published on that date from the Consumer Price Index published the previous year.

(d) RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(A) NOTICE TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Federal Trade Commission in writing that the attorney general intends to bring a civil action under paragraph (1) before initiating the civil action.

(ii) CONTENTS.—The notification required by clause (i) with respect to a civil action shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed and the complaint itself.

(iii) EXCEPTION.—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required by clause (i) before initiating the civil action, the attorney general shall notify the Federal Trade Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

The attorney general of a State may—

(i) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under paragraph (1); and

(ii) upon intervening—

(A) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(B) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(e) INVESTIGATORY POWERS.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State to conduct investigations, to administer oaths or affirmations, or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(f) PREEMPTIVE ACTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—If the Federal Trade Commission institutes a civil action or an administrative action with respect to a violation of a rule promulgated under section 2(a)(2), the attorney general of any State that has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of such State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the violation of such rule by such person that, but for the preemptive action by the Commission, might have been brought under section 1331 or 1332 of title 28, United States Code, may—

(i) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general under paragraph (1); and

(ii) upon intervening—

(A) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(B) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(g) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under paragraph (1), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(i) is an inhabitant; or

(ii) may be found.

(h) ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under paragraph (1), any other officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under paragraph (1), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this subsection to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.
SEC. 4. BIENNIAL REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 2 years after the effective date of the regulations initially promulgated under section 2, the Federal Trade Commission shall—

(1) review the implementation of this Act;

(2) assess the effectiveness of such regulations, including how such regulations define or interpret the term "personal information" as such term is used in section 2;

(3) assess the effect of such regulations on online commerce; and

(4) submit to Congress a report on the results of the review and assessments required by this section.

---

BY MRS. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 419. A bill to limit the use of cluster munitions. To the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with my friend and colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY to introduce the Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act of 2013.

Our legislation places common sense restrictions on the use of cluster munitions. It prevents any funds from being spent to use cluster munitions that have a failure rate of more than one percent.

In addition, the rules of engagement must specify that the cluster munitions will only be used against clearly defined military targets; and will not be used where civilians are known to be present or in areas normally inhabited by civilians.

Our legislation also includes a national security waiver that allows the President to waive the prohibition on the use of cluster munitions with a failure rate of more than one percent, if he determines it is vital to protect the security of the United States to do so.

However, if the President decides to waive the prohibition, he must issue a report to Congress within 30 days on the failure rate of the cluster munitions used and the steps taken to protect innocent civilians.

Cluster munitions are large bombs, rockets, or artillery shells that contain up to hundreds of small submunitions, or individual "bomblets." They are intended for attacking enemy weapons and armor formations spread over a half mile radius.

But, in reality, they pose a deadly threat to innocent civilians.

In Afghanistan, between October 2001 and November 2002, 127 civilians lost their lives due to cluster munitions, 70 percent of them under the age of 18.

An estimated 1,220 Kuwaitis and 400 Iraqi civilians have been killed by cluster munitions since 1991.

During the 2006 war in Lebanon, Israeli cluster munitions, many of them manufactured in the U.S., injured and killed 343 civilians.

Sadly, Syria is just the latest example.

According to Human Rights Watch, the Syrian military has used air-dropped and ground-based cluster munitions near or in civilian areas.

In October of 2013, Taftanaz and Tamane reported that helicopters dropped cluster munitions on or near their towns. One resident told Human Rights Watch:

On October 9, I heard a big explosion followed by several smaller ones coming from Shelakh field located at the north of Taftanaz. We went to see what happened. We saw a big (bomb) cut in half and several (bomblets) that we detected personally found one that was not exploded. There were small holes in the ground. The holes were dispersed and spread over 300 meters.

Another resident reported that an air-dropped cluster munitions released bombs that landed between two neighboring schools.

Last month, Human Rights Watch issued another report that Syrian forces used "notoriously indiscriminate" ground-based cluster munitions near Idlib and Latamneh, a town near Hama.

Not surprisingly, the residents of these towns also reported that many of the bomblets were dispersed over a wide area, failed to explode, and killed or maimed innocent civilians.

One resident of Latamneh told Human Rights Watch:

I heard a big explosion followed by smaller ones. . . . I saw wounded people everywhere and unexploded submunitions. The damage caused to the buildings was minimal. I saw a lot of unexploded bomblets.

One civilian was killed during the attack and 15 more, including women and children, were wounded. Another civilian was later killed by an unexploded bomblet. One video shows a baby with shrapnel along his right arm.

Videos taken after the incident also show that the civilians who came across the munitions were unaware of the deadly power of an unexploded bomblet.

Men, and even children, can be seen handling these weapons as if they were toys or simply souvenirs from the war.

Now, the United States has rightly condemned the Syrian military’s use of cluster munitions against innocent civilians.

However, our moral leadership is hampered by the fact that we continue to maintain such a large arsenal of these deadly weapons and our continued resistance to international efforts to restrict their use.

In fact, the United States maintains an estimated 5.5 million cluster munitions containing 728 million submunitions. These bomblets have an estimated failure rate of between 5 and 15 percent.

According to the most recent data, only 30,900 of these 728 million submunitions have self-destruct devices that would reduce less than one percent failure rate.

That accounts for only 0.00004 percent of the U.S. arsenal.

So, the technology exists for the U.S. to meet the one percent standard, but our arsenal still overwhelmingly consists of cluster bombs with high failure rates.

How then, do we convince Syria to stop using these deadly weapons?

While we wait, the international community has taken action.

On August 1, 2010, the Oslo Convention on Cluster Munitions—which would prohibit the production, use, and export of cluster munitions and requires signatories to eliminate their arsenals within eight years—formally came into force. To date, it has been signed by 111 countries and ratified by 77 countries.

This group includes key NATO allies such as Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, who are fighting alongside our troops in Afghanistan.

It includes 33 countries that have produced or used cluster bombs.

But it does not include the United States.

The United States chose not to participate in the Oslo process or sign the treaty. This is unacceptable.

Instead, the Pentagon continues to assert that cluster munitions are "legitimate weapons with clear military utility in combat."

Recognizing that the United States could not remain silent in the face of widespread international efforts to restrict the use of cluster munitions, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates issued a new policy on cluster munitions in June, 2008 stating that, after 2018, the use, sale, and transfer of cluster munitions with a failure rate of more than 1 percent would be prohibited.

This policy is a step in the right direction, but would still allow the Pentagon to use cluster bombs with high failure rates for five more years.

That runs counter to our values. I believe the administration should take another look at this policy.

In fact, on September 29, 2009, Senator LEAHY and I were joined by 14 of our colleagues in sending a letter to President Obama urging him to conduct a thorough review of U.S. policy on cluster munitions.

On April 14, 2010, we received a response from then National Security Advisor Jim Jones stating that the administration will undertake this review following the policy review on U.S. landmines policy.

The administration should complete this review without delay.

Until then, we are still prepared to use these weapons with well-known failure rates and significant risks to innocent civilians.

What does that say about us?

The fact is, cluster munition technologies already exist that meet the one percent standard. Why do we need to wait until 2018?

This delay is especially troubling given that in 2001, former Secretary of Defense William Cohen issued his own
policy on cluster munitions stating that, beginning in fiscal year 2005, all new cluster munitions must have a failure rate of less than one percent.

Unfortunately, the Pentagon was unable to meet this deadline and Secretary Gates' policy essentially postpones any meaningful action until 2018. If we do nothing, close to twenty years will have passed since the Pentagon first recognized the threat these deadly weapons pose to innocent civilians. We can do better.

First, it should be noted that in 2007, Congress passed, and President Bush signed into law, the FY 2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act, which included a provision that prohibits the sale and transfer of cluster bombs with a failure rate of more than one percent. That ban has been renewed on an annual basis and remains on the books.

Our legislation simply moves up the Gates deadline and extends the ban on the sale and transfer of cluster munitions with high failure rates to our own arsenal.

For those of my colleagues who are concerned that it may be too soon to enact a ban, I say: Look at the use of cluster munitions in Iraq since 2003 and observe a moratorium on their use in Afghanistan since 2002.

In conclusion, let me say that Senator LEAHY and I remain as committed as ever to raising awareness about the threat posed by cluster munitions and to pushing the United States to enact common-sense measures to protect innocents. This body constantly talks about America’s moral leadership, and this is the perfect opportunity to exercise it.

Senator LEAHY and I continue our efforts for people like Phongsavath Souliyalat. Last year, former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton traveled to Laos and met Phongsavath, a 19-year-old Lao man who lost his sight and his hands to a bomblet three years before.

The bomblet that injured Phongsavath was dropped more than 30 years ago during the Vietnam War. It lay unexploded, a de facto landmine, until his 16th birthday. Sadly, he is not alone. The U.S. dropped 270 million bomblets over Laos, and 30 percent failed to explode.

According to an article from the Los Angeles Times, civilians in one-third of Laos are threatened by unexploded ordnance, and only one percent of that area has been cleared.

Since the Vietnam War, more than 20,000 people have been killed or injured by these deadly weapons. All of them were innocent civilians that the United States did not intend to target. After Phongsavath described the suffering of those who, like him, had been injured by unexploded bomblets, Secretary Clinton replied: “We have to do more.”

I agree wholeheartedly. As a first step, Congress should pass the Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act of 2013. I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative.

Mr. LEAHY, Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my friend from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, in introducing the Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act of 2013. It is identical to the bill that she and I have introduced in prior years, and I commend her for her persistence on this important humanitarian issue.

I come to this issue having devoted much effort over many years to shining a spotlight on and doing what can be done to help innocent victims of war. In the last century, and continuing into this new century, noncombatants increasingly have borne the brunt of the casualties in armed conflicts across the globe. Limiting the use of weapons that are inherently indiscriminate, and that have indiscriminate effects, such as cluster munitions, are tangible, practical, meaningful things we can do to reduce these unnecessary casualties.

Cluster munitions, like any weapon, have some military utility. But anyone who has seen the indiscriminate devastation that cluster munitions cause over wide areas understands the unacceptable threat they pose to noncombatants. These are not the laser guided weapons the Pentagon showed destroying their targets during the invasion of Baghdad. To the contrary, Cluster munitions can kill and maim anyone within the 360 degree range of flying shrapnel.

There is the horrific problem of cluster munitions that fail to explode as designed and remain as active duds, like landmines, until they are triggered by whoever comes into contact with them. Often it is an unsuspecting child, or a farmer.

Even now, in Laos today people are still being killed and maimed by millions of U.S. cluster munitions left from the 1970s. That legacy, resulting from years of secret bombing of a peaceful people who posed no threat to the United States, contaminated more than a third of Laos’ agricultural land and cost countless innocent lives. It is shameful that we have contributed less in the past 35 years to clean up these deadly remnants of war than we spent in a few days of bombing.

Current law prohibits U.S. sales, exports and transfers of cluster munitions that have a failure rate exceeding 1 percent. The law also requires any sale, export or transfer agreement to include a requirement that the cluster munitions will be used only against military targets.

The Pentagon continues to insist that the United States should retain the ability to use millions of cluster munitions in its arsenal which have estimated failure rates of 5 to 20 percent. It has pledged to meet the 1 percent failure rate for U.S. use of cluster munitions in 2018.

Like Senator FEINSTEIN I reject the notion that the United States can justify using antiquated weapons that so often fail, so often kill and injure innocent civilians including children, and which many of our allies have renounced. That is not the kind of leadership the world needs and expects from the United States. If we have learned anything from Afghanistan it is that harming civilians, even unintentionally, creates enemies among those whose support we need, and undermines the mission of our troops.

Senator FEINSTEIN’s and my bill would apply the 1 percent failure rate to U.S. use of cluster munitions beginning in 2015. However, our bill permits the President to waive the 1 percent requirement if the President certifies that it is vital to protect the security of the United States. I would hope the Pentagon would recognize the best interest, and will work with us by supporting this reasonable step.

Since December 3, 2008, when the Convention on Cluster Munitions opened for signature in Dublin, at least 97 countries have joined, including Great Britain, Germany, Canada, Norway, Australia and other allies of the United States. However, the Bush Administration did not participate in the negotiations that culminated in the treaty, and the Obama Administration has not signed it.

Some have dismissed the Cluster Munitions Convention as a pointless exercise, since it does not yet have the support of the United States and other powers such as Russia, China, Pakistan, India and Israel. These are some of the same critics of the Ottawa treaty banning antipersonnel landmines, which the United States and the other countries I named have also refused to sign. But that treaty has dramatically reduced the number of landmines produced, used, sold, and stockpiled—and the number of mine victims has fallen sharply. Any government that contemplates using landmines today does so knowing that it will be condemned by the world community. I suspect it is only a matter of time before the same is true for cluster munitions.

It is important to note that the United States today has the technological ability to produce cluster munitions that meet the requirements of our bill, as well as of the treaty. What is lacking is the political will to act. There is no excuse for continuing to use cluster munitions that cause unacceptable harm to civilians.

I urge the Obama administration to review its policy on cluster munitions and put the United States on a path to...
join the treaty as soon as possible. In the meantime, our legislation would be an important step in the right direction.

I want again to thank and commend Senator Feinstein, who has shown such passion and steadfastness in raising the need for funding emergency opportunity to protect civilians from these indiscriminate weapons.

By Mr. Alexander (for himself, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Corker, and Mr. Paul):

S. 421. A bill to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from taking any action to establish a restricted area prohibiting public access to waters downstream of a dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. Alexander. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation along with Senator McConnell, Senator Corker, and Senator Paul, to prevent the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from restricting fishing rights in some of the best fishing areas in the States of Tennessee and Kentucky below 10 dams along the Cumberland River.

I have had discussions with the Corps several times about this. They have told me the only solution is legislation. I am hoping there is some other solution by reasonable compromise.

But I am taking the Corps’s advice. On Thursday, Congressman Whitfield, of Kentucky, introduced legislation on this matter, and so I am introducing similar legislation today.

I have also drafted language that could be included in an appropriations bill that would prevent the Corps of Engineers from using any funds to restrict fishing in what is called the tailwaters below these 10 Corps of Engineers dams on the Cumberland River.

Today I spoke with the Secretary of the Army, John McHugh. I urged him to have the Corps give Congress enough time to consider this matter, perhaps to work out something with the Corps by compromise or, if not, to pass legislation.

On Monday, I am meeting with the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Jo-Ellen Darcy, who is in charge of the Corps of Engineers, to ask that the Corps stop taking any further action to build physical barriers along the Cumberland River.

Earlier, I met with James DeLapp, the colonel who is the commander of the Nashville District. Then I met, along with Congressman Whitfield and Congressman Cooper of Nashville, TN, with MG Michael Walsh, who is the deputy commanding general. I have had a number of meetings on this subject, and I am determined to get some result, one way or the other.

I am delighted to have the Republican leader, Senator McConnell, my colleague, Senator Corker from Tennessee and Senator Paul of Kentucky as cosponsors on the legislation.

One may say, with a large number of problems facing our country—from Iran to the sequester—why is a Senator—in fact, four, and a number of Congressmen interested in fishing?

There are 900,000 Tennesseans who have fishing licenses, and one of my jobs is to represent them. I know and they know about some of the best fishing areas in our State.

This is an area where grandfathers and grandsons and granddaughters go on Saturdays and go during the week. There are lots of Tennesseans who consider these prized properties and their lands. These are public lands, and they feel they have a right to be there.

The problem is that the Corps of Engineers wants to erect physical barriers below the dams to keep the fishermen out of the area that is just below the dam.

The Corps’ goal is laudable. The goal is to improve safety, they say. We all support safety, but there are much better solutions than this.

Let me give an analogy. When you have a railroad crossing, you do not keep the gate down at the railroad crossing 100 percent of the time. The track is not dangerous if the train is not coming.

The water comes through these dams only 20 percent of the time, and the water is not dangerous if the water is not spilling through the dams. So if we kept the gate down at the railroad crossing 100 percent of the time, we would not be able to travel anywhere. That is the same sort of reasoning we have here.

From Washington, the Department of the Army is saying they have a policy, which they have had since 1996—which they have never applied on the Cumberland River—that suddenly they have decided, after all these years, they have to close the fishing area 100 percent of the time, even though it might be dangerous only 20 percent of the time.

I am not the only one who thinks this is an unreasonable policy.

Last week, I went to Old Hickory Dam, near Nashville. About 150 fishermen were there with me on the banks of the Cumberland River. I met with the Corps officials. They turned the water on so I could see it spilling through the dam. Then they turned it off. I met with Ed Carter, the director of the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. I met with Mike Butler, the chief of the Tennessee Wildlife Federation. I have talked with the Kentucky wildlife people and this is what they say. They think the Corps’ plans to improve safety are so unreasonable that the wildlife agencies will not even help them enforce it. But they say, on the other hand, there are reasonable ways to improve safety; that is, to treat the waters below the dam the way the Tennessee Valley Authority does, for example, which is to erect large signage, some of which already exist on Old Hickory Dam—blow the siren when the water is coming through. You can close the parking lot. You could patrol the area.

There are lots of ways to put the gate down, in effect, on these fishing areas 20 percent of the time. That makes a lot of sense, and the local agencies are willing to help do that.

Our legislation makes clear that for purposes of this act, installing and maintaining sirens, strobe lights, and signage for alerting the public of hazardous waters shall not be considered a part of the prohibition. It makes no sense to take these public lands and say to people; Well, the lawyers came in and said we need to do this. Of course we need to be careful; however, being careful does not mean you keep the gate down over the railroad crossing 100 percent of the time, and it doesn’t mean you close the area to fishing 100 percent of the time when it is dangerous only 20 percent of the time.

I am also concerned about the $2.6 million the Corps needs to transfer from other parts of its budget to put up these physical barriers. Where is the money coming from? I thought we were in the middle of a big sequester, a big budget crunch. I thought we were out of money. One of the areas which has some of the most difficult problems to deal with is the Department of the Army. This is no time to be wasting money building barriers that the wildlife people in Tennessee and Kentucky, whose job it is to encourage boat safety, think are unreasonable.

I am doing what the Corps has said needs to be done, which is to provide legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with the Corps of Engineers. My hope is that we can work out a reasonable solution with the wildlife agencies.

The county judges on both sides of the border are very involved in this. They see the economic benefit that comes from the large number of people who visit those areas for recreational purposes. They leave their dollars behind. This creates good jobs in Tennessee and Kentucky.

Basically, these are public waters. Tennessee and Kentucky fishermen ought to have access to them, and there shouldn’t be an edict from Washington that puts the gate down. They need to cross 100 percent of the time. I am going to do my best to see that doesn’t stand. I hope we can work it out, but if we cannot, I am glad to introduce this legislation with Senator McConnell, Senator Corker, and Senator Paul. The same legislation is in the House of Representatives with Congressman Whitfield. I look forward to my meeting Monday with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the text of this bill was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

S. 421

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 “Freedom to Fish Act.”
SEC. 2. RESTRICTED AREAS AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS DAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall not take any action to establish a restricted area prohibiting public access to water designated as part of a dam owned by the Corps of Engineers.

(b) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this Act, installing and maintaining sirens, strobe lights, and signage for alerting the public of hazardous water conditions shall not be considered to be an action to establish a restricted area under subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), this section shall apply to an action described in subsection (a) during the period beginning on August 1, 2012, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) cease implementing the restricted area resulting from the action; and

(B) remove any barriers constructed in connection with the restricted area.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 431. A bill to authorize preferential treatment for certain imports from Nepal and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Nepal Trade Preferences Act.

This legislation is simple and straightforward. It grants duty-free status to imports of Nepalese garments for a seven year period.

As a friend of Nepal and the Nepalese people for over 25 years, I believe this bill will promote economic prosperity and lasting political stability in one of the world’s poorest countries.

Nepal has a per capita income of $540. Approximately 25 percent of the nation’s 24 million people live in poverty.

The unemployment rate in Nepal stands at a staggering 47 percent; and most Nepalese live on $3 a day.

Nepal’s economic woes are compounded by a devastating, 10-year Maoist insurgency which resulted in the deaths of 13,000 people.

Thankfully, on November 21, 2006 Nepal’s government and Maoist rebels signed a peace accord.

Two years later, Nepal became a republic and a Constituent Assembly was elected to draft a new constitution.

Unfortunately, this momentum has stalled and Nepal remains without a new constitution.

Challenges persist for Nepal’s economy.

In 2005, in accordance with an international agreement, all quotas on garment imports were removed.

This has had a devastating impact on Nepal’s garment industry as U.S. imports have shifted their orders to China. This is good news for other suppliers with cheaper labor markets.

The number of people employed by the Nepalese garment industry dropped from over 100,000 people—half of them women—to between 5,000 and 10,000.

Garment exports fell from approximately $139 million in 2000 to $47 million in 2011.

The impact on the domestic industry will be minimal. At most, Nepalese garments have accounted for 0.26 percent of all garment imports in the United States generating $14 million in revenue.

Nepal will continue to be a small player in the U.S. market.

But to allay any concerns that Nepalese garments will somehow flood the market, this bill does place sensible restrictions on the amount of garments that will receive duty free status. That amount will rise every year up to a specific percentage of all U.S. garment imports.

By passing this legislation, we will help ensure that the garment industry will be a big player in contributing to Nepal’s economic growth and development. This will be more jobs and a rising standard of living for the Nepalese people.

Let there be no doubt, it is my hope that this bill will also spur Nepal’s political parties to come together, resolve their differences, and finalize a new constitution. Lasting political stability is essential if Nepal is to fully realize the economic benefits of this legislation.

Almost 7 years ago, the Nepalese people embraced peace and reconciliation. Let us show our solidarity with them and demonstrate our commitment to the success of the peace process by passing this commonsense measure.

I urge my colleagues to support the Nepal Trade Preferences Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 432. A bill to extend certain trade preferences to certain least-developed countries in Asia and the South Pacific, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Asia-Pacific Trade Preferences Act of 2013, a bill to promote economic growth, democracy, and political stability in some of the world’s poorest countries.

This legislation will provide duty- and quota-free benefits for garments and other products similar to those afforded to beneficiary countries under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, AGOA.

The countries covered by this legislation are 13 Least Developed Countries, LDCs, as defined by the United Nations and the U.S. State Department, which are not covered by any current U.S. trade preference program: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Kiribati, Laos, Maldives, Nepal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, East Timor, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

These countries are among the poorest in the world with the bulk of their citizens living on less than $1 a day. Despite this widespread poverty, their exports are subject to some of the highest U.S. tariffs, averaging around 16 percent.

In fact, these developing countries pay a disproportionate share of U.S. tariffs.

Bangladesh, for example, is the 9th largest contributor of U.S. tariffs even though it is the 46th largest source of U.S. imports.

Cambodia is the 12th largest contributor of U.S. tariffs but ranks as the 60th largest source of U.S. imports.

So, in essence, these two developing countries pay more in U.S. tariffs than many European countries. How is that fair or consistent with our values?

Unfortunately, the United States is the only developed nation that has not provided an enhanced trade preference program to the beneficiary countries in this bill.

Indeed, we maintain duty preference programs for Haiti, the countries of sub-Saharan African and other developing countries and rightly so. These programs are critical components of our efforts to provide hope for millions of people struggling with poverty.

But it makes no sense to exclude other countries at the same level of economic development. We should not hesitate to correct this inequity.

This is not about pitting one developing country against the other. Rather, it is a simple matter of fairness and
ensuring that we help all of those in need.

In fact, this effort goes hand in hand with my long-standing support for a strong and effective foreign aid budget for the United States as an essential tool in lifting these countries out of poverty and put them on the path to economic prosperity and political stability.

Especially in these difficult fiscal times, however, humanitarian and development assistance should not be the sum total of our efforts.

Make no mistake: these programs help stabilize poor and war-torn countries, save lives, and lay the foundation for future prosperity.

Yet, the key for sustained growth, jobs, and rising standards of living will be the ability of each of these countries to create vital export industries to compete in a free and open global marketplace.

It is clear that the textile and apparel industries in many of the Asia-South Pacific countries in this bill are those industries that hold out the best hope for export growth.

We should help these countries help themselves by opening the U.S. market to their exports as we have done for other developing countries in the past.

By doing so, we will demonstrate the best of American values: reaching out to neighbors in need and helping them to stand on their own two feet.

We will also help ourselves.

First, as these countries become more prosperous, we will see new opportunities for our own exports in their growing markets.

This, in turn, will create jobs and economic growth in our own country.

But if we maintain high tariffs on imports from the Asia-South Pacific countries, those opportunities will likely go to the European Union and other developed countries that already have trade preference programs for these countries.

We should not put ourselves at such a disadvantage.

Second, as the Asia-South Pacific countries become more stable politically, we will help protect U.S. national security interests by preventing failed states which could become breeding grounds for terror.

There is no doubt in my mind that the cost of lowering tariffs on imports, compared to 24 percent for apparel imports, is far less than any military intervention.

We will also help ourselves by securing partners in the fight against global threats such as terrorism, climate change, and HIV/AIDS pandemic, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

U.S. leadership is essential in those efforts. But they require a global, multilateral response. As these countries grow, they can assume a larger role and contribute more effectively.

When it comes to our national security, every bit of assistance helps.

Finally, at a time of economic uncertainty, by eliminating tariffs on imports from the Asia-South Pacific countries, this bill will help lower prices for the American consumers and provide them with more options.

It will also help the 3 million American workers whose jobs depend on apparel imports.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Asia-South Pacific Trade Preferences Act is a win-win for the U.S. and the Asia-South Pacific countries.

Now, let me address some of the concerns that may be raised about this bill.

First, many of the Asia-South Pacific countries have struggled in the past with corruption, a lack of democracy, human rights abuses, and the absence of rule of law.

Some may ask: why reward these countries with a trade preference program?

Make no mistake: these countries will not automatically receive the trade benefits provided by this legislation.

This legislation has been drafted to ensure that the benefits are granted on a performance-driven basis.

That is, to be eligible, a beneficiary country must demonstrate that it is making continual progress toward establishing rule of law, political pluralism, the right to due process, and a market-based economy that protects private property rights.

So, this legislation would help promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law while sustaining vital export industries and creating employment opportunities.

The beneficiary countries have a clear incentive to stay on the right path or they will lose the benefits of this bill.

If we ignore any problems, we will sustain the status quo and our efforts will fail.

Finally, whenever we discuss the creation of a new trade preference program, understandable concerns are raised about the impact on domestic manufacturers.

If this bill becomes law, however, the impact on U.S. jobs will be minimal.

Currently, the beneficiary countries under this legislation account for only 4 percent of U.S. textile and apparel imports, compared to 24 percent for China, and 72 percent for the rest of the world.

These countries will continue to be small players in the U.S. market, but the benefits of this legislation will have a major impact on their export economies.

By passing this legislation we will have an opportunity to change lives, protect our national security interests, and help the American consumer. We should seize this opportunity.

I respectfully ask for the support of all my colleagues for this important initiative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.
Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,787,685, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $10,267, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and
(2) not to exceed $461, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 5. COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,453,383.

SEC. 6. COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,178,904, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $4,667, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and
(2) not to exceed $1,167, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 7. COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,950,532, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $3,864,061, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $290,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and
(2) not to exceed $4,080,061, of which amount—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,787,685, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $10,267, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and
(2) not to exceed $461, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 8. COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,453,383.
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 — The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $75,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 12. COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY — In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 — The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,866,195, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $100,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and
(2) not to exceed $20,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 11. COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY — In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, to—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
(2) to employ personnel; and
(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013 — The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $5,074,229, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $75,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and
(2) not to exceed $5,833, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) INVESTIGATIONS —

(1) IN GENERAL — The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, is authorized to study or investigate—

(A) the efficiency and economy of operations of the United States Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption, or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated or doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals with the laws and regulations governing the allocation of fuels in short supply, the management of energy supplies including, but not limited to, their performance with knowledge and talents;
(B) the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of the public interest, wages, or working conditions, and em- ployees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities; (C) organized criminal activity which may be investigated in or otherwise utilize the facilities of the committee in the furtherance of any transactions and the manner and extent to which, and the iden- tity of the persons, farms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which organized criminal activity have infiltrated lawful business enterprises, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized criminal activity in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against such practices or activities;
(D) all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety, including but not limited to investment in security and commodity and security fraud, computer fraud, and the use of offshore banking and corporate facilities to carry out criminal objectives;
(E) The efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to—

(i) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;
(ii) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation’s resources of knowledge and talents;
(iii) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relations between the United States and international organizations principally concerned with national security of which the United States is a member; and
(iv) legislative and other proposals to improve these methods, processes, and relationships;
(F) The efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of energy shortages including, but not limited to, their performance with respect to—

(i) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply;
(ii) the implementation of effective energy conservation measures;
(iii) the management of energy shortages in all forms;
(iv) the coordination of energy programs with State and local government;
(v) control of exports of scarce fuels;
(vi) the management of tax, import, pricing, and other policies affecting energy supplies;
(vii) maintenance of the independence of the petroleum and petrochemical industries; and
(viii) the allocation of fuels in short supply by public and private entities;

(G) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government;
(x) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries; and

(xii) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies; and
(G) the efficiency and economy of all branches and functions of the Government, with particular reference to their operations and performance with particular references to the operations and management of Federal regulatory policies and programs.

(c) INVESTIGATIONS — In carrying out the duties provided in paragraph (1), the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee of the committee shall not be limited to any subject to which it is limited by law, and functions, and operations of any particular branch of the Government and may extend
to the records and activities of any persons, corporation, or other entity.

(3) SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORITY.—For the purposes of this subsection, the committee may, in its discretion, authorize subcommittee of the committee, or its chairperson, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, to issue such orders, and for the purpose of carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, or its chairperson, or any duly authorized individual consultant, or organizations thereof as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); and

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $1,409,970, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $30,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $10,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 17. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under S. Res. 400, agreed to by the Senate on April 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by such section, the Special Committee on Aging is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $1,704,661, of which amount not to exceed $10,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))).

SEC. 18. SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under S. Res. 400, agreed to by the Senate on April 4, 1977 (94th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by such section, the Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $3,739,220, of which amount not to exceed $15,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))).

SEC. 19. COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 105 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1995 (103rd Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by that section, the Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized from March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, under this section shall not exceed $1,409,970, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $30,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $10,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).
to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.—The expenses of the Select Committee on Intelligence, for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013, in subsection (b) in an amount not to exceed $3,950,000, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $3,000,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1996); and

(2) not to exceed $20,000, may be expended for training consultants of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(i) of that Act).

SEC. 20. SPECIAL RESERVE.

(a) Establishment.—Within the funds in the account “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” appropriated by the legislative branch appropriation Acts for fiscal year 2013, there is authorized to be established a special reserve to be available to any committee funded by this resolution as provided in subsection (b) in an amount not to exceed $3,850,000, which shall be available for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013.

(b) Availability.—The special reserve authorized in subsection (a) shall be available to any committee—

(1) in the event of basic need to meet unpaid obligations incurred by that committee during the period referred to in subsection (a); and

(2) at the request of a Chairman and Ranking Member of that committee subject to the approval of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 21. SENATE NATIONAL SECURITY WORKING GROUP EXTENSION AND REVISION.

(a) Working Group Reestablishment.—

(1) The Senate National Security Working Group (in this section referred to as the “Working Group”), authorized by Senate Resolution 165 of the 101st Congress, 1st session (agreed to on April 13, 1989), as subsequently amended and extended, is hereby reconstituted.

(2) Duties.—The Working Group—

(A) may conduct meetings and maintain records of all meetings and activities;

(B) may authorize any committee to act as official spokesperson on the United States delegation to any negotiations to which the United States is a party regarding—

(i) the reduction, limitation, or control of conventional weapons, weapons of mass destruction, or the means for delivery of any such weapons;

(ii) the reduction, limitation, or control of missiles; and

(iii) export controls;

(C) may study any issues related to national security that the majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate jointly determine appropriate;

(D) may study any issues related to national security that the majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate jointly determine appropriate;

(E) is encouraged to consult with parliamentarians and legislators of foreign nations and to participate in international forums and institutions regarding the matters described in subparagraphs (C) and (D); and

(F) is not authorized to investigate matters relating to intelligence operations against the United States, counterintelligence operations and activities, or other intelligence matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Intelligence under Senate Resolution 400 of the 94th Congress, agreed to on May 19, 1976.

(3) Composition.—

(A) in general.—The Working Group shall be composed of 20 members, as follows:

(i) 7 Cochairmen, who shall head the Working Group;

(ii) 4 Members of the Senate from the majority party in the Senate (in this section referred to as the “Majority Cochairmen”), appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(iii) 3 Members of the Senate from the minority party in the Senate (in this section referred to as the “Minority Cochairmen”), appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(iv) 6 Members of the Senate from the majority party in the Senate, appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(v) 6 Members of the Senate from the minority party in the Senate, appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(B) Administrative Cochairmen.—The majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate shall designate one of the Majority Cochairmen to serve as the Majority Administrative Cochairman, and the minority leader of the Senate shall designate one of the Minority Cochairmen to serve as the Minority Administrative Cochairman.

(C) Publication.—Appointments and designations under this paragraph shall be printed in the Congressional Record.

(4) Vacancies.—Any vacancy in the Working Group shall be filled in the same manner in which the member was made.

(b) Working Group Staff.—

(1) Compensation and Expenses.—(A) The Working Group is authorized, from funds made available under subsection (c), to employ such staff in the manner and at a rate not to exceed that allowed for employees of a committee of the Senate under subparagraph (A) of section 105(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968 (2 U.S.C. 61-1(e)), and to incur such expenses as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out its duties and functions.

(B) Senate Resolution 243, 101st Congress, agreed to July 1, 1987, is amended in section 2(b) by striking the period at the end and inserting “at a rate not to exceed that allowed for employees of a committee of the Senate under paragraph (3) of section 105(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968 (2 U.S.C. 61-1(e));”.

(2) Payments made under this subsection for reimbursable expenses shall be authorized, however, only for those actual expenses incurred by the Working Group in the course of conducting its official business. Amounts received as reimbursement for such food expenses shall not be reported as income, and the expenses so reimbursed shall not be allowable as a deduction under title 26, United States Code.

(c) Designation of Professional Staff.—

(A) in general.—The Majority Administrative Cochairman and, in the case of the Majority Cochairmen, no more than one or more professional staff members for each Majority Cochairman of the Working Group, upon recommendations from each Majority Cochairman, shall designate one or more professional staff members for each Majority Cochairman of the Working Group, upon recommendations from each such Majority Cochairman.

(B) Compensation of Senate Employees.—

(i) In the case of the compensation of any such professional staff member, the salary of such employee shall be paid by the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, out of the account of Miscellaneous Expenses, for Senate employees who are paid at an annual rate.

(ii) in the case of the compensation of any such professional staff member, the salary of such employee shall be paid by the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, out of the account of Miscellaneous Expenses, for Senate employees who are paid at an annual rate.

(C) Expenses Available.—For any fiscal year, not more than $250,000 shall be expended for staff and for expenses (excepting expenses incurred for foreign travel), of which not less than $150,000 shall be available for each Administrative Cochairman and the staff of such Administrative Cochairman, and not more than $50,000 shall be available for each Cochairman who is not an Administrative Cochairman and the staff of such Cochairman.

(3) Leadership Staff.—In addition to the amounts referred to in paragraph (2), for any fiscal year, not more than $20,000 shall be expended for staff and for expenses (excepting expenses incurred for foreign travel), of which not more than $10,000 shall be available for each Administrative Cochairman and the staff of such Administrative Cochairman, and not more than $5,000 shall be available for each Cochairman who is not an Administrative Cochairman and the staff of such Cochairman.

(4) Foreign Travel.—

(A) in general.—All foreign travel of the Working Group shall be authorized solely by the majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate, upon the recommendation of the Administrative Cochairman. Participation by Senate staff members in foreign travel, and access to all classified briefings and information made available to the Working Group during such travel, shall be limited exclusively to Working Group staff members with appropriate clearances.

(B) Authorization.—

(i) Committee Staff.—No foreign travel or other funding shall be authorized by any committee of the Senate for the use of staff for activities described under this paragraph without the joint written authorization of the majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate to the chairperson of such committee.

(ii) Member Staff.—No foreign travel or other funding shall be authorized for the staff of any Member of the Senate, other than the Working Group Staff, for activities described under this paragraph unless the majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate jointly so authorize in writing.

(c) Payment of Expenses.—

(1) in general.—The expenses of the Working Group shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, out of the account of Miscellaneous Items, upon vouchers approved jointly by the Administrative Cochairmen (except to the extent required for reimbursable expenses).

(ii) in the case of the compensation of any such professional staff member, the salary of such employee shall be paid by the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, out of the account of Miscellaneous Items, upon vouchers approved jointly by the Administrative Cochairmen (except to the extent required for reimbursable expenses).

(2) Amounts Available.—For any fiscal year, for any such professional staff member, the salary of such employee shall be paid by the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, out of the account of Miscellaneous Items, upon vouchers approved jointly by the Administrative Cochairmen (except to the extent required for reimbursable expenses).

(ii) in the case of the compensation of any such professional staff member, the salary of such employee shall be paid by the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, out of the account of Miscellaneous Items, upon vouchers approved jointly by the Administrative Cochairmen (except to the extent required for reimbursable expenses).
Whereas, on April 15, 1948, the people of Israel proclaimed the establishment of the sovereign State of Israel; 

Whereas, on March 28, 1949, the United States Government recognized the establishment of the new State of Israel and established full diplomatic relations; 

Whereas, since its establishment nearly 65 years ago, the modern State of Israel has built a nation, forged a new and dynamic democratic society, and created a thriving economic, cultural, and intellectual life despite the heavy costs of war, terrorism, and unjustified diplomatic and economic boycotts against the people of Israel; 

Whereas the people of Israel have established a vibrant, pluralistic, democratic political system, including freedom of speech, association, and religion; a vigorously free press; free, fair, and open elections; the rule of law; a fully independent judiciary; and other democratic principles and practices; 

Whereas, since the 1979 revolution in Iran, the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran have repeatedly made threats against the existence of the State of Israel and sponsored acts of terrorism and violence against its citizens; 

Whereas, on October 27, 2005, President of Iran Mahmoud Ahmadinejad called for a world free of Zionism and anti-Semitism; 

Whereas, in February 2012, Supreme Leader of Iran Ali Khamenei said of Israel, “The Zionist regime is a cancer tumor on this region that should be cut off. And it definitely will be cut off;” 

Whereas, in August 2012, Supreme Leader Khamenei said of Israel, “This bogus and fake Zionist outgrowth will disappear off the landscape of geography.”; 

Whereas, in August 2012, President Ahmadinejad said that “in the new Middle East, there will be no trace of the American presence and the Zionists”; 

Whereas the Department of State has designated the Islamic Republic of Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism since 1984; 

Whereas the Department of State has characterized the Islamic Republic of Iran as the “most active state sponsor of terrorism” in the world; 

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has provided weapons, training, funding, and direction to terrorist groups, including Hamas, Hizballah, and Shi'ite militias; 

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has prosecuted a pattern of illicit and deceptive activities to acquire a nuclear weapons capability; 

Whereas, since September 2005, the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has found the Islamic Republic of Iran to be in non-compliance with its safeguards agreement with the IAEA, which Iran is obligated to undertake as a non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; 

Whereas the United Nations Security Council has adopted multiple resolutions since 2006 demanding of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran its full and sustained suspension of all uranium enrichment-related activities and its full cooperation with the IAEA on all outstanding issues related to its nuclear activities, particularly those concerning the possible military dimensions of its nuclear program; 

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has refused to comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions or to fully cooperate with the IAEA; 

Whereas, in November 2011, the IAEA Director General issued a report that documented “serious concerns regarding possible military dimensions to Iran’s nuclear programme,” and affirmed that information was “available to the Agency indicating that ‘Iran has carried out activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device’ and that some activities may be ongoing; 

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran is in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for denying its citizens basic freedoms, including the freedoms of expression, religion, peaceful assembly and movement, and for flagrantly abusing the rights of minorities and women; 

Whereas the bipartisan Board of the Union Address on January 24, 2012, President Barack Obama stated, “Let there be no doubt: America is determined to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. There are options on the table to achieve that goal;” 

Whereas Congress has passed and the President has signed into law legislation imposing strong sanctions on Iran to encourage the Government of Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and end its support for terrorism; 

Whereas these sanctions, while having significant effect, have yet to persuade Iran to abandon its illicit pursuits and comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions; 

Whereas more stringent enforcement of sanctions legislation, including elements targeting oil exports and access to foreign exchange, could still lead the Government of Iran to change course; 

Whereas, in his State of the Union Address on February 12, 2013, President Obama reiterated, “The leaders of Iran must recognize that now is the time for a diplomatic solution, because a coalition stands united in demanding that they meet their obligations. And we will not hesitate to prevent them from getting a nuclear weapon;” 

Whereas, on March 4, 2012, President Obama stated, “Iran’s leaders should understand that, if they stand in the way of containing Iran’s breakout capacity, I have a policy to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon;” 

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has provided weapons, training, and funding to the regime of Bashar al-Assad that has been used to suppress and murder its own citizens; 

Whereas, since at least the late 1980s, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has engaged in a sustained and well-documented pattern of illicit and deceptive activities to acquire a nuclear weapons capability; 

Whereas, since September 2005, the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has found the Islamic Republic of Iran to be in non-compliance with its safeguards agreement with the IAEA, which Iran is obligated to undertake as a non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; 

Whereas the United Nations Security Council has adopted multiple resolutions since 2006 demanding of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran its full and sustained suspension of all uranium enrichment-related activities and its full cooperation with the IAEA on all outstanding issues related to its nuclear activities, particularly those concerning the possible military dimensions of its nuclear program; 

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has refused to comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions or to fully cooperate with the IAEA; 

Whereas, in November 2011, the IAEA Director General issued a report that documented “serious concerns regarding possible military dimensions to Iran’s nuclear program,” and affirmed that information was “available to the Agency indicating that ‘Iran has carried out activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device’ and that some activities may be ongoing; 

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran stands in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for denying its citizens basic freedoms, including the freedoms of expression, religion, peaceful assembly and movement, and for flagrantly abusing the rights of minorities and women; 

Whereas the bipartisan Board of the Union Address on January 24, 2012, President Barack Obama stated, “Let there be no doubt: America is determined to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. There are options on the table to achieve that goal;” 

Whereas Congress has passed and the President has signed into law legislation imposing strong sanctions on Iran to encourage the Government of Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and end its support for terrorism; 

Whereas these sanctions, while having significant effect, have yet to persuade Iran to abandon its illicit pursuits and comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions; 

Whereas more stringent enforcement of sanctions legislation, including elements targeting oil exports and access to foreign exchange, could still lead the Government of Iran to change course; 

Whereas, in his State of the Union Address on February 12, 2013, President Obama reiterated, “The leaders of Iran must recognize that now is the time for a diplomatic solution, because a coalition stands united in demanding that they meet their obligations. And we will not hesitate to prevent them from getting a nuclear weapon;” 

Whereas, on March 4, 2012, President Obama stated, “Iran’s leaders should understand that, if they stand in the way of containing Iran’s breakout capacity, I have a policy to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon;” 

Whereas, on October 22, 2012, President Obama said of Iran, “The clock is ticking. . . And we’re going to make sure that if they do not meet the demands of the international community, then we are going to take all options necessary to make sure they don’t have a nuclear weapon;” 

Whereas, on May 19, 2011, President Obama stated, “Every state has a right to self-defense, and Israel must be able to defend itself, by itself, against any threat;” 

Whereas, on September 21, 2011, President Obama stated, “America’s commitment to Israel’s security is unshakeable. Our friendship with Israel is deep and enduring;” 

Whereas, on March 4, 2012, President Obama stated, “And whenever an effort is made to delegitimize the state of Israel, my administration has opposed them. So there should not be a shred of doubt by now: when the chips are down, I have Israel’s back;” 

Whereas, on October 22, 2012, President Obama stated, “Israel is a true friend. And if Israel is attacked, America will stand with Israel. I’ve made that clear throughout my presidency . . . I will stand with Israel if they are attacked;” 

Whereas, in December 2012, 74 United States Senators wrote to President Obama “As you begin your second term as President, we ask you to reiterate your readiness to take military action against Iran if it refuses to abandon its pursuit of a nuclear weapon. In addition, we urge you to work with our European and Middle Eastern allies to demonstrate to the Iranians that a credible and capable multilateral coalition exists that would support a military strike if, in the end, this is unfortunately necessary;” 

And whereas the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-150) stated that it is United States policy to support Israel’s inherent right to self-defense; 

Resolved, 

SECTION I. SENSE OF CONGRESS. 

Congress— 

(1) reaffirms the special bonds of friendship and cooperation that have existed between the United States and the State of Israel for more than sixty years and that enjoy overwhelming support among the people of the United States; 

(2) strongly supports the close military, intelligence, and security cooperation that Congress has pursued with Israel and urges this cooperation to continue and deepen; 

(3) deprecates and condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the recent actions and policies of the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran threatening the security and existence of Israel; 

(4) recognizes the tremendous threat posed to the United States, the West, and Israel by the Government of Iran’s continuing pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability; 

(5) recognizes that the United States is to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon capability and to take such action as may be necessary to implement this policy, then we are going to take all options necessary to make sure they don’t have a nuclear weapon; 

(6) reaffirms its strong support for the full implementation of United States and international sanctions on Iran and urges the President to continue and strengthen enforcement of sanctions legislation; 

(7) declares that the United States has a vital national interest in, and unbreakable commitment to, ensuring the existence, survival, and security of the State of Israel; and 

reaffirms United States support for Israel’s right to self-defense; and 

(8) recognizes that the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in self-defense, the United States Government
should stand with Israel and provide diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence.

SEC. 2. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war.

SENATE RESOLUTION 66—DESIGNATING THE FIRST WEEK OF APRIL 2013 AS “NATIONAL ASBESTOS AWARENESS WEEK”

Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. Tester, Mrs. Boxer, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Reid, and Mr. Isakson) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas dangerous asbestos fibers are invisible and cannot be smelled or tasted; Whereas the inhalation of airborne asbestos fibers can cause significant damage; Whereas asbestos fibers can cause cancer such as mesothelioma and asbestosis and other health problems; Whereas asbestos-related diseases can take 10 to 50 years to present themselves; Whereas the typical survival time for those diagnosed with mesothelioma is between 6 and 24 months; Whereas, generally, little is known about late-stage treatment of asbestos-related diseases, and there is no cure for such diseases; Whereas early detection of asbestos-related diseases may give some patients increased treatment options and might improve their prognoses; Whereas the United States has substantially reduced its consumption of asbestos, yet continues to consume almost 1,100 metric tons of the fibrous mineral for use in certain products throughout the United States; Whereas asbestos-related diseases have killed thousands of people in the United States; Whereas exposure to asbestos continues, but safety and prevention of asbestos exposure are significantly reduced by the incidence of asbestos-related diseases and can further reduce the incidence of such diseases; Whereas asbestos has been a cause of occupational cancer; Whereas thousands of workers in the United States face significant asbestos exposure; Whereas thousands of people in the United States die from asbestos-related diseases every year; Whereas a significant percentage of all asbestos-related disease victims were exposed to asbestos on naval ships and in shipyards; Whereas asbestos was used in the construction of a number of office buildings and public facilities built before 1975; Whereas people in the small community of Libby, Montana, suffer from asbestos-related diseases, including mesothelioma, at a significantly higher rate than people in the United States as a whole; and Whereas the establishment of a “National Asbestos Awareness Week” will raise public awareness about the prevalence of asbestos-related diseases and the dangers of asbestos exposure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—That the Senate—

(1) designates the first week of April 2013 as “National Asbestos Awareness Week”; and

(2) urges the Surgeon General to warn and educate the public about the public health issues of asbestos exposure, which may be hazardous to their health; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Office of the Surgeon General.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 23. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. King) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 16, to provide for a sequester replacement; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 24. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. King) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 388, to appropriately limit sequestration, to eliminate tax loopholes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 23. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. King) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 16, to provide for a sequester replacement; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION B—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $40,157,392,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,989,384,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $12,529,469,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $28,053,829,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duties, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $4,341,823,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,875,596,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $659,621,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,728,505,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $33,804,145,000.

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy Reserve, $13,516,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

For expenses of training, organizing, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve, repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,140,508,000.

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, administration, travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law; expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $7,075,042,000.

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $13,516,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

For salaries and expenses necessary for the Department of the Army, $335,921,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction, and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided for herein, such funds shall be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, administration, travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law; expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $7,075,042,000.

For salaries and expenses necessary for the Department of the Navy, $3,140,508,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction, and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to
be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided hereunder, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For the Department of the Air Force, $259,200,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reclamation, and acceleration of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided hereunder, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For the Department of Defense, $11,133,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reclamation, and acceleration of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided hereunder, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For the Department of the Army, $297,500,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reclamation, and acceleration of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided hereunder, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID
For expenses related to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $108,759,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REduction ACCOUNT
For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate consultation with the Secretary of State and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilities, defense and military personnel for demilitarization and destruction of weapons, weapons components, and related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and destruction of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contracts, $519,111,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND
For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $720,000,000.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $529,263,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

COOPERATIVE THREAT Reduction Account
For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate consultation with the Secretary of State and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilities, defense and military personnel for demilitarization and destruction of weapons, weapons components, and related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and destruction of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contracts, $519,111,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND
For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $720,000,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,624,361,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY
For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor, specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $4,969,269,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training device (including ground guidance and communication equipment), and electronic and communication equipment, and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title, reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $17,008,348,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts therefor, specialized equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $719,154,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or owned in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

- Carrier Replacement Program, $564,371,000.
- Virginia Class Submarine, $3,217,601,000.
- Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,652,557,000.
- CVN Refueling Overhaul, $1,615,392,000.
- CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP), $70,010,000.
- DDG–69 Destroyer, $969,222,000.
- DDG–81 Destroyer (AP), $406,283,000.
- Littoral Combat Ship, $1,784,959,000.
- LPD–27 (AP), $883,255,000.
- Joint High Speed Vehicle, $189,196,000.
- Moored Training Ship, $397,300,000.
- LCCAC Life Extension Program, $85,830,000; and
- Construction of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $372,573,000.

In all: $15,614,855,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017. Provided, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V–22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces and used in the manner provided for in this paragraph. Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase and lease of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therefor, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $6,170,286,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground and air-borne electronic and communication equipment, training device (including ground guidance and communication equipment), and electronic and communication equipment, and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, reserve plant and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $1,394,448,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

FOR EXPENSES OF ACTIVITIES AND AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (OTHER THAN THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS) NEEDED FOR PROCUREMENT, PRODUCTION, AND MODIFICATION OF EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, MATERIALS, AND SPARE PARTS THEREFOR, NOT OTHERWISE PROVIDED FOR; THE PURCHASE OF PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES FOR REPLACEMENT ONLY; LEASE OF PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES; AND EXPANSION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PLANTS, GOVERNMENT OWNED EQUIPMENT AND INSTALLATION THEREOF IN SUCH PLANTS, ERECTION OF STRUCTURES, AND ACQUISITION FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSES, AND SUCH LANDS AND INTERESTS THEREIN, MAY BE ACQUIRED, AND CONSTRUCTION PROSECUTED THEREON, PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF TITLE, $17,008,348,000, TO REMAIN AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION UNTIL SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 363 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $189,189,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $8,427,388,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $16,646,307,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $16,614,855,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

INCLUSION OF TRANSFERED FUNDS

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic
and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to laws authorizing the obligation of funds, and operation of facilities and equipment, $18,419,129,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014: Provided, That the funds available in this paragraph, $200,000,000 for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program shall only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to include program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation to include proof of concept demonstration, testing, and validation; and transition to full-scale production: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation to accomplish the purpose provided herein: Provided further, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 60 days before making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Operational Test and Evaluation Program, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $2,237,688,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

TITLE V
REVOLVING AND MANAGING FUNDS
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS
For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,516,184,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND
For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 174), and for the necessary expenses to maintain a U.S.-flag reserve fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $697,840,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such component is manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propulsion; shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: Provided further, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previous funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military departments or the Secretary of the Army, pursuant to law, may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis: Provided further, That such acquisition shall be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

TITLE VI
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law, $32,240,788,000, of which $30,707,349,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 1 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2015, and of which not to exceed 1 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That the Department of Defense shall not be limited in obligations for TRICARE enrollment and to medical and health care programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs: Provided, That $15,954,952,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $556,452,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,029,977,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for expenses of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $1,301,786,000, of which $635,843,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 1 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That the funds provided shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $22,214,000 for activities on military installations and $31,734,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, to assist State and local governments; $18,592,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2015, and of which not to exceed 1 percent shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergenc Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $647,351,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $627,705,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program.

DRUG INTERDiction AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfers to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 19 and title 32, $1,029,977,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this division.

TITLE VII
RELATED AGENCIES
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM ACCOUNT
For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $514,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $542,346,000.

TITLE VIII
GENERAL PROVISIONS
SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this division shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, payments of lawfully accrued compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: Provided, That this section does not authorize to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: Provided further, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this division shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this division which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated in the last 2 months of the fiscal year: Provided, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $5,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense, to be available in this division to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided, That funds transferred may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which appropriated and available, and pay- items for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further,
That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this division: Provided further, That funds provided in this section shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority or unanticipated military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested is identified by the Congress: Provided further, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 1 of each year: Provided further, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

Sect. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled “Committee Recommended Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2014,” the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming is necessary to carry out the purposes of section 8005 of this division: Provided further, That the report shall in- clude—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President’s budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, adjustments due to the Secretary of Defense, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation of funds appropriated to working capital funds in this division, no obligations may be made against appropriated to working capital funds in this division, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer: Provided, That for multiple transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

Sect. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this division, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogrammings and transfers authorities for fiscal year 2013: Provided, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President’s budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, adjustments due to the Secretary of Defense, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation of funds appropriated to working capital funds in this division, no obligations may be made against appropriated to working capital funds in this division, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer: Provided, That for multiple transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

Sect. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash balances in working capital funds: Provided, That transfers may be made between such funds: Provided further, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the “Foreign Currency Fluxtations, Defense” appropriation and the “Operation and Maintenance” appropriation for the acquisition of systems and equipment determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made if the Secretary of Defense has not notified the Congress of the proposed transfer: Exempt in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this division, and in cases where such amounts are necessary at any time for cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense: Provided, That a request for multiple transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this division may be not available for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated to remain available until expended, for humanitarian and military assistance programs that are authorized by any law to be carried out in the manner provided by such law to be carried out in the manner provided by such law: Provided further, That amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this division, no obligations may be made against appropriated to working capital funds in this division, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

Sect. 8010. (a) None of the funds provided in this division shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract for economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at the time the previously offered contract was awarded: Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this division shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government’s liability: Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this division shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof that the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this division: Provided further, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: Provided further, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this division may be used for multiyear contracts awarded after the date of the enactment of this division unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in such budget request for production beyond the current fiscal year, the funds provided in this division for such units in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellations provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

(b) Funds appropriated in title III of this division may be used for a multiyear procurement contract as follows:

Sect. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated to remain available until expended, for humanitarian and military assistance programs that are authorized by any law to be carried out in the manner provided by such law to be carried out in the manner provided by such law:

Provided further, That amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this division, no obligations may be made against appropriated to working capital funds in this division, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

Sect. 8012. Funds appropriated by this division may be available for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated to remain available until expended, for humanitarian and military assistance programs that are authorized by any law to be carried out in the manner provided by such law to be carried out in the manner provided by such law:

Provided further, That amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this division, no obligations may be made against appropriated to working capital funds in this division, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

Sect. 8013. None of the funds made available by this division shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress. Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this division shall be available for basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student receiving benefits under the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund
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when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: Provided, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with a Mentor-Protégé Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this division solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protégé Program, as authorized under the Army.

**TRANSFER OF FUNDS**

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this division for the Department of the Army, the Army Reserve, and the National Guard, in accordance with the Mentor-Protégé Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this division solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protégé Program, as authorized under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this division.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this division may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufac-

**SEC. 8020.** Funds appropriated by this division for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political purposes.

SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: Provided, That contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8022. Funds appropriated in this division shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation when time spent as a full-time student is credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8023. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this division shall be available for the purchase of ordnance and related articles, through competition based on cost, of which—

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated in title III of this division shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted in the United States:

SEC. 8025. For the purposes of this division, the term “congressional defense committees” means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Senate Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition is necessary for national security purposes: Provided further, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are being as of the date of enactment of this division.

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the direct procurement of non-repetitive items or related articles, through competition based on cost, of which—

SEC. 8077. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign military sales agreement under the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, as amended, described in paragraph (2) of this section has been entered into by the United States and any country which is party to an agreement permitting the access of foreign Governments of the United States to any Government-owned, controlled, or operated facility or to any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense for the purpose of acquiring sensitive military or strategic technology or property, the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Secretary of State of its determination and shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition is necessary for national security purposes: Provided further, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are being as of the date of enactment of this division.
against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary’s blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to all types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is an agreement in the form of a memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively allowed the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress on the first available date after the date of the enactment of this Act its first report on the operation and maintenance (as defined in section 2921(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code) of the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise made available by this division may be used to approve or liaise with respect to the procurement of goods and services entered into without competition on behalf of the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance:

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) in the case of any equipment or product which was classified as an end item and which is to remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve Contingencies, which shall remain available until expended, pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ‘‘Buy American Act’’ means chapter 83 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8036. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2887 note) shall be available until expended for foreign military sales, grants, and assistance available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8037. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this division may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member of the employee’s place of work remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that transferring or reassigning personnel to reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats; or

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8038. None of the funds made available in this division may be used to acquire or to contract for any type of item that the Secretary of Defense determines to be a technical fighter to any foreign government: Provided, That the Department of Defense may conduct or participate in studies, research, development, testing, and other activities and develop a future export version of the F–22A that protects classified and sensitive information, technologies and U.S. warfighting capabilities.

SEC. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this division shall be available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014 to accept an unsolicited proposal which offers significantly lower cost, or significantly higher technical, scientific or technological promise, that the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(b) The purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to assure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $250,000, contracts relating to equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense:

SEC. 8047. The head of the activity responsible for the Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2013. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items purchased from Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2014 Department of Defense list of investment items submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this division shall be budgets for in a proposed fiscal year 2014 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8048. None of the funds appropriated by this division for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve Contingencies, which shall remain available until expended, pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ‘‘Buy American Act’’ means chapter 83 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8049. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2887 note) shall be available until expended for foreign military sales, grants, and assistance available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8050. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this division may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘‘Buy American Act’’ means chapter 83 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally or knowingly violating title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any investment or products purchased with acquisitions provided under this division, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are equal or competitively inferior, quality competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8051. None of the funds appropriated by this division shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal, unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to assure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $250,000, contracts relating to equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense:

SEC. 8056. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this division may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member of the employee’s place of work remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that transferring or reassigning personnel to reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats; or

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense.
most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;
(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that over all performance periods, as stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by the Department of Defense is less than the cost to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of:
(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; and
(B) $10,000,000; and
(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by:
(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or
(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code;
(b) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that:
(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);
(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or
(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450e), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 9(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)), and shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.
(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal or target, if any, that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (b) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, for the conversion or outsourcing of commercial activities.

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

"Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2007/2010": $114,648,000;
"Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2011/2013": $13,760,000;
"Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2011/2015": $21,086,000;
"Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2011/2013": $93,400,000;
"Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2011/2013": $8,709,000;
"Other Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2011/2013": $9,500,000;
"Operation and Maintenance, Defense Wide, 2012/2013": $21,000,000;
"Aircraft Procurement, Army, 2012/2014": $47,400,000;
"Other Aircraft Procurement, Army, 2012/2014": $59,606,000;
"Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014": $1,040,000;
"Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2012/2016": $28,800,000;
"Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2012/2016": $83,000,000;
"Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014": $25,015,000;
"Other Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014": $4,800,000;
"Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps, 2012/2014": $50,703,000;
"Procurement, Marine Corps, 2012/2014": $335,301,000;
"Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014": $581,699,000;
"Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014": $45,896,000;
"Other Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014": $55,800,000;
"Procurement, Defense Wide, 2012/2014": $16,000,000;
"Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 2012/2013": $8,000,000;
"Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Algebra, 2012/2013": $240,254,000;

SEC. 8041. Of the funds made available in this division for the procurement of defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use or otherwise made available in this division, none of the funds available for any fiscal year for defense contract and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds made available in this division for defense contract and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this division for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: Provided, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds made available in this division for defense contract and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used for the procurement or reimbursement of any foreign military sales or military equipment other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force may authorize the transfer to another nation or an international organization of any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use or otherwise made available to the foreign government or organization by the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8046. None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used for the procurement or reimbursement of any foreign military sales or military equipment other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin. Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force may authorize the transfer to another nation or an international organization of any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use or otherwise made available to the foreign government or organization by the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.
(a) The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any Department of Defense training program involving a foreign security forces or police of a foreign country, the Secretary of Defense shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis.

SEC. 8058. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used for payments to the Department of Defense in support of any program involving a foreign security forces or police of a foreign country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive this restriction in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used for payments to the Department of Defense in support of any program involving a foreign security forces or police of a foreign country.

SEC. 8059. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this division may be used for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance on military family housing units.

SEC. 8060. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a classified quarterly report beginning 30 days after enactment of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 8061. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purpose of providing the requested support pursuant to section 8056 of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 8062. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purpose of providing the requested support pursuant to section 8056 of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 8063. (a) Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any Department of Defense training program involving a foreign security forces or police of a foreign country, the Secretary of Defense shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis.

SEC. 8064. (a) None of the funds made available by this division may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces or police of a foreign country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any Department of Defense training program involving a foreign security forces or police of a foreign country, the Secretary of Defense shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis.
may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: Provided, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, or local laws. Any failure to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense. 

SEC. 8067. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 2909–231; 10 U.S.C. 2401 note), is amended in effect to apply to disbursements that are made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2013. 

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS) 

SEC. 8068. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $200,000,000,000 from funds available under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense” shall be transferred to the Department of State “Global Security Contingency Fund”: Provided, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in the department of Defense Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2014, notice to the congressional defense committees in writing with the source of funds and a detailed justification, execution plan, and timeline for execution of the transfer. 

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS) 

SEC. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this division under the headings “Procurement, Defense-Wide” and “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $479,736,000 shall be for the Israel Co-operative Programs: Provided, That, of this amount, $221,000,000 shall be for the Secretary of the Department of Defense to reimburse the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats, $149,679,000 shall be for the Short Range Missile Defense (SRMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBM program, of which $39,206,000 shall be for procurement activities for the Armored-Piercing Incendiary (API)”, or “armor-piercing incendiary (API)”, except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Exports of Military Articles issued by the Department of State. 

SEC. 8064. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 8063 to the National Guard of a State in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis. 

SEC. 8065. None of the funds appropriated by this division shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds resales (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia. 

SEC. 8066. Of the amounts appropriated in this division under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, $13,381,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects that support the purposes of this section: Provided further, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: Provided further, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, or local laws. Any failure to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense. 

SEC. 8070. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command operational and administrative control of U.S. Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet. 

(b) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Combined Force Command, Operation, and Command Control C-130 and KC-135 forces assigned to the Pacific and European Air Force Commands. 

(c) The command and control relationships in subsections (a) and (b) which existed on March 13, 2011, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act. 

(d) This subsection does not apply to administrative control of Navy Air and Missile Defense Command. 

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS) 

SEC. 8071. Of the amounts appropriated in this division under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, $337,573,000 shall be available until expended in fiscal year 2013, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: Provided, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following in the amounts specified: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which those funds are appropriated. 

(1) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2007/2013”: LHA Replacement Program $156,685,000; 

(2) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2008/2013”: LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $80,888,000; and 

(3) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2009/2013”: CVN Refueling Overhauls Program $135,000,000. 

SEC. 8072. Funds appropriated by this division shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity under such program, project, or activity must be under taken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees. 

SEC. 8073. None of the funds provided in this division shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity only under such program, project, or activity must be under taken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees. 

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS) 

SEC. 8074. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2014 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance components and for each appropriated account: Provided, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the capability of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall include budget justifications for the United States intelligence, surveillance, and reconstruction components and for each appropriated account: Provided further, That the amounts available for intelligence, surveillance, and reconstruction components and for each appropriated account: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which those funds are appropriated. 

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS) 

SEC. 8075. None of the funds in this division shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity under such program, project, or activity must be under taken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees. 

SEC. 8076. In addition to the amounts appropriated in this division, the Secretary of Defense may be obligated to transfer funds to the following in the amounts specified: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which those funds are appropriated. 

(1) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Army”, $37,775,000 shall be available until expended in fiscal year 2013, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: Provided, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following in the amounts specified: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which those funds are appropriated. 

(2) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Army, 2007/2013”: LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $80,888,000; and 

(3) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Army, 2008/2013”: LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $80,888,000; and 

SEC. 8077. None of the funds provided in this division shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity only under such program, project, or activity must be under taken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees. 

SEC. 8078. None of the funds provided in this division shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity only under such program, project, or activity must be under taken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.
That the transfer authority provided by this section shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 3rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron or perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8079. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8080. The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds from any available Department of the Navy appropriation to any available Navy ship construction appropriation for the purpose of liquidating necessary changes resulting from inflation, marked fluctuations, or rate adjustments provided in any ship construction program appropriated in law: Provided, That the Secretary may transfer not to exceed $100,000,000 under the authority provided in section 213(b), Public Law 104-182, for the purpose of making transfers to shipbuilding and conversion, or any subdivison of appropriations made in this division under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8081. Provided further, That the current National Intelligence shall include the budget exhibits identified in paragraphs (1) and (2) as described in the Department of Defense Financial Management System Appropriations Act of fiscal year 2012, and the Budget for the Fiscal Year 2013, the 101st Congress, First Session:

(1) A table for each appropriation with a budgetary account, including any fiscal year transfers and reductions, that allocates the funds appropriated under this division to programs, activities, and accounts covered by this division: Provided, That the report identified in subsection (c) of this section shall be available to reimburse the amounts specified as follows: $20,000,000 to fisher houses and suites pursuant to Appropriations, the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Defense, the Office of Management and Budget, the Defense Acquisition Workforce, and the Department of Defense, the Budget for the Fiscal Year 2013, the 101st Congress, First Session. (2) For research, development, test and evaluation projects requesting more than $5,000,000 in any fiscal year, the R-1, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program Development, Test and Evaluation Budget Item Justification; R-3, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Project Cost Analysis; and R-4, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program Schedule Profile.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8087. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army may use up to $25,000,000 of funds appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, Army in this division for real property maintenance and repair projects, and activities at Arlington National Cemetery.

SEC. 8088. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reforming and transferring authorities for the fiscal year 2013: Provided, That the report shall include—

(1) A table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President’s budget requests by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, and the fiscal year enacted levels.

(2) A table in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center and project; and

(3) An identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this division shall be available for transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8089. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $20,000,000 is available for transfer to the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: Provided, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this provision.

SEC. 8090. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit the budget to Congress by not later than 60 days after the President submits the budget to Congress, unless the Director of National Intelligence determines that the budget may be submitted later to Congress than 60 days after the President submits the budget to Congress.

SEC. 8091. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this division for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, and “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established in accordance with section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8094. Funds appropriated by this division for operations and maintenance in any fiscal year may be available for the purpose of making remittances to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with the report of the Select Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate.

SEC. 8095. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this division, shall, subject to paragraphs (b) and (c), make public the website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

S. 8096. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this division, the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds for the Joint Defense Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111–44, ‘‘Provided, That for purposes of section 170(b), the facility operations and construction costs of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Charlotte Regional Medical Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 708 of Public Law 110–417. Provided further, That the additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense–Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Committee on Finance of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

S. 8099. (a) In this section the term ‘‘conference’’ has the meaning given that term under section 170(b) of the Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(b) A grant or contract funded by amounts made available under this division may not be used to fund the cost of a conference that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose of the program under which the grant or contract was awarded.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Department of Defense may not sponsor or host a conference for which the cost to the Department is expected to be more than $100,000 using amounts made available under this division, unless the Deputy Secretary of Defense approves sponsoring or hosting the conference.

(c)(2)(A) Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Department of Defense may not sponsor or host a conference for which the cost to the Department is expected to be more than $500,000 using amounts made available under this division.

(c)(2)(B) ‘‘Contractor’’ means—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that dates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of $1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that dates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(c) The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition on subparagraph (a) if the Deputy Secretary determines that it is in the interest of national security to spend more than $500,000 using amounts made available under this division.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition under subparagraph (a) if the Deputy Secretary determines that it is in the interest of national security to spend more than $500,000 using amounts made available under this division, unless the Deputy Secretary of Defense approves sponsoring or hosting the conference.

Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating funds for this purpose, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

S. 8103. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States the ‘‘Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund’’. There is appropriated $2,382,100,000, for the ‘‘Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund’’ for transfers to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Army until September 30, 2014, ‘‘Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds from the ‘‘Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund’’ to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; research, development, test and evaluation; and procurement, only for the purposes of manning, operating, sustaining, equipping and modernizing the Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers CG–61, CG–64, CG–65, CG–66, CG–68, CG–73, and the Whidbey Island-class amphibious assault ships LSD–41 and LSD–46. ‘‘Provided further, That funds transferred shall be merged with and made available for the same period of time as the appropriation to which they are transferred: ‘‘Provided further, That the transfer authority provided herein shall be in addition to transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: ‘‘Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, not less than 30 days prior to making any transfers from the ‘‘Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund’’, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of such transfers.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

S. 8104. Of the amounts made available in this division under the heading ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’, there is appropriated $106,482,000, to be available until expended: ‘‘Provided, That such funds shall only be available to the Secretary of the Navy for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of 250 armored service vehicles or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

S. 8105. Of the funds appropriated for ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’, $106,482,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds, to remain available until expended, to assist the civilian population of Guam in response to the military buildup of Guam, for addressing the needs of the civilian water and sewage improvements: ‘‘Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating funds for this purpose, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

S. 8106. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be obligated or expended to pay a retired general or flag officer to serve as a senator or senator advising the Secretary of Defense unless such retired officer files a Standard Form 278 (or successor form consistent with the provisions under part 1764 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations) to the Office of Government Ethics.

S. 8101. Appropriations available in the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of 250 armored service vehicles or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.
That in making such funds available, the Office of Economic Adjustment or the Secretary of Education shall give priority consideration to those military installations with which the Secretary determines that the most serious capacity or facility condition deficiencies as determined by the Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That funds may not be made available unless the Secretary certifies that the Department of Defense-connected children’s greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 8105. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act to any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions, or to any other foreign country or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a report containing a description of the individual’s country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary of State certifies in writing that the individual has engaged in, and is a member of, the armed forces of the United States; and

SEC. 8106. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act to any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to any foreign country or entity unless the Secretary has provided written notice to Congress of the detainee’s transfer; and

SEC. 8106. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act to any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to any foreign country or entity unless the Secretary has provided written notice to Congress of the detainee’s transfer; and

SEC. 8107. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act to any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (b) or (c). (b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

SEC. 8107. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act to any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (b) or (c). (b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

SEC. 8108. None of the funds made available by this division may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony violation of federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the unaided tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8109. None of the funds made available by this division may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony violation of federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the unaided tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8110. The Secretary of the Air Force shall obligate and expend funds previously
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appropriated for the procurement of RQ-4B Global Hawk and C-27J Spartan aircraft for the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated.

S. 251 [Basis of Sense of the Senate that the next available capital warship of the U.S. Navy be named the USS ‘Ted Stevens’ to recognize the public service achievements, military service, and unyielding heroism and courage of the long-serving United States Senator for Alaska.]

TITLE IX
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WARMING

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Army”, $9,790,082,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Navy”, $896,625,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Marine Corps”, $1,626,356,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Military Personnel, Air Force”, $1,286,783,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Army”, $154,895,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Navy”, $10,262,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps”, $24,722,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Reserve Personnel, Air Force” $25,348,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Army”, $10,473,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Air Force”, $120,618,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, $30,578,256,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, $6,968,812,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, $1,108,360,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, $9,291,493,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, $8,274,052,000: Provided, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,750,000,000 to be available until September 30, 2014, shall be for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access, provided to United States military operations in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and post-operation Iraq border security related to the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided further, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense determines, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the office of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That the requirement under this subsection provide notification to the appropriate congressional committees shall not apply with respect to a reimbursement for access based on an international agreement: Provided further, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military operations in Afghanistan, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: Provided further, That such amount in this section is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve”, $25,477,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve”, $120,618,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, National Guard”, $382,448,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

(including transfer of funds)

For the “Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund”, $350,000,000, to remain available until
September 30, 2014: Provided, That such sums shall be available to the Secretary of Defense for infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall be available to the Secretary of State, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense jointly decide that a specific project will be undertaken in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WAPENS PROCUREMENT, NAVY
For an additional amount for “Weapons Procurement, Navy”, $284,356,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps”, $381,567,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY
For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Navy”, $98,882,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Army”, $284,356,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Army”, $67,951,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army”, $22,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $326,193,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, $2,284,190,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Navy”, $426,436,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND
For the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” account, $98,577,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of assisting the applicableTech. Transfers to or from, or obligations available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps”, $284,356,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, $381,567,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Air Force”, $34,350,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force”, $136,201,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Air Force”, $2,684,470,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE
For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $362,749,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND
For the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” account, $98,577,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of assisting the applicable
available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT
For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons and other procurements for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,000,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015: Provided, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, $42,357,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, $32,519,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $1,467,894,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS
For an additional amount for “Defense Working Capital Funds”, $1,467,894,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM
For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, $993,898,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DRUG INTERDiction AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE
For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense”, $469,025,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFRAUT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For the “Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defраut Fund”, $1,514,114,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defраut Fund, in consultation with the Congress, to develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personal and funds to assist United States forces in the detection, location, identification, and neutralization of improvised explosive devices: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: Provided further, That not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE
SEC. 9001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
SEC. 9002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $1,000,000,000 between the appropriations or funds otherwise made available for the Department of Defense in this title: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority provided in this section: Provided further, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the limitations as set forth in the authority provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, 2013.
and seafall, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

S. Rept. 9097. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

S. 9006. None of the funds made available in this division may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code).


(4) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice concerning any proposed or actual purchase of any military equipment exceeding $250,000.

Mr. KING) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill approved by the Senate by the vote of 83 to 17, consisting of the following:

SEC. 9007. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase or maintain any other provision of law, to support United States Government transition activities in Iraq by funding the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and other security, and facilities renovation and construction: Provided, That the extent authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 the operations and activities that may be carried out by the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, include assisting Iraqi Ministry of Defense personnel to address gaps in capability of such personnel to manage defense-related institutions and integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and counter-terrorism: Provided further, That not later than October 30, 2012, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for transitioning any such training and assisting operations that are needed after the end of fiscal year 2013, to existing or new contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services consistent with the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.): Provided further, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq at each site where such operations and activities will be conducted during fiscal year 2013.

S. 9013. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: Provided, That such amounts are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: ‘‘Other Procurement, Army, 2012’’: $2,076,000,000; ‘‘Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund, 2012 and 2013’’: $400,000,000; ‘‘Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2012 and 2013’’: $2,083,000,000; ‘‘Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, 2012 and 2013’’: $1,000,000,000; ‘‘Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, 2012 and 2013’’: $400,000,000.

This division may be cited as the ‘‘Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013’’.

S. 24. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. King) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 388, to appropriately limit sequestration, to eliminate tax loopholes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

DIVISION B—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise provided for, for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for Members of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $30,157,392,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for Members of the Navy on active duty, (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for Members of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $29,589,469,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for Members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $12,529,469,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for Members of the Air Force on active duty (except except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for Members of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,053,629,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 1011, 1032, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, and for the Department of Defense on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with
performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,875,598,000.

TITLE II
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $14,804,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $35,804,145,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $5,894,962,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $7,899,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $34,983,793,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities at the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $31,331,839,000: Provided, That not more than $30,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense (the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, or the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)) in connection with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That the transfers provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,140,508,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,266,962,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,227,382,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units described in the preceding proviso: Provided, That none of the funds authorized by law for the operation of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $38,044,951,000; Provided further, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $272,285,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air National Guard; support of National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders in the execution of their duties as authorized by law; and expenses authorized by law for the operation of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $44,509,325,000: Provided, That none of the funds authorized by law for the operation of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $3,140,508,000; Provided further, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $272,285,000.
things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supply- ing and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies, equipment, and materials; and adjustment of claims for services performed by National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bu- reau, $6,493,155,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $13,516,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $335,921,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that the funds required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred; Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $310,594,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred; Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORRESTER-USED DEFENSE WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $11,133,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred; Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMED FORCES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $287,243,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred; Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORRESTER-USED DEFENSE WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $3,303,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred; Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this division.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Hu- manitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid pro- gram (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $198,759,000, to re- main available until September 30, 2014.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries out- side of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe storage, control, and accounting of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weap- on-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demili- tration of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military con- tacts, $519,111,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $720,000,000.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc- tion, modification, and modernization of air- craft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary thereof, and such lands and interests therein, may be ac- quired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government, and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,414,061,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc- tion, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary thereof, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be ac- quired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government, and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,429,665,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc- tion, modification, and modernization of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, including ord- nance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary there- for, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government, and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,733,773,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, produc- tion, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ordnance and ammunition facili- ties, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be ac- quired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement
and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,624,380,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY**

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment; repair of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $16,936,358,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY**

For procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment; repair of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $16,936,358,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY**

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories thereof; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $16,936,358,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS**

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and associated equipment and items for the Department of the Navy, afloat and ashore, and acquisition of land to support the construction, procurement, and production of such equipment and items, $1,980,209,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS**

For expenses necessary for the procurement, modification, and modernization of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories thereof; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, $17,908,348,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**CONVERSION, NAVY**

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants; Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the construction, expansion, operation, and management of such plants, including the land necessary therefor, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $11,260,646,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment and items; spare parts and accessories thereof, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the construction, expansion, operation, and management of such plants, including the land necessary therefor, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $4,193,276,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE**

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of ammunition, and associated equipment and items for the Department of the Air Force, afloat and ashore, and acquisition of land to support the construction, procurement, and production of such equipment and items, $1,980,209,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and control equipment, electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts thereof, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the construction, expansion, operation, and management of such plants, including the land necessary therefor, such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants, $199,648,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE**

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts thereof not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $17,908,348,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**Air Force**

For construction, procurement, and modification of equipment for the air force, $1,334,448,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

**Missile**

For expenses necessary for the procurement, production, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment and items; spare parts and accessories thereof, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the construction, expansion, operation, and management of such plants, including the land necessary therefor, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $11,260,646,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.
therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $4,592,586,000, to remain available for obliga-
tion until September 30, 2015.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES
For activities by the Department of De-
fense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2099), $189,189,000, to remain available until ex- pended.

TITLE IV
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY
For expenses necessary for basic and ap-
plied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, re-
habilitation, lease, and operation of facili-
ties and equipment, $8,427,588,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY
For expenses necessary for basic and ap-
plied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, re-
habilitation, lease, and operation of facili-
ties and equipment, $16,646,307,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014: Provided, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces: Provided further, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE
For expenses necessary for basic and ap-
plied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, re-
habilitation, lease, and operation of facili-
ties and equipment, $25,371,206,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research project; or activities designated and or-
dered by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $18,419,129,000, to remain available for obliga-
tion until September 30, 2014: Provided, That the funds made available in this para-
graph, $200,000,000 for the Defense Rapid In-
novation Program Fund, may only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to in-
clude program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation, proof of concept demonstra-
tion; engineering, testing, and valida-
tion; and transition to full-scale production: Provided further, That the Secretary of De-
fense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation to accomplish the pur-
pose provided herein: Provided further, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the De-
partment of Defense: Provided further, That the Secretary shall not, fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evalu-
ation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, produc-
tion decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $223,788,000, to remain available for obligation until Sep-
tember 30, 2014.

TITLE V
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND
For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,516,181,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND
For National Defense Sealift Fund pro-
grams, projects, and activities, and for ex-

denses of the National Defense Reserve 
Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve emergency needs of the United States, $697,846,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used in contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the fol-
lowing major components unless such com-
ponents are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for containers: Provided fur-
ther, That the exercise of an option in a con-
tract awarded through the obligation of pre-
viously appropriated funds shall not be con-
sidered to be the award of a new contract: Provided further, That the Secretary of the 
military department responsible for such 
procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by 
certifying in writing to the Committees on 
Appropriations of the House of Representa-
tives and the Senate that adequate domestic 
supplies are not available to meet Depart-
ment of Defense requirements; for emergen-
ty Preparedness Program to assist State 
and local governments; of which $1,026,977,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, for procurement; of which $1,823,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emer-
gency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $627,705,000 shall only be for the Assembling Chemical Weapons Al-
ternatives (ACWA) program.

DRUG INTERDICTIO N AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For drug interdiction and counter-drug ac-
tivities of the Department of Defense, for 
transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military per-
sations of the reserve forces; remaining under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and main-
tenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, $1,138,283,000: Provided, That the funds appro-
priated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided there-
in, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this head-
ing is in addition to any other transfer au-
 thority contained elsewhere in this division.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $332,921,000, of which $331,921,000 shall be for operation and main-
tenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergency temporary em-
ployees expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and pay-
ments may be made on the Inspector Gen-
eral's certification that the funds are neces-
sary for emergency temporary military purposes; of which $1,000,000, to re-
main available until September 30, 2015, shall be for procurement.

TITLE VII
RELATED AGENCIES
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND
For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund to maintain the funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Dis-
ability System, $531,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $542,346,000.

TITLE VIII
GENERAL PROVISIONS
SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this division shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not author-
ing the Congress.
SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of
compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: Provided, That salary increases granted by the President by order, as indicated by the projections of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 3332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: Provided, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components of the Armed Forces or any training center of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8006. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the advice and consent of the Senate, transfer not to exceed $5,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this division, to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations, if appropriate, and the fiscal year ending on the following day, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred to the extent that such authority is deeded by Congress: Provided further, That such authority may be used to transfer funds that may be transferred under this section (a) occur between appropriation accounts in the Department of Defense, if appropriate, and the fiscal year ending on the following day, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 90 days after enactment of this division, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2013: Provided, That the report shall include—

1. a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President’s budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;
2. a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and
3. an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this division, none of the funds provided in this division shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense, except to the extent that such balances are required to be used for the operation and maintenance of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps, may be maintained in only such accounts as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into account offsetting collections and transfers.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this division may be used for a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this division: Provided further, That the execution of a multiyear procurement contract for any aircraft shall not be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for procurement beyond advance procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year is denied; and, in the case of a contract for procurements of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for procurement beyond advance procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year is denied.

(c) The contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funds provided in this division.

(d) The contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

(e) Appropriations in title III of this division may be used for a multiyear procurement contract as follows:

(1) F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G aircraft; up to 10 DDG–51 Arleigh Burke class Flight IIA guided missile destroyers, as well as the AEGIS Weapon Systems, MK 41 Vertical Launching Systems, and Commercial Broadband Satellite Systems associated with those vessels; SSN–774 Virginia class submarine and government-furnished equipment; CH–47 Chinook helicopter; and V–22 Osprey aircraft variants.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may employ temporary fiscal funding for any Virginia class submarines and government-furnished equipment associated with the Virginia class submarines to be procured during fiscal years 2014 through 2018 if the Secretary of Defense:

(1) determines that such an approach will permit the Navy to procure an additional Virginia class submarine in fiscal year 2014; and

(2) intends to use the funding for that purpose.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated to support the operation of the United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10,
United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 2(b) of title 50 of the United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: Provided, That the funds available for the Department of Defense Defense Media Activity shall not be used to pay the salary of employees of that entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

SEC. 8020. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2560(c) of title 10, United States Code, and the Department is authorized to accept contributions, including the receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8022. (a) Of the funds made available in this division, not less than $28,454,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $2,935,000 shall be available from “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counterdrug activities, and drug construction activities involving youth programs;

(2) $9,298,000 shall be available from “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”; and

(3) $922,000 shall be available from “Other Procurement, Air Force” for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should work to reimburse the Civil Air Patrol for expenses incurred by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8023. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this division are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Ad Hoc Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: Provided, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Travel Regulation, when engaged in the performance of duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department for any separate fiscal year shall be used for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any separate fiscal year 2013 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(e) This section shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP) of the Department of Defense.

(f) The Secretary of the Defense shall, with the submission of the department’s fiscal year 2014 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be authorized for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.
S. 8024. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this division shall be used to procure carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or any Fort in the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: Provided, That these procurement restrictions do not apply to all Federal Class 9615, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of Defense shall review, in accordance with rule 5(d)(3) of the rules of the Senate, the applicability of the Buy American Act to all contracts for the acquisition of components and other Defense-related articles, in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of Defense, for the purpose of purchasing military hardware and equipment for the Armed Forces of the United States from domestic suppliers.

S. 8028. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated in title 10, United States Code, for the warrant and an actuarial valuation of the annuity and the cost of the annuity for the fiscal year and for transfers to the United States Government for the fiscal year and for transfers to the United States Government or approved by the Secretary of Defense under section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, shall be used for the following purposes:

(a) For the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or
(b) The purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial or technical capability and to insulate a specific concern is given financial support:

S. 8034. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense in the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide," less than $25,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, or to support the Buy American Act with respect to such products produced in the United States that are covered by the Buy American Act.

S. 8036. None of the funds appropriated by this division shall be used to procure small quantities of military equipment and supplies for the purpose of supporting studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on any contract or blanket purchase order for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Operations Fund during fiscal year 2013, or if such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

S. 8038. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2013. Such report shall be made available in accordance with the Buy American Act, for the purpose of identifying and requiring the reimbursement of the costs of any procurement determination that was chargeable to the Department of Defense under the Buy American Act: Provided further, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for collection of information or support of the procurement processes, and for covert action programs authorized by the President shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

S. 8039. None of the funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development, or for covert action programs authorized by the President may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence information systems and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the command components.

S. 8043. None of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense in the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide," less than $25,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, or to support the Buy American Act with respect to such products produced in the United States that are covered by the Buy American Act.

S. 8046. None of the funds appropriated by this division shall be used to procure small quantities of military equipment and supplies for the purpose of supporting studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on any contract or blanket purchase order for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Operations Fund during fiscal year 2013, or if such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

S. 8048. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2013. Such report shall be made available in accordance with the Buy American Act, for the purpose of identifying and requiring the reimbursement of the costs of any procurement determination that was chargeable to the Department of Defense under the Buy American Act: Provided further, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for collection of information or support of the procurement processes, and for covert action programs authorized by the President shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

S. 8049. None of the funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development, or for covert action programs authorized by the President may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence information systems and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the command components.

S. 8053. None of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense in the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide," less than $25,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, or to support the Buy American Act with respect to such products produced in the United States that are covered by the Buy American Act.

S. 8056. None of the funds appropriated by this division shall be used to procure small quantities of military equipment and supplies for the purpose of supporting studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on any contract or blanket purchase order for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Operations Fund during fiscal year 2013, or if such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

S. 8058. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2013. Such report shall be made available in accordance with the Buy American Act, for the purpose of identifying and requiring the reimbursement of the costs of any procurement determination that was chargeable to the Department of Defense under the Buy American Act: Provided further, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for collection of information or support of the procurement processes, and for covert action programs authorized by the President shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

S. 8059. None of the funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development, or for covert action programs authorized by the President may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence information systems and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the command components.
Provided. That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts which a civil official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of aircraft.

S. 8037. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this division may be used—

(1) to operate an operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from the operating agency if the member or employee’s place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department or agency.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the Defense Programs;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other threats.

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense.

S. 8038. None of the funds made available in this division may be used to approve or license the sale of the F-22A advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government: Provided, That the Department of Defense may conduct or participate in studies, research, design and other activities to define and develop a future export version of the F-22A that protects classified and sensitive information, technologies and U.S. warfighting capabilities.

S. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this division shall be made available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act by the Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that the conversion will result in performance levels greater than or equal to levels of the Javits-Wagner-O’Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code) or a Federal Acquisition Regulation implementing the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15));

(3) the award of contract is in the interest of the national defense.

(b) None of the funds appropriated in this division may be used to award an acquisition contract under the authority of the Secretary of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 69 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a)(1), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O’Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with section 107 of title 29, United States Code;

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 816 of title 25, United States Code, for competitive or out sourcing of commercial activities to carry out the provisions of the American Indian Housing Act (25 U.S.C. 292).

SEC. 8036. None of the funds made available in this division may be used for the competition or outsourcing of biometric activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program.

SEC. 8037. None of the funds made available in this division may be used to award any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in this division, none shall be made available to the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 69 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds appropriated in this division may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated in this section shall be made available to the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 69 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 8043. None of the funds appropriated in this division may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8044. None of the funds available in this division may be used to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees unless—

(a) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(b) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(c) (1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;
domestic origin: Provided, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of "commercial items", as defined by section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, except that the restriction shall not apply to the purchase of end items.

SEC. 8049. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available in this Act for any other international peacemaking or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and (b) any other international peacemaking, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation; (c) A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8050. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor for the same or similar work;

(2) such bonus is part of restructing costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this division under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” may be transferred to appropriations available for the payment of overtime, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel with salaries and for allowances, and for services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8052. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated obligation, a current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account may be obligated or charged in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

SEC. 8053. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a case-by-case basis to meet the needs of such an entity, if the National Guard Bureau determines that the use of equipment is in the best interest of the National Guard.

SEC. 8054. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds made available in this Act for funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(b) The total amount charged to such an appropriation account may not exceed the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

SEC. 8055. None of the funds appropriated in this Act for any other international peacemaking or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, or any other international peacemaking, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation; (c) A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8056. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided by this Act if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into under section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into or on after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation on foreign support in the form of military bases, and the Secretary of Defense shall take such action as is necessary to ensure that the United States provides all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to funding any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.
the congressional defense committees de-
scribing the extraordinary circumstances,
the purpose and duration of the training pro-
gram, the United States forces and the for-
eign involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the war.

S. 8056. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated for or expended for the purposes of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that are used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

S. 8069. Notwithstanding any other provi-
sion of law, the Secretary of Defense may waive the restrictions of section (d) of title 32, United States Code, on the use of appropriated funds to transfer to the Department of Energy or the National Nuclear Security Administration.

S. 8060. The Secretary of Defense may waive a provision that requires the entity to demilitarize the project, the planned acquisition of an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture, and $4,365,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range ground and aerial-based suite.

S. 8066. The amounts appropriated in this division shall be used to support the construction of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2013.

S. 8087. Of the amounts appropriated in this division under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", $372,573,000 shall be available until September 30, 2013, for the construction of a new amphibious transport dock ship to be named after the admiral who served as the Chief of Naval Operations during World War II, to be used for the purpose of conducting amphibious operations and to support the deployment of United States forces.

S. 8068. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $280,000,000 from funds available under "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" may be transferred to the Department of Energy or the National Nuclear Security Administration for the construction of a new nuclear weapons production facility.

S. 8067. Of the amounts appropriated in this division under the heading "Procure ment, Defense-Wide" and "Research, Developpment, Test and Evaluation," $199,679,000 shall be made available for the procurement of Iron Dome defense system to counter shortrange rocket threats.

S. 8064. The Secretary of Defense may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary; Provided, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense may, not to exceed $200,000,000 from funds available under "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", $156,685,000; and

S. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this division under the heading "Procure ment, Defense-Wide" and "Research, Developpment, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", $199,679,000 shall be made available for the support of research and development activities conducted by defense agencies for the development of new technologies, including technologies for the acquisition of critical materials and technologies.

S. 8053. None of the funds appropriated in this division under the heading "Procure ment, Defense-Wide" and "Research, Developpment, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", $199,679,000 shall be made available for the support of research and development activities conducted by defense agencies for the development of new technologies, including technologies for the acquisition of critical materials and technologies.
(3) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2009-2013”: CVN Refueling Overhauls Program $135,000,000, 000.

SEC. 8072. Funds appropriated by this division, and made available by the transfer of funds in this division, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2013 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

SEC. 8073. None of the funds provided in this division shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8074. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2014 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, and the Procurement accounts. These budget documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: Provided further, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall include budget exhibits in OP-3 and OP-32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds in this division may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement, or operational costs of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8076. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this division, $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, he shall make grants in the amount specified as follows: $10,000,000 to the United Service Organizations.

SEC. 8077. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this division shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this division at the Air Force Reserve. The Air Force Reserve shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-flying season.

SEC. 8078. None of the funds provided in this division shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information is lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: Provided, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8079. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be ordered to active duty. Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to deploy the member to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8080. The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds from any available Department of the Navy appropriation to any available Navy ship construction appropriation for the purpose of liquidating necessary changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuations, or rate adjustments for any ship construction program appropriated in law: Provided, That the Secretary may transfer, after the amount appropriated for ship construction programs and facilities for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system. Provided further, That the Secretary may not transfer any funds under the authority of paragraph (1) of this section without notifying the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8081. For purposes of section 7108 of title 41, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy” that is not closed at the time reimbursement is made shall be available to reimburse the Judgment Fund and shall be considered for the same purposes as any subdivision under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy” appropriations in the current fiscal year or any prior fiscal year.

SEC. 8082. None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUA V) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for research and development of the MQ-1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8083. Up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Navy” may be made available for transfer to the Command for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation operations such as humanitarian assistance, medical, and personnel costs of training and exercising foreign security forces: Provided, That funds made available for this purpose may be obligated, combined, and charged to accounts of any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8084. Up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this division for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

SEC. 8085. Provided further, That the Secretary may transfer funds appropriated under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy” approved for any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

(TITLE V) NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

SEC. 8086. The National Intelligence program shall include the budget exhibits identified in paragraphs (1) and (2) as described in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation with the congressional budget justification books:

(1) For procurement programs requesting more than $10,000,000 in any fiscal year, the R–1, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Budget Item Justification; R–2, Research and Development, Test and Evaluation Budget Item Justification; R–3, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Project Cost Analysis; and R–4, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program Schedule Profile.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8087. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army may use up to $25,000,000 of funds appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, Army in this division for real property maintenance and repair projects and activities at Arlington National Cemetery.

SEC. 8088. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees establishing the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2013: Provided, That the report shall include:

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President’s budget request, adjustments made by Congress, additions due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center and project; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this division shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8089. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $30,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: Provided, That funds transferred under this provision shall be made available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided
further, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this provision.

S. 8096. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress an annual report, at or about the time that the President’s budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and the National Intelligence Program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

S. 8097. Except as provided in this section, the term "congressional intelligence committees" means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.


SEC. 8099. Funds appropriated by this division for operation and maintenance may be available for the purpose of making remittances to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development program in accordance with the requirements of section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

S. 8096. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this division shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both the House of Representatives and the Senate a report, within 15 days of the appropriation, describing the nature and estimated costs of any new or significantly expanded program of independent contractors that may not be evidenced in a central fund established under section 2861 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract.

(c) The restrictions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor's or subcontractor's agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a cost reimbursement contract.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and, for the contract or subcontract term selected, shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination made under this section not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

S. 8097. None of the funds made available under this division may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries.

SEC. 8100. Funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this division, up to $139,204,000, shall be available for transfers to the Defense Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

S. 8097. (a) In this section the term "conference" has the meaning given that term under section 308-3.1 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor.

(b) A grant or contract funded by amounts made available under this division may not be used for the purpose of defraying the cost of a conference that is not directly and programatically related to the purpose of the program under which the grant or contract was awarded.

S. 8098. Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Department of Defense may not sponsor or host a conference for which the cost to the Department is expected to be more than $100,000 using amounts made available under this division, unless the Deputy Secretary of Defense approves sponsoring or hosting the conference.

S. 8097. (2) (A) The Deputy Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition under subparagraph (B) or paragraph (3), the Department of Defense approves sponsoring or hosting the conference.

(B) The Deputy Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of this subsection if the Deputy Secretary determines that it is in the interest of national security to spend more than $500,000 on a conference.

S. 8097. For purposes of a conference sponsored or hosted by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Inspector General shall discharge the authorities and responsibilities of the Deputy Secretary of Defense under this subsection.

S. 8097. (a) Not later than October 31, 2013, the Deputy Secretary of Defense shall provide a publicly available report of all Department- sponsored or co-sponsored conferences during fiscal year 2013 where the cost to the Department is more than $100,000 using amounts made available under this division, which—

(1) shall include, for each such conference—

(A) the cost of the conference to the Department of Defense;

(B) the location of the conference;

(C) the date of the conference;

(D) a brief explanation of how the conference advanced the mission of the Department of Defense;

(E) the total number of individuals whose travel expenses or other conference expenses were paid by the Department of Defense; and

(F) any waiver made under subsection (c)(2)(B).

(2) shall not include any confidential or similarly sensitive information.

S. 8097. (b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be obligated or expended to pay a retired general or flag officer to serve as a special assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense unless such retired officer files a Standard Form 278 (successor form concerning public financial disclosure under part 2634 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations) to the Office of Government Ethics.

S. 8098. Funds appropriated for operation and maintenance in the Commonwealth of Virginia in this division, up to $250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.
Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds, to remain available until September 30, 2013, for the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund". There is appropriated $2,382,100,000, for the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund" to remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds from the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund" to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; research, development, test and evaluation; and procurement, only for the purpose of equipping and modernizing the Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers CG-63, CG-64, CG-65, CG-66, CG-68, CG-69, CG-73, and the Whidbey Island-class dock landing ships LSD-41 and LSD-46: Provided further, That funds transferred shall be merged with and be available until expended: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided herein shall not be available for the same purposes and for funds transferred shall be merged with and available until expended: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds from the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund", notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8103. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund". There is appropriated $2,382,100,000, for the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund" to remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds from the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund" to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; research, development, test and evaluation; and procurement, only for the purpose of equipping and modernizing the Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers CG-63, CG-64, CG-65, CG-66, CG-68, CG-69, CG-73, and the Whidbey Island-class dock landing ships LSD-41 and LSD-46: Provided further, That funds transferred shall be merged with and be available until expended: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided herein shall not be available for the same purposes and for funds transferred shall be merged with and available until expended: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds from the "Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund", notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8104. Of the amounts made available in this division under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", there is appropriated $31,000,000, to be available until expended: Provided, That such funds shall only be available to the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, or for transfer to the Secretary of Education, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, or supplement other Federal funds to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations in order to address capacity or facility condition deficiencies at such schools: Provided further, That in making such funds available, the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Secretary of Education shall give priority consideration to those military installations with schools having the most serious capacity or facility condition deficiencies as determined by the Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That funds may not be made available for a school unless its enrollment of Department of Defense dependents is greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 8105. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense that—

(A) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(B) maintains control over each detention facility in which the individual is to be detained so that the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(C) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(D) has taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take effective action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(E) has taken or agreed to take such actions as are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage in or reengage in any terrorist activity; and

(F) has agreed to share with the United States any information that—

(i) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(ii) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies; and

includes an assessment, in classified or unclassified form, of the capacity, willingness, and past practices (if applicable) of the foreign country or entity in relation to the Secretary's certifications:

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantánamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to such foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in terrorist activity;

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantánamo to effectively—

(A) an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance); or

(B) a pre-trial agreement entered in a military commission case prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.
(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) The term ‘foreign terrorist organization’ means an organization so designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

SEC. 8107. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, or any possession to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is not—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 8108. None of the funds made available by this division may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability existed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8109. None of the funds made available by this division may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency was aware of the responsibility for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8110. The Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize and expend funds previously appropriated for the procurement of RQ-4B Global Hawk and C-27J Spartan aircraft for the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated.

SEC. 8111. It is the Sense of the Senate that the next available capital warship of the U.S. Navy be named the USS Ted Stevens to recognize the public service achievements, military service sacrifice, and undaunted heroism and courage of the long-serving United States Senator for Alaska.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/DEFENSE-WIDE

MILITARY PERSONNEL

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Army”, $353,804,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Air Force”, $22,744,000: Provided, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concur-

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Navy”, $27,351,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, $790,062,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, $1,750,000,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, $3,004,000,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS


OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, $1,750,000,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, $8,274,052,000: Provided, That the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,750,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access, provided to United States military operations in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and post-operation Iraq border security related to the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq, as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and Provided further, That the requirement under this heading to provide notification to the appropriate congressional committees shall not apply with respect to a reimbursement for access based on an international agreement: Provided further, That the funds may be used by the Secretary for those purposes of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loans such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military operations in Afghanistan, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided by this paragraph: Provided further, That such amount in this section is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve”, $154,537,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve”, $25,477,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCES RESERVE
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Forces Reserve”, $120,618,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, $382,418,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, $19,975,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND
For the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund”, $550,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such sums shall be available to the Secretary of Defense for infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall be undertaken by the Secretary of State, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense jointly decide that a specific project will be undertaken by the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the infrastructure referred to in the preceding proviso is in support of the counterinsurgency strategy, which may require funding for facility and infrastructure projects, including, but not limited to, construction, operation, and transportation projects and related maintenance and sustainment costs: Provided further, That the authority to undertake such infrastructure projects is in support of any other authorities or activities provided to provide assistance to foreign nations: Provided further, That any projects funded under this heading shall be jointly formulated and concurred in by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That funds may be transferred to the Department of State for undertaking projects, which funds shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available any funds contributed in accordance with the provisions of any such Act: Provided further, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Secretary of State to transfer funds: Provided further, That any unexpended funds transferred to the Secretary of State under this authority shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States if the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, determines that the project cannot be implemented for any reason, or that the project no longer supports the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan: Provided further, That any funds returned to the Secretary of Defense under the previous proviso shall be available for use under this appropriation and shall be treated in the same manner as funds not transferred to the Secretary of State: Provided further, That the foregoing purpose is provided herein to the Secretary of State in accordance with section 655(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers to or from, or obligations from the Fund, notify the appropriate committee of Congress in writing of the details of any such transfers or obligations: Provided further, That the “appropriate committees of Congress” are the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND
For the “Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund”, $350,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such sums shall be available to the Secretary of Defense for infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall be undertaken by the Secretary of State, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense jointly decide that a specific project will be undertaken by the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the infrastructure referred to in the preceding proviso is in support of the counterinsurgency strategy, which may require funding for facility and infrastructure projects, including, but not limited to, construction, operation, and transportation projects and related maintenance and sustainment costs: Provided further, That the authority to undertake such infrastructure projects is in support of any other authorities or activities provided to provide assistance to foreign nations: Provided further, That any projects funded under this heading shall be jointly formulated and concurred in by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That funds may be transferred to the Department of State for undertaking projects, which funds shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available any funds contributed in accordance with the provisions of any such Act: Provided further, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Secretary of State to transfer funds: Provided further, That any unexpended funds transferred to the Secretary of State under this authority shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States if the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, determines that the project cannot be implemented for any reason, or that the project no longer supports the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan: Provided further, That any funds returned to the Secretary of Defense under the previous proviso shall be available for use under this appropriation and shall be treated in the same manner as funds not transferred to the Secretary of State: Provided further, That the foregoing purpose is provided herein to the Secretary of State in accordance with section 655(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers to or from, or obligations from the Fund, notify the appropriate committee of Congress in writing of the details of any such transfers or obligations: Provided further, That the “appropriate committees of Congress” are the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Army”, $1,140,294,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Army”, $67,951,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehi- cles, Army”, $15,222,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $262,190,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY
For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, $2,284,190,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY
For an additional amount for “Weapons Procurement, Navy”, $436,436,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS
For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine
Corps’$, $2,824,356,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY**

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Navy”, $98,892,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS**

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Marine Corps”, $865,977,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, $9,965,327,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Air Force”, $34,350,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE**

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force”, $116,203,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Air Force”, $2,684,470,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE**

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $382,749,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT**

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,000,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015: Provided, That the Chief of National Guard and Reserve components may, later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committee the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY**

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, $42,297,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY**

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, $92,519,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE**

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, $35,130,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS**

**DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM**

For an additional amount for “Defense Working Capital Funds”, $1,467,864,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE**

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $122,387,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONS**

For an additional amount for “Research and Development Operations”, $1,514,114,000, to remain available in the Department of Defense until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE**


**DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM**

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, $993,898,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE**

For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense”, $469,025,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**JOINT IMPROVED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DETECTION FUND**

For the “Joint Improved Explosive Device Detection Fund”, $5,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: Provided, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improved Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, and personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided here-in to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: Provided further, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees of the details of any such transfer: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL**

For an additional amount for the “Office of the Inspector General”, $35,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE**

SEC. 9001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated otherwise made available in the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2013.

**INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS**

SEC. 9002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $1,000,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: Provided further, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013.

SEC. 9003. Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, “Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund”, or the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” provided in this division and executed in the fiscal year 2013 and any over-seas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: Provided, That for the purpose of this section and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.
S. 1070

S. 9004. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of $75,000 per vehicle; and (b) heavy and light construction equipment, aircraft, the personal property of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

S. 9005. Not to exceed $200,000,000 of the amount appropriated in this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Army” may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small-scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: Provided, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed $20,000,000: Provided further, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year in which funds are made available pursuant to this section the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: Provided further, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commodity, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander’s Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: Provided further, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to this authority in this section for any project with a total anticipated cost for completion of $5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for the country in which it is to be carried out.

S. 9006. Funds available in this title may be used for operations and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

S. 9007. Funds made available in this title for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Operation and Maintenance, Army may be used for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish or maintain a military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

S. 9009. None of the funds provided in this section for any project with a total anticipated cost of $5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the sustainment of the activities and maintenance or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance or the project, including the agreement with the contractor or third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance.

S. 9010. Funds made available in this title for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Operation and Maintenance, Army may be used in the acquisition of defense equipment and other property or services for forces engaged in Operation Enduring Freedom: Provided, That, upon certification by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations, any funds made available in this title for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Operation and Maintenance, Army may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than $500,000: Provided further, That, upon certification by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations, any funds made available in this title for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Operation and Maintenance, Army may be used in the acquisition of defense equipment and other property or services for forces engaged in Operation Enduring Freedom: Provided, That the AROC has convened and approved a plan for the sustainment of the activities and maintenance or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance or the project, including the agreement with the contractor or third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance.

S. 9011. Funds made available in this title for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Operation and Maintenance, Army may be used in the acquisition of defense equipment and other property or services for forces engaged in Operation Enduring Freedom: Provided, That the AROC has convened and approved a plan for the sustainment of the activities and maintenance or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance.

S. 9012. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” up to $980,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of any other provision of law, to support United States Army forces in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction.
Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 28, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Addressing FHI’s Financial Condition and Program Challenges, Part II.”

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 28, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Delivery System Reform: Progress Report from CMS.”

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 28, 2013, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 28, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 28, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON INTelligence

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 28, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I see our majority leader on the floor. I will yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate very much my friend from Iowa allowing me to proceed. I would just note for the record that I have only had two U.S. Senators visit me in my home in Searchlight. He is one of them.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 4, 2013, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 15 and 16; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. RES. 64

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, March 5, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, S. Res. 64; that the only amendment in order in the resolution be a Paul amendment striking provisions relative to the National Security Working Group; that there be up to 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form on the Paul amendment; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote on the Paul amendment; that upon disposition of the Paul amendment, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the resolution, as amended, if any.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appoints the following Senator as a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 112th Congress: the Honorable ROGER WICKER of Mississippi.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate complete its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 4, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the journal of proceedings be approved and the previous question be ordered on the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, there will be up to two rolloff calls on confirmation of the Chen and Paull nominations by both U.S. district judge nominees for New York.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Madam President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that following the statement of the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, the Senate adjourn under the previous order.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, we are now on the eve of the so-called sequester. Tomorrow, March 1, Federal agencies will begin making $85 billion in arbitrary, destructive budget cuts—cuts that economists tell us will damage our fragile economy and cost nearly 1 million jobs. This is a shame and it is shameful. This is yet another self-inflicted wound to our economy, and it is completely unnecessary.

For months, President Obama and Democrats in Congress have urged Republicans to join with us in negotiating a balanced package of spending cuts and revenue increases to head off this sequester. Regrettably, we have run up against the same old response from our Republican colleagues: obstruction, obstruction, obstruction—an adamant refusal to compromise. They reject the very idea of a balanced approach, insisting that all deficit reduction must come exclusively from cuts to spending and investment. Since they have not gotten their way, they are now willing to allow all the destructive impacts of the sequester to happen.

This is because it really is breathtaking. Republicans would rather allow our economy to lose up to a million jobs than to close a tax loophole that pays companies to move American jobs to foreign countries. They would rather risk jolting the economy back into recession than to close a tax loophole that allows hedge fund managers making hundreds of millions of dollars a year to pay a lower tax rate than middle-class families. It really is breathtaking.

I am deeply concerned about the arbitrary cuts to programs that undergird the middle class in this country—everything from medical research to...
education to food and drug safety. Earlier this week, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Francis Collins, warned that the sequester would slash $1.6 billion from NIH's budget, directly damaging ongoing research into cancer, Alzheimer's, and other diseases.

Funding for special education would also suffer deep cuts, eliminating Federal support for more than 7,200 teachers, aides, and other staff who support our students with disabilities.

Funding for food safety would be severely impacted, resulting in thousands of fewer inspections, a slowdown in meat processing, costing jobs and endangering the safety of the public. The Food Safety and Inspection Service may have to furlough all employees for approximately 2 weeks, which could close down or severely restrict meatpacking plants around the country.

The list of destructive budget cuts goes on and on, and what many people may not understand is that these are just the latest cuts to spending and investment.

Over the past 2 years, the President and Congress have already agreed to $4 trillion in spending cuts, all from the discretionary side of the budget. These have been very dramatic spending reductions.

As I said earlier today, when we hear the Speaker of the House say: Well, let me think about that; I have to go to the floor, at the eleventh hour, to plead one final time for a compromise and common sense from Republicans. Yes, I am here to plead for some common sense, some compromise from Republican leadership. What we need is an approach to the discretionary spending cuts that ensures the vast majority of the American people, 60, 70 percent, believe we should have a balanced approach, both in revenues and in cutting spending.

We have reached out our hand in an effort to shake hands with the Republicans. They have not reciprocated by reaching out their hand to close the deal.

It is still possible, but it is only possible if the other side is willing to make some compromises. Time is short. I urge colleagues to put ideology and this partisanship aside, stop this sequester, tackle these budget deficits in a way that allows us to invest in a growing economy and a stronger middle class.

A lot of people say if the sequester kicks in, people aren't going to feel it right away. Well, maybe not tomorrow night, maybe not even Saturday or Sunday. We will begin next week, when the Food Safety and Inspection Service starts furloughing people and we begin fewer inspections and maybe the week after that when our air traffic
controllers begin to be furloughed because they don’t have enough money and air traffic begins to slow down in New York and Chicago and Washington, DC, and Atlanta.

It is always true that in times such as these, when we have these kinds of crises facing us, who gets hurt first and the most are the people at the bottom rung of the ladder, kids with disabilities, families who need some heating assistance in the middle of the winter, elderly people who may need some Meals On Wheels delivered to their homes.

These are always the people who get hit first and the hardest. We can’t forget our societal obligations as a Congress to make sure their needs are met also. We can’t turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to the needs of people in our society who don’t have anything anyway. We can’t throw them out in the cold. We can’t let our children be denied Head Start programs or adequate child care programs. This is not befitting a great and wonderful society such as America.

I am hopeful with a meeting in the White House tomorrow—as I know it is not just a photo opportunity—we will hear from the Speaker of the House that, yes, we need a balanced approach, and we are willing to take that balanced approach. If they do that, we can get this settled within the next few days and then move ahead.

So that is my hope for tomorrow. And I hope, again, we will see some forthcoming on the part of Republicans that they are indeed willing to compromise.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, March 4, 2013, at 2 p.m.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE VICTIMS OF SUMGAI'T

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the pogrom against people of Armenian descent in the town of Sumgait, Azerbaijan. The three-day massacre in the winter of 1988 resulted in the deaths of scores of Armenians, many of whom were burnt to death after being brutally beaten and tortured. Hundreds of others were wounded. Women and girls were brutally raped. The carnage created thousands of ethnic Armenian refugees, who had to leave everything behind to be looted or destroyed, including their homes, cars and businesses.

These crimes, which were proceeded by a wave of anti-Armenian rallies throughout Azerbaijan, were never adequately prosecuted by Azerbaijan authorities. Many who organized or participated in the bloodshed have gone on to serve in high positions on the Azerbaijani government. For example, in the days leading up to the massacre, a leader of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan, Hidayat Orujov, warned Armenians in Sumgait, "If you do not stop campaigning for the unification of Nagorno Karabakh with Armenia, if you do not sober up, 100,000 Azeris from neighboring districts will break into your houses, torch your apartments, rape your women, and kill your children." In a cruel twist, Orujov went on to serve as Azerbaijan's State Advisor for Ethnic Policy and later as head of State Committee for Work with Religious Organizations.

The Sumgait massacres led to wider reprisals against Azerbaijan's ethnic minority, resulting in the virtual disappearance of Azerbaijan's 450,000-strong Armenian community, and culminating in the war launched against the people of Nagorno Karabakh. That war resulted in almost 30,000 deaths on both sides and created more than one million refugees in both Armenia and Azerbaijan.

In the years since the fighting ended, the people of Artsakh, the region's ancestral name, have struggled to build a functioning democratic state in the midst of unremitting hostility and threats from Azerbaijan, as well as sniper fire and other incursions across the Line of Contact between the two sides. Hatred towards Armenians is both inculcated and reinforced in the Azerbaijani perspective. Orujev's campaigns remained the whole world why the people of Artsakh must be allowed to determine their own future and cannot be allowed to slip into Aliyev's clutches, lest the carnage of Sumgait a quarter century ago serve as a fore-shadowing of a greater slaughter.

TRIBUTE TO SARAH COLLINS-RUDOLPH IN RECOGNITION OF HER SACRIFICES AS A SURVIVOR OF THE 1963 BOMBING OF SIXTEENTH STREET BAPTIST CHURCH IN BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Sarah Collins-Rudolph, a little known American hero whose life was forever changed on the morning of Sunday, September 15, 1963. On that tragic day, Sarah's sister Addie was one of four little girls killed in the noted bombing of Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. While her name isn't engraved in memorials or printed in history books, to many in the Birmingham community, Sarah is known as "the fifth little girl." As we remember the 50th anniversary of this tragic event in our nation's history, we pay tribute to the four lives that were lost. But, we must also remember those that survived this horrible tragedy. Sarah Collins-Rudolph is one of those survivors. Sarah is the last of eight children born to Alice and Oscar Collins of the 98th to the 112th, Mr. Galligan delivered key documents to our Committee from the Department of Defense. We could always count on a story that ended with a chuckle from Bill. Many staff over the years has become fond of Bill and it won't be the same not seeing his face around Capitol Hill anymore. We wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement. I'm sure he will be enjoying more time with his grandchildren.

HAPPY 80TH BIRTHDAY, MRS. BETTY HECHLINSKI

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks in honor of my aunt, Mrs. Betty Hechlinski of South Bend, Indiana who turns 80 years old today. A lifelong Hoosier resident, Aunt Betty was the oldest of three children and attended school in her hometown of South Bend, graduating from St. Adalbert Elementary School and Washington High School. Aunt Betty has always assumed a natural leadership role in the Walorski family, particularly to my father Walorski. The proud mother of three children and five grandchildren, Aunt Betty continues to remain busy in the community, attending church and blessing us all with her wonderful cooking at family gatherings. As the matriarch of the Walorski family, she continues to remind us of the power of generosity and kindness. I am honored to join our family and friends in wishing Aunt Betty a Happy Birthday, with many more years of continued health and joyful memories.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM P. GALLIGAN'S 43 YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to William (Bill) P. Galligan, for his exceptional dedication to duty and service to the Department of Defense, spanning over a 43-year career, in honor of his retirement at the end of September 2012.

Mr. Galligan enlisted in the U.S. Air Force in February 1969 and served on Active Duty until February 1993. His uniformed service included two combat tours in Vietnam, assignments at bases in Germany and stateside, and 11 years as administrative assistant and Congressional courier on the Comptroller's staff at the Pentagon. With his retirement from the Air Force, he transitioned to a civilian role and continued to serve the Comptroller organization for another 19 years.

In his capacity, including three decades in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) office, serving 15 Congresses from the 98th to the 112th, Mr. Galligan delivered key documents to our Committee from the Department of Defense. We could always count on a story that ended with a chuckle from Bill. Many staff over the years has become fond of Bill and it won't be the same not seeing his face around Capitol Hill anymore. We wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement. I'm sure he will be enjoying more time with his grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO SARAH COLLINS-RUDOLPH IN RECOGNITION OF HER SACRIFICES AS A SURVIVOR OF THE 1963 BOMBING OF SIXTEENTH STREET BAPTIST CHURCH IN BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Sarah Collins-Rudolph, a little known American hero whose life was forever changed on the morning of Sunday, September 15, 1963. On that tragic day, Sarah's sister Addie was one of four little girls killed in the noted bombing of Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. While her name isn't engraved in memorials or printed in history books, to many in the Birmingham community, Sarah is known as "the fifth little girl." As we remember the 50th anniversary of this tragic event in our nation's history, we pay tribute to the four lives that were lost. But, we must also remember those that survived this horrible tragedy. Sarah Collins-Rudolph is one of those survivors. Sarah is the last of eight children born to Alice and Oscar Collins of the 98th to the 112th, Mr. Galligan delivered key documents to our Committee from the Department of Defense. We could always count on a story that ended with a chuckle from Bill. Many staff over the years has become fond of Bill and it won't be the same not seeing his face around Capitol Hill anymore. We wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement. I'm sure he will be enjoying more time with his grandchildren.
that day to survive. She lost her right eye and her life was filled with corrective surgeries and extensive medical care for her injuries. There were 21 survivors of the bombing of Sixteenth Street Baptist Church but no single family suffered as much as the Collins family, losing Addie Mae and caring for Sarah’s multiple injuries.

The physical and emotional scars of this senseless tragedy remain with Sarah as she continues her extraordinary life. Even today, there are moments when she struggles mentally with her fate of being bombed at just 12 years old. Despite the persistent aftermath of the events, she is dedicated to making sure that the nation remembers the bombing and its significance to the civil rights movement. Sarah shares her painful story in hopes that future generations will know their history and remember those that were symbols of the civil rights movement.

Today, I salute Sarah Collins-Rudolph for her sacrifices to our country. We are often reminded of the civil rights giants that fought on the front lines for justice and equality. But it is an imperative that we never forget the sacrifices made by all those who were a part of this transformative time in America. On behalf of a grateful nation, we say thank you to Mrs. Sarah Collins-Rudolph for the personal sacrifice and courageous fight she has endured for civil and equal rights. On that Sunday morning in 1963, Sarah’s life changed instantly and she was forever scarred by the actions of those who sought to stifle America’s movement. But because of Sarah, we rejoice in a new era of our history that realizes the dreams of those before us.

I also congratulate the following students, coaches and community leaders who are being recognized at the 23rd Annual Fairfax County Football Hall of Fame:

- E212 Scholarship Award Recipients: Raina Aide (Cheerleading, J.E.B. Stuart HS), Harrison “Sonny” Rome (Football, Chantilly HS), Brian Deely (Football, Westfield HS), and Ben Sanford (Football, Madison HS)
- Fairfax County Football Hall of Fame 2013 Inductees: Evan Royster (Washington Redskins, Penn State, Westfield HS, FBYC), Bruce Riddick (足球, Yorktown HS), and Steve Wilmer (Coach/Commissioner—McLean Youth Football)
- Football Official of the Year—Youth Sports: Steve Caruso (Fairfax County Football Officials Association)
- Karl Davey Community Achievement Award: Tom Healy (Southwestern Youth Association, FYFL)
- Tom Davis Mentorship Service Award: Deb Garris (Manager, Synthetic Turf Branch, Fairfax County Park Authority)
- Gene Nelson Commissioner of the Year Award: Jason McEachin (Dulles South Youth Sports)
- High School Players of the Year: Jonathan Allen (Stone Bridge HS), Tyler Donnelly (Yorktown HS), Oren Burks (South County HS), Sean Hueselkamp (Chantilly HS), Scott Carpenter (Gonzaga College HS), Nick Newman (Battlefield HS)
- High School Coaches of the Year: Mickey Thompson (Stone Bridge HS), Jason Rowley (Oakton HS)
- Youth Sports Players of the Year: Avery Howard (Manassas YFL), Virginia “Ginny” Delacruz (SYC), Justin Burke (RYA), Preston Bacon (CYA), Miles Thompson (Fairfax Police Youth Club), Anthony Eaton, Jr. (Alexandria Youth Football), Hunter Godin (APYFL), Robbie McGoff (SCAA), Nicholas DiVecchia (SYA), Markel Harrison (VYI), Carlo Esposito (BRYC), Michael Bayeux-Gary (HOYF), Philippe Oliveros (CYA), Joshua Breeze (FT. Belvoir Youth Sports), Noah Adler (VYI), Christian Jessup (Dulles South Youth League)

The importance of youth sports cannot be overstated. Participation in organized sports instills in our youth many values that will serve them well throughout life. These values include sportsmanship, teamwork, honesty, a sense of belonging, and maybe most important, the work ethic developed by striving for success and working to achieve a common goal. Organized youth sports also contribute to our society. Studies have shown a correlation between participation in sporting activities and increased academic performance. Some studies indicate that a reduction in gang activity can be partially attributed to refocusing at-risk children into organized, supervised activities such as youth sports.

I commend the Fairfax County Youth Football League for providing opportunities for our children to succeed and be a part of a team. I also congratulate the following students, coaches and community leaders who are being recognized at the 23rd Annual Fairfax County Football Hall of Fame:

- $1,500 Scholarship Award Recipients: Raina Aide (Cheerleading, J.E.B. Stuart HS), Harrison “Sonny” Rome (Football, Chantilly HS), Brian Deely (Football, Westfield HS), and Ben Sanford (Football, Madison HS)

HONORING MARINE MASTER SERGEANT ELBERT LESTER

HON. GEORGE MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll No. 53. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

HONORING MARINE MASTER SERGEANT ELBERT LESTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I rise to recognize a remarkable veteran, Marine Master Sergeant Elbert Lester. On Friday, November 2, 2012, Marine Master Sergeant Elbert Lester, now eighty-seven years of age, was awarded the Mintford Point Marines’ Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honor bestowed by Congress for distinguished achievement.

The Mintford Point Marines were the first African-Americans to serve in the United States Marine Corps in 1941, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Fair Employment Practices Commission, ultimately forcing the Corps to recruit blacks. When asked, “Why did you choose the Marine Corps?” he replied “They decided that for me.” He then explained while at the Army recruiting station, the black company was asked for volunteers to go into the Marines. No one did. “So, they put our names in a hat and my name was one of those that were pulled. I was one of the unlucky ones.”

Elbert Lester was assigned to the 27th Depot Company as a Corporal and would serve in the Pacific. Following training, his unit was put aboard a ship in Norfolk, VA to Guadalcanal, a thirty-day voyage that would begin his time of service in the South Pacific. Most of the 19,000 black Marines trained at Mintford Point were assigned to ammunition and depot companies, bringing ammunition and supplies to the front lines, and returning wounded and dead to transport ships.

After the war, he returned to Quitman County, Mississippi where he married his childhood sweetheart Pearlene Williams. They have three children: Frank, Teressa, Pearlie Mae, Elbert Jr., Patricia, Laresia, Napoleon, Jr., Miranda, Alberta, Timothy, Roderick, Darius, Cornelius and three adopted: Waring, Tiffany and Kikera Brown. Mr. and Mrs. Lester have been married for 65 years and live on their 80-acre farm. They attend Woodland Missionary Baptist Church, where they both sing in the choir.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mintford Point Marine Master Sergeant Elbert Lester for his sacrifices in promoting democracy around the world and the United States of America.
Annual Awards.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to be on the floor this morning to talk about the 52nd Anniversary of the founding of the Peacetime Corp. However, something very unpeaceful happened in my district in Santa Cruz, CA recently. I need to speak about it—Tuesday afternoon, two police officers were shot and killed, and a suspect was later killed by police. When other officers arrived at the scene, they found two detectives, Sgt. Loran “Butch” Baker, a 28-year veteran, and Detective Elizabeth Butler, a 10-year veteran, shot and killed outside a residence.

Sgt. Baker and Detective Butler are the first officers to be killed in the line of duty in the city’s history. Sgt. Baker leaves behind a wife, two daughters and a son, who is a community service officer with the Santa Cruz Police Department.

Detective Butler leaves behind her partner and two young sons.

This is a horrible tragedy, and I join with all residents of the Central Coast, to mourn this loss and to pay our respects to these two outstanding officers.

Our prayers and sympathies are with the families and loved ones of the officers who gave their lives in the line of duty.

While the words of comfort we offer today are sincere, our actions and deeds will be the true test of our resolve. If we are truly committed to ending gun violence in our communities, we must be willing to find real solutions to prevent this type of senseless shooting from occurring again.

We owe that much to the brave men and women who put on a police uniform every day.

We must be willing to protect those who so bravely protect us.

As a community, we promise that the sacrifices of Sgt. Baker and Detective Butler will not be forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 46, had I been present, I would have voted “Yea.”

TO RECOGNIZE VFW POST 7327 AND THE 2013 AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Springfield Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 7327 and the recipients of its 2013 Annual Awards.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) traces its beginnings to 1899 when veterans of the Spanish American War established local organizations to bring awareness to their service and to advocate for veterans retirement benefits and improved medical care. Today, with membership of 2.2 million at approximately 1,100 posts worldwide, the VFW continues its efforts to support the men and women who have served our great country in uniform and their families.

The VFW has a distinguished record of service to the broader community. The VFW and Ladies Auxiliary contribute more than 13 million hours of volunteerism every year. In this field of champions, the Springfield VFW Post 7327 stands out for the depth of its commitment to our community.

Often called “The Friendliest VFW Post in Virginia,” Post 7327 has one of the most aggressive ADOPT-A UNIT programs in the entire VFW organization to support our service members stationed overseas. VFW Post 7327 visits the VA hospital at least quarterly; bringing along goodie bags for our Wounded Warriors. Each Thanksgiving and Christmas, VFW Post 7327 adopts military families in need through the USO and provides them with meal baskets for each holiday, Christmas gifts for all the children, commissary cards for the parents, and a Christmas party where the children can meet Santa and receive a gift filled stocking. The Ladies Auxiliary members collect, sort, and distribute more than 2,000 pieces of clothing each month to various charitable organizations.

VFW Post 7327 is a strong supporter of local youth organizations including the Boys Scouts, Girl Scouts, and Little League Baseball that contribute greatly to the education and well being of our children.

Each year, VFW Post 7327 bestows awards to outstanding local citizens in recognition of their extraordinary actions and dedication. I congratulate the following individuals on receiving these 2013 Awards:

Teachers of the Year: Erin Poppe and Michael Walser.

Emergency Medical Technician of the Year: Kayla Thompson.


Patriot’s Pen: 1st Place: Shane David King, 2nd Place: Sion Kim, 3rd Place: Rishon A. Eliott.

Police Officer of the Year: George Joca.

The COST OF INACTION WILL BE STAGGERING

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I submit this letter, which is an example of an opportunity for a bipartisan climate action.

The COST OF INACTION . . .

The effects of climate change in the world’s most vulnerable regions present a serious threat to American national security interests. As a matter of risk management, the United States must work with international partners, public and private, to address this impending crisis. Potential consequences are undeniable, and the cost of inaction, paid for in lives and valuable U.S. resources, will be staggering. Washington must lead on this issue now.

Countries least able to adapt to or mitigate the impacts of climate change will suffer the most, but the resulting crises will quickly become a burden on U.S. priorities as well. Both the Department of Defense and the State Department have identified climate change as a serious risk to American security and an agent of instability. Without precautionary measures, climate change impacts abroad could spur mass migrations, inflame civil conflict, and lead to a more unpredictable world. In fact, we may already be seeing signs of this as vulnerable communities in some of the most fragile and conflict-ridden states are increasingly displaced by floods, droughts and other natural disasters. Protecting U.S. interests under these conditions would progressively exhaust American military, diplomatic, and development resources as we struggle to meet growing demands for emergency international engagement.

It is in our national interest to confront the risk that climate change in vulnerable regions presents to American security. We must offer adaptive solutions to communities currently facing climate-driven displacement, support disaster risk reduction measures and help mitigate potential future
impacts through sustainable food, water and energy systems. Advancing stability in the face of climate change threats will promote resilient communities, reliable governance and dependable energy systems. Advancing stability in the face of climate change threats will promote resilient communities, reliable governance and dependable energy systems.

We, the undersigned Republicans, Democrats and Independents, implore U.S. policymakers to strengthen security and global stability by addressing the risks of climate change in vulnerable nations. Their plight is our fight; their problems are our problems. We must face budgetary uncertainty and a fragile economic recovery, public and private sectors must work together to meet the funding demands of this strategic international portfolio of peace, security, and solutions. Effective adaptation and mitigation efforts in these counties will protect our long-term national interests abroad.


HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous and remarkable veteran, Mrs. Pamela W. Walker. Mrs. Walker was born and raised in Leland, Mississippi. She is one of seven children born on September 27, 1962 to Mr. Vernel and Mrs. Alice. She is married to Mr. Lester Walker and has three sons: Jarvis, Reginald, and Derrick.

Mrs. Walker graduated from Leland High School in 1980. She went on to further her education at Alcorn State University, where she received her Bachelor of Arts degree in 1985; her Bachelor of Science degree in 1994 from Mississippi Valley State University; and her Masters of Science in 2002, also from Mississippi Valley State University.

Mrs. Walker joined the Army ROTC at Alcorn State University, on May 15, 1984. Since then, she has served a total of 26 years in the military. Over that time period, she has attended several military schools, received numerous awards, and has served overseas in FEPA-Okinawa, Saudi Arabia, Germany, Iraq, and Korea.

Furthermore, her determination and drive to serve her country has pushed her up the ladder in leadership. She was appointed Second Lieutenant (1984), First Lieutenant (1987), Captain (1991), Major (1998), and she retired as a Lieutenant Colonel (2006).

Mrs. Walker is currently an elementary teacher in Greenville Public School District (Mississippi), where she has been for 23 years. She has learned a lot about life during her time in the service, and it has helped her in her classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Pamela W. Walker for her time and dedication to serving our country.

TO RECOGNIZE THE RECIPIENTS
THE FAIRFAX COUNTY 2012 LAND CONSERVATION AND TREE PRESERVATION AND PLANTING AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recipients of Fairfax County 2012 Land Conservation and Tree Preservation and Planting Awards. Fairfax County is considered one of the best counties in the nation in which to live, work and raise a family. One reason for this designation is the innovative environmental protection policies that have been implemented by the county and embraced by its business partners. I was pleased to have led that effort during my tenure as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors. These awards recognize the following developers, designers and site superintendents who have excelled in their stewardship of the environment:


Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these fine citizens of Fairfax County and its residents have benefited greatly from the collaborative spirit that is represented by these awards today, and I thank each of the awardees for their efforts.

HON. KENNETH R. BARBER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dorothy Hunt Finley—a daughter of Southern Arizona ranchers who spent a lifetime giving back to her community before passing away on February 20th at the age of 92. Dorothy grew up in rural Cochise County, not far from the U.S.-Mexico border and never envisioned a future as an educator, a beer distributor and a community leader and benefactor.
For three decades, Dorothy was a teacher and a principal at schools in the Tucson Unified School District. She was chairwoman of the TusD Elementary School Principals and president of the Arizona Elementary School Administrators. Because of her background in education, Dorothy became a member of the Pima Community College Foundation Board and co-founded the Women’s Studies Advisory Council at the University of Arizona.

Her life took a turn 30 years ago when her husband, Harold, died. Dorothy became CEO of Finley Distributing Company, a beer wholesaler. She also became a dedicated community activist.

Dorothy was a member of nearly 100 community organizations that benefited from her time, commitment and financial generosity. That list includes the Arizona Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Tucson Economic Council, Pima County Juvenile Court, Arizona Historical Society, Tucson Urban League, the Arizona Theatre Company, the UA Wildcat Club, La Frontera Child Family Center, the American Diabetes Association, Big Brothers Big Sisters, the Junior Diabetes Foundation, the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Goodwill Industries, the March of Dimes and the United Cerebral Palsy Foundation.

Dorothy received numerous well-deserved awards for her work, including a gubernatorial CE Meritorious Service Award, the Entrepreneur of the Year award from the YWCA and the Woman of the Year honor from the Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. She was named among the top 100 private business owners in Arizona and received a Lifetime Achievement Award from the YWCA.

In 2004, Dorothy was presented with the Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher Distinguished Civilian Humanitarian Award, which she traveled to the Pentagon to accept. She also is the only civilian to have a building named after her on Davis-Monthan Air Force Base: the Dorothy Finley Child Development Center.

I am proud to recognize Dorothy Hunt Finley—an exceptional friend to the people of Southern Arizona. She will be deeply missed.

CONGRATULATING GO SOLAR BROWARD ROOPTOP SOLAR CHALLENGE

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Go SOLAR Broward Rooftop Solar Challenge, a U.S. Department of Energy grant-funded program that encourages residents and businesses of Broward County to convert to solar energy. I would like to applaud the program and its sponsors for establishing a simplified and streamlined process for Broward County residents and businesses to obtain photovoltaic rooftop solar systems.

I have been a long-time supporter of solar power as a way to create new jobs in South Florida and move our county towards a more secure energy future. With some of our nation’s most beautiful environmental treasures, including our beaches and the Everglades, I believe these natural resources must be protected by further investments in renewable energy options. Improving access to innovative clean energy technologies will help curb our dependence on fossil fuels, thereby benefiting our environment, economy, and national security.

The Go SOLAR Broward Rooftop Challenge provides an important service to the county by making solar power more accessible to local residents and businesses. I am thankful to this conference for bringing together government officials, local businesses, and private citizens committed to solar energy to share information and resources. I want to particularly thank Kristin Jacobs, Broward County Mayor, for her leadership in spreading green energy to the region. Congratulations to the Go SOLAR Broward Rooftop Challenge team and all of the conference participants for taking action to spread solar power resources to South Florida.

HONORING LARRY DANCE

HON. LUKE MESSER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of one of my constituents, Larry Dance of Greensburg, Indiana.

Larry was a life-long resident of Greensburg and active member of the community. He served his country in Operation Desert Storm as a member of the Air Force, earning theAct of Bravery Medal. At home, he served as a member of the Greensburg Police Department, including being named Officer of the Year and President of the Fraternal Order of Police.

Larry continued his love of sport as an assistant wrestling coach at Greensburg High School and as a team wrestler in the World Police and Fire Games. On a personal note, I have fond memories playing alongside Larry on the Greensburg High School football team. I ask the entire 6th District to keep his wife Shannon, three daughters Mallory, Megan, and Baili, and the entire extended Dance family in your thoughts and prayers.

HONORING MR. JOHN MCELENEY, DEALERSHIP OWNER OF MCELENEY CHEVY BUICK GMC TOYOTA OF CLINTON, IOWA

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize Mr. John McEleney, an automobile dealer in Clinton, Iowa. John, owner of McEleney Chevy Buick GMC Toyota, was recently nominated for the 2013 TIME Dealer of the Year award sponsored by TIME Magazine and Ally. John was nominated by Bruce Anderson, President of the Iowa Automobile Dealers Association, and was honored at the National Automobile Dealers Association Convention & Exhibition in Orlando. The TIME Dealer of the Year award is one of the auto industry’s most prestigious awards, recognizing both success in the industry and exemplary community service.

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Dulles Regional Chamber of Commerce (the DRCC) for its ongoing dedication to local businesses and our community. The DRCC sponsors a fundraising event, Casino Royale, the proceeds of which will support programs for homeless children in Fairfax County. In addition, during this event, the DRCC will present its 2013 “Educator of the Year” Awards to educators who demonstrate exceptional effort and achievement.

The DRCC dates back to 1959, when it began as the Herndon Chamber of Commerce. Since its founding, the Chamber has
witnessed explosive regional growth and now serves the Town of Herndon; western Fairfax County, including the communities of Chantilly, Centreville and Fairfax; and eastern Loudoun County, including the communities of Sterling/ Dulles, South Riding, and parts of Ashburn. The DRCC defines itself as a workforce champion and provides leadership in the areas of diversity, education, and transportation advocacy.

As the former Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, and now as a Member of Congress representing much of this community, I have been proud to partner with the DRCC on promoting the region’s pro-

business climate and expanding Metro’s Silver Line into the Dulles Corridor.

Northern Virginia is considered one of the best places in the country in which to live, work, and raise a family. One factor in this designation is our outstanding school systems. The DRCC recognizes the importance of a globally competitive K–12 education system to our workforce development and believes the most important investment Virginia can make is in human capital.

The jobs of the future and the ability of our businesses to compete rest in having a well-

trained workforce. As an elected representa-
tive and a parent, I believe that investing in education and college access programs, with a focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math, is an investment in America and will spur innovation and set our young people on a path for lifelong success. This year’s award-

ees have demonstrated how outstanding edu-
cators are crucial leaders on that journey. Therefore, I am pleased to join the chamber in congratulating the following recipients of the 2013 Educator of the Year Award:

Ms. Whitney Branisteau, Dranesville Elementary School; Ms. Hallie Case, Herndon Middle School; Ms. Barbara Clougherty, Chan-
tilly High School; Ms. Jen Howe, Chantilly Academy; Mr. Jeff Jones, Mountain View High School; Ms. Cheryl McGovern, Herndon Ele-

dental School; Ms. Kelly Mosgrove, Ormond Stone Middle School; Ms. Amy Valint, Hern-
don High School; Ms. Kay Ward, Liberty Mid-
dle School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals and thank-
ing them for their many contributions to our children’s success and our nation’s future.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF STEM EDUCATION

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP
OF NEW YORK

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) education to this country’s future and prosperity. Educating a STEM workforce has become increasingly central to U.S. economic competitiveness and growth and requires the collaborative efforts of government, private industry and non-profits to succeed.

STEM fields are more important than ever to the development and maintenance of a high standard of living in the 21st century. Over the past several decades the performance of American students in STEM subjects has lagged behind their international peers. And at the same time that students are spending less time studying science in the classroom than they did a decade ago, only one out of every five households has access to STEM extra-
curricular activities.

Employers are increasingly frustrated when searching for qualified applicants for high-pay-
ing STEM jobs. Job growth in STEM fields of-

fers great potential, estimated to grow at the rate of 17 percent by 2018—nearly double the rate of non-STEM related careers. Given these figures, it is difficult to understated the importance of STEM education, both in and outside of school, for our nation’s collective economic future and the future our nation’s students.

Federal, state, and local governments must partner with the private sector to provide American students with the resources necessary to compete in an increasingly com-

petitive global market.

One private sector campaign aimed at ad-

dressing this issue is Time Warner Cable’s Connect a Million Minds (CAMM) program. CAMM is designed to inspire the next genera-
tion of problem solvers by connecting young people to the wonders of STEM outside of the classroom. Introduced in November 2009 in conjunction with President Obama’s “Educate to Innovate” effort, CAMM has answered the President’s call-to action for cross-sector part-

nerships to address the STEM crisis. In downtown New York CAMM connects parents and students with dozens of local STEM re-

sources that would otherwise remain un-
tapped, including the Brooklyn Botanic Gar-
den, the National Park Service at Hamilton Grange, and the New York Transit Museum.

I want to congratulate Time Warner Cable for their important initiative and urge my col-
league to recognize how essential such pro-
grams are to all of our communities.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speak-
er, we mark the 4th of February, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which was the first bill President Obama signed law. The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act is of enormous importance for women’s rights in the workplace. For decades, companies large and small have paid women less for the same work compared to their male counterparts. This law reaffirmed that each occurrence of pay and compensation discrimination against women violates title VII of the Civil Rights Act. The law addressed a Supreme Court ruling in Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Com-

pany that undermined statutory protections against discrimination by unduly restricting the time period in which victims of discrimination could challenge and recover for discriminatory compensation decisions or other practices, contrary to the intent of Congress. The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act restored women’s right to challenge employers once they discovered they were wrongfully discriminated against in terms of pay and benefits. Further, the law clarified that employees are entitled up to two years of backpay for such discrimination, as provided under title VII.

Since enactment, courts around the country have applied the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act as Congress intended, for straightforward pay discrimination cases based on sex, race, dis-
ability, and age. In clarifying the period during which a worker may file a discrimination claim by each unfair paycheck, the law has provided a proper time frame extension to file lawsuits against employers for wage discrepancies.

The anniversary of the signing of this bill re-

flects the commitment of our nation to ensure equal pay for all Americans and serves as a reminder that we must monitor and protect civil rights laws.
Unfortunately, equal opportunity is not yet a reality for women. This is why I join my Demo-
ocratic colleagues in supporting the The Pay-
check Fairness Act, which strengthens the
equality provisions within the Lilly Ledbetter
Fair Pay Act and eliminates the loopholes not
seen in the past. For example, it increases
penalties on employers who violate federal law
and allows women to pursue legal matters if
they are treated unjustly. The legislation also
ensures equality in the tax code so that every-
one—male and female, high-income earners
and those living in poverty—pays their respec-
tive tax rate. Fairness should be applicable to
all, in wages and in taxes. The Paycheck Fair-
ness Act provides effective remedies to
women who are not being paid equal wages
for equal work, and Congress should pass the
bill as soon as possible.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HORACE
MARVEL BROOKS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today
to honor the life of Horace “Chief” Marvel
Brooks. I ask my colleagues to join me in
celebrating the good and long life of Mr.
Brooks, who passed away on Sunday, Janu-
ary 20, 2013.

Horace joined the United States Navy at the
age of 17 and served in both World War II and
the Korean War. Horace far exceeded his duty
in serving both his country, family and the
24th District of Texas. Each year around Vet-
erans Day, Horace would share stories of his
military duties with high school students, im-
parting wisdom and firsthand experiences.

Mr. Speaker, Horace “Chief” Brooks was a
great father and family man, and a true Amer-
ican patriot. I ask all my distinguished col-
leagues to join me in celebrating his life, and
honoring the many people whose lives are
better for having crossed his path.

RECOGNIZING THE TURNING POINT
MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, as the na-
tion’s capital hosts a weekend celebration of
women’s suffrage movement and a true turning
point of history, I ask my distinguished col-
leagues to join me in celebrating his life, and
honoring the many people whose lives are
better for having crossed his path.

Their incarceration was one of the most sig-
ficant but least known events of the women’s
suffrage movement and a true turning point in
the ultimately successful struggle. The gutsy
women—labeled by some as “unpatriotic” —
held firm to their goals. Choosing jail over pay-
ing a $25 fine, one protested, “Not a dollar of
your fine or mine. To pay a fine would be an
admission of guilt. We are innocent.”

Winning the right to vote took 72 years
when Tennessee ratified the 19th Amendment
in 1920, the largest extension of democratic
rights in the nation’s history. The suffragists’
nonviolent actions pioneered civil rights tactics
later used in other civic movements and their
refusal to back down became a model for ac-
tivists.

To recognize their struggle, the all–volunteer
Turning Point Suffragist Memorial Association
is building the memorial in the shadow of the
nation’s capital in Fairfax County. It will feature
a waterfall and 19 stations (for the 19th
Amendment) along a winding garden path to
relate the history of the movement and the
story of empowerment and perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me
in commending the members and supporters
of the Association and wishing them continued
success with the memorial.

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to
support H.R. 11, the reauthorization of the Vi-
olence Against Women Act.

Over the last 18 years, VAWA has provided
life-saving assistance to hundreds of thou-
sands of American women and children. Originally
passed by Congress in 1994 as part of the Violent
Crime Control and Law Enforcement
Act of 1994, this landmark, bipartisan legisla-
tion was enacted in response to the preva-
lence of domestic and sexual violence and the
significant impact that such violence has on
the lives of women.

Just last month a co-ed at the venerable
University of Virginia, my alma mater was con-
victed of murdering her girlfriend. This hits
close to home. As well as Yvette Cade, who
had acid poured over her face by an irate ex-
husband. As well as the murder of Annie Le
at Harvard University. And unfortunately, I
could go on and on. These women were white,
black, and Asian, living in different cities
under different circumstances. They had one
common denominator: victims of abject and
pervasive violence. Lives destroyed because of
men-at-rage.

VAWA has provided funding for DHSS,
ice providers to combat domestic violence,
which is evidence that the Majority continues
to pick and choose which victims of domestic
violence is the leading cause of injury
women in America.

The VAWA Reauthorization bill significantly
strengthens the ability of the Federal Govern-
ment, the States, law enforcement, and serv-
ice providers to combat domestic violence,
dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.
As with the previous reauthorizations of VAWA
in 2000 and 2005, this bill responds to the re-

talies and needs reported by those who work
with victims every day to make VAWA work
better for all victims.

The Republican leadership announced they
will bring their version of the Violence Against
Women Act (VAWA) reauthorization to the
House Floor. As opposed to the bipartisan
Senate bill, the House Republican version of
VAWA omits protections for the LGBT, Native
women, and immigrant communities. It also
excludes provisions that combat sex traf-
ficking, and that would have helped law en-
forcement address the backlog in DNA evi-
dence kits. The GOP version is being brought
to the House Floor in the complete absence of
committee action and without the consultation
of House Democrats.

As my colleague, Congressman JOHN CON-
yers stated “The House Republican version of
VAWA is evidence that the Majority continues
to pick and choose which victims of domestic
WHY REPUBLICANS OPPOSE THE BILL (“CONTROVERSIAL” PROVISIONS)

PROTECTIONS FOR LGBT SURVIVORS

The Senate bipartisan reauthorization of VAWA ensures that ALL victims of domestic violence receive aid, including LGBT survivors. LGBT people are often victims of Domestic Violence.

A 2010 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention study found that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered victims report intimate partner violence, sexual violence, and stalking at levels equal to or higher than the general population.

The report also found that bisexual women report higher incidences of rape, physical violence, and stalking than their lesbian and heterosexual counterparts.

Recent studies show that LGBT victims face discrimination when accessing services. For example, 45% of LGBT victims were turned away when they sought help from a domestic violence shelter, according to a 2010 survey, and nearly 55% were denied protection orders.

Service providers have gathered numerous stories of LGBT victims denied assistance or services because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Senate Bill ensures non-discrimination, and allows for a wider variety of groups to apply for VAWA funding.

The legislation clarifies that organizations seeking to provide specific services to gay and lesbian victims may receive funds under the largest VAWA grant—the STOP formula grant program.

No organization will be required to develop services specifically targeting this population, but those organizations that would like to offer such services will be able to access funding. Currently, STOP grant funds are only available to organizations predominantly serving women.

Additionally, the legislation clarifies that gay and lesbian victims are included in the definition of underserved populations. Although the LGBT community experiences domestic violence at the same rate as heterosexual couples, a 2010 study found that many victim services providers lack services specific to LGBT victims and have not received training in how to work with LGBT victims. Specialized services are important for this population because reporting rates and prosecution rates are very low.

This bill does not mandate that Service Providers Offer Specific LGBT Services.

The legislation does not require service providers to offer specific programs for LGBT victims. It simply seeks to increase the availability of specialized services and to ensure that no victim is turned away based on their sexual orientation or gender identity.

VAWA AND IMMIGRANT WOMEN

H.R. 11 adds the crime of stalking to the offenses for which a U Visa is available. The U Visa program created to encourage immigrant victims of crime to report and help prosecute criminal activity. It is only available to victims of certain crimes, which currently include domestic violence and sexual assault.

H.R. 11 protects the children of applicants for U Visas from “aging out” of the process if they become adults while their parent’s application is pending.

H.R. 11 clarifies that VAWA self-petitioners, U Visa petitioners and holders, and T Visa holders (victims of human trafficking) are exempted from the public charge inadmissibility test.

H.R. 11 requires annual reports to Congress regarding outcomes and processing times for VAWA self-petition applications.

H.R. 11 strengthens the existing International Marriage Broker Regulation Act to provide vital disclosures to foreign fiancées and fiancés of U.S. citizens regarding the criminal history of the sponsoring citizen and other information foreign fiancées or fiancés need to protect themselves from entering abusive marriages. Requires international marriage brokers to collect proof that the foreign fiancée or fiancé is of the age of consent.

H.R. 11 extends the application of the Prison Rape Elimination Act to all immigration detention facilities under the authority of the DHS and HHS.

VAWA EXPANDS PROTECTIONS FOR TRIBAL WOMEN

VAWA Reauthorization provides law enforcement with additional tools to combat domestic and sexual assault in tribal communities.

The bill adds new federal crimes—including a ten-year offense for assaulting a spouse or intimate partner by strangling or suffocating and a five-year offense for assaults resulting in substantial bodily injury—that will enable federal prosecutors to more effectively combat types of assault frequently committed against women in Indian country.

These new crimes allow law enforcement to appropriately address the gradual escalation of seriousness often associated with domestic violence offenses. The bill also clarifies that tribal courts have the authority to issue and enforce tribal protection orders, ensuring that these protection orders can be used effectively to keep women safe.

VAWA Reauthorization closes jurisdictional loopholes that ensure that those who commit domestic violence in Indian country do not escape justice.

The bill addresses a gaping jurisdictional hole by giving tribal courts concurrent jurisdiction over Indian and non-Indian defendants who committed domestic violence offenses against an Indian in Indian country.

Currently, tribal courts do not have jurisdiction over non-Indian defendants who abuse and attack their Indian spouses on Indian lands, even though more than 50% of Native women are married to non-Indians. Prosecution of domestic violence offenses in Indian country often falls through the cracks, since federal and state law enforcement and prosecutors have limited resources and may be located hours away from Indian communities.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I urge the members of this House to vote in favor of H.R.11. The Violence Against Women Act provides crucial protections for victims of domestic violence. We cannot wait any longer to reauthorize this crucial legislation that saves the lives of women every day.

HONORING THE 25TH SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF THE YOUNG ISRAEL OF BOCA RATON AND YAKOV & RUCHIE LYONS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the 25th Silver Anniversary of the Young Israel of Boca Raton, Florida synagogue. I would like to recognize them for their service to the Jewish community of South Florida and the local community as a whole.

Founded in 1988, the Young Israel of Boca Raton has served as a center of Jewish identity and education for the South Palm Beach County community. I want to particularly acknowledge Yakov (Jason) and Ruchie Lyons, the special honorees during the Silver Anniversary celebration, for their dedication to the synagogue and its emphasis on prayer, study, and community service.

I would like to congratulate the Young Israel of Boca Raton synagogue, an extraordinary Jewish community of South Florida, on their 25th Silver Anniversary. Hopefully, through their example, the Young Israel’s philosophy and spiritual guidance can extend far beyond South Florida.

HONORING ELIZABETH MICHELLE WOODS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable veteran, Elizabeth Michelle Woods. She is a lifelong resident of the Mississippi Delta.

Ms. Woods joined the United States Army Reserves while a senior in high school at East Side High School and served eight years with the 479th Ordnance Company. She completed a tour of duty in Operation Desert Storm as an assistant squad leader. She earned the U.S. Army Achievement Medal, the U.S. Army Certificate of Achievement and other awards. After returning from Saudi Arabia she obtained an Associate of Arts Degree in Social Work.

Woods earned the rank of Sergeant Promotional after serving our country for 12 years and received an Honorable Discharge. During and after completion of her military
There is little doubt that after 48 years of service, leadership, work ethic and knowledge base, Mr. Wright has valuable experience to DIA’s Office of EURASIA Division, where Mr. Wright would eventually become Division Chief.

Since August of 2011, Mr. Wright has lent his considerable experience to DIA’s Office of Congressional and Public Affairs where his leadership, work ethic and knowledge base have proven invaluable to his colleagues. There is little doubt that after 48 years of serving his country, Mr. Wright has earned some well-deserved R&R.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Elizabeth Woods for her dedication to serving our great country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 25, 2013, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on rollover vote No. 46 (on approving the journal) and “yes” on rollover vote No. 47 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 667).

RECOGNIZING MR. LEE WRIGHT AND HIS 48 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and commend Lee Wright of Woodbridge, Va., for his 30 years of honorable service with the United States Air Force and for his subsequent 18 years of civilian service with the Defense Intelligence Agency. We are fortunate to have among us veterans with Mr. Wright’s sense of duty and continued commitment to public service.

Mr. Wright began his career stationed at Cam Rahn Bay, RVN in 1964. After his tour in Vietnam, Mr. Wright served at multiple air stations, eventually serving on staff at the USAF Military Air Command, Non–Commissioned Officer Academy. Mr. Wright soon moved on to DIA assignments spanning Western Europe, Turkey, Eurasia and Russia where he served multiple roles in intelligence operations. He devoted, hard work, and expertise on Russia led to successive roles within DIA’s Russia/EURASIA Division, where Mr. Wright would eventually become Division Chief.

Since August of 2011, Mr. Wright has lent his considerable experience to DIA’s Office of Congressional and Public Affairs where his leadership, work ethic and knowledge base have proven invaluable to his colleagues. There is little doubt that after 48 years of serving his country, Mr. Wright has earned some well-deserved R&R.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and thanking Lee Wright for his committed and selfless service to his colleagues and our country. We wish Mr. Wright, his wife, Dottie, and his family well in retirement.

RECOGNIZING RARE DISEASE DAY

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, today, February 28, 2013, marks the sixth annual International Rare Disease Day, a day to raise awareness of the nearly 7,000 rare diseases affecting 30 million Americans, or about one in ten people. Here in the United States, any disease affecting 200,000 people or fewer is considered rare.

Rare Disease Day is also an opportunity to celebrate the life-saving advances in science and research that continue to transform the diagnosis, treatment, and standard of care for many orphan diseases, thanks in no small part to the advocacy efforts of the medical community, patients and their families, and rare disease organizations.

In my congressional district, I have met with a number of constituents and their families whose lives have been impacted by rare diseases, cystic fibrosis among them. Cystic fibrosis is a genetic disease affecting approximately 30,000 children and adults in the United States and is characterized by a reduction in the flow of salt and water across cell membranes, which results in the buildup of thick, sticky mucus in the lungs. In 1955, with limited therapies available, children with cystic fibrosis were not expected to live long enough to attend elementary school. Today, due to significant improvements in medical treatment and care, people with the disease are living longer. The median predicted age of survival now stands at 38 years.

Today, I have never been more hopeful of the promise science holds for all patients affected by rare diseases; however, there remains much work to be done. On this sixth annual International Rare Disease Day, I join with patients and their families in urging my colleagues to think about what more Congress can do to help bring hope to those suffering from rare diseases.

CLUSTER MUNITIONS CIVILIAN PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to join my esteemed colleagues, Representative CHARLES Boustany (R–LA) and Senators Dianne Feinstein (D–CA) and Patrick Leahy (D–VT) in introducing the Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act of 2013. This bill will restrict the use and deployment of dangerous cluster munitions.

Cluster bombs are canisters designed to open in the air before making contact, dispersing between 200 and 400 small munitions that can saturate a radius of 250 yards. The bombs are intended for military use when attacking enemy troop formations, but are often used in or near populated areas. This is a problem because up to 40 percent of these bombs fail to explode and become de facto landmines, posing a significant risk to civilians—particularly children—lasting years after a conflict ends.

The Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act prevents any U.S. military funds from being used on cluster munitions with a failure rate of more than 1 percent, unless the rules of engagement specify that cluster munitions (1) will only be used against clearly defined military targets, and (2) will not be used where civilians are known to be present or in areas normally inhabited by civilians.

The bill requires the president to report to Congress on the plan to clean up unexploded cluster munitions, and it includes a national security waiver allowing the president to waive the prohibition if he determines such a waiver is vital to national security.

Mr. Speaker, current law prohibits U.S. sales, exports and transfers of cluster munitions that have a failure rate exceeding 1 percent. The law also requires any sale, export or transfer agreement to include a requirement that the cluster munitions will be used only against military targets. Regrettably, the Pentagon insists that the U.S. should continue to have the ability to use millions of stockpiled cluster munitions that have estimated failure rates of 5 to 20 percent until 2018. This is simply not acceptable; we can do better.

I believe strongly that the United States should be an international leader in ending the terrible toll on civilian populations caused by the high failure rate of these weapons. Passage of this bill will establish in law the Pentagon’s standard of a 99 percent functioning rate for all U.S. cluster munitions, and ensure that our deployment and use of these munitions adhere uniformly to this standard. We must do everything possible to spare innocent civilians intended for military targets. The current risk posed by cluster munitions is simply unacceptable.

In 2011, Handicap International studied the effects of cluster bombs in 24 countries and regions, including Afghanistan, Chechnya, Laos and Lebanon. Its report found civilians make up 98 percent of those killed or injured by cluster bombs, and 27 percent of the casualties were children.

The Oslo Convention on Cluster Munitions—which has been signed by 111 countries and ratified by 77—prohibits the production, use and export of cluster munitions and requires signatories to eliminate their arsenals within eight years. While nearly all of our major military allies have joined this treaty, to date, the United States has not.

There will always be those who will argue against such a change in military policy and practice, who will say this can’t be done. History argues otherwise. I am hopeful that we can make significant progress on this issue and pass this legislation during the 113th Congress.
THE LAST DOUGHBOY
HON. TED POE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there was once a man who wouldn’t take no for an answer when told he was too young to join the United States Army.

He looked for ways to join, even if it meant telling a recruiter a whopper about his age.

In the recruiter’s eyes he was 21 when he was just 16.

And the only way he could land foot in the action of World War I was to drive an ambulance.

It was the quickest way he could get to the battlefield.

He desperately wanted to help other Americans that were already fighting the war to end all wars.

During the war, not only did he rescue Americans, but he rescued the other wounded allies and took them back behind enemy lines.

This brave man was Frank Buckles.

Even after being told “no,” he became the last surviving doughboy from America.

This week marks 2 years since his death.

He was 110 years old, and a true fighter, Mr. Speaker.

Today, I remember my friend and patriot, Mr. Buckles.

We celebrate the remarkable life that he lived.

And that’s just the way it is.

HONORING NED GATHWRIGHT
HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a remarkable veteran of the Korean Conflict from July 30, 1954 until July 25, 1957.

Ned Gathwright served in the United States Army in the Infantry 11 Bravo Company. He received his Basic and Advanced Individual Training at Fort Jackson, South Carolina. His duty stations were Airborne School at Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Co E 505th Infantry 2nd Airborne Battalion Group in Augsburg, Germany. For his service, he has received the National Defense Medal, Parachutist Badge, and the Good Conduct Medal.

Mr. Gathwright’s early education was in the Coahoma County Schools, graduating in 1954 from Coahoma County Agricultural High School. In 1957, he enrolled at Coahoma Junior College on the Montgomery GI Bill. Upon graduating, he entered Jackson State University and received his Bachelor Degree in 1960. The Quitman County School District employed him in the district’s Science and Math Departments the same year. He continued his formal education at UCLA, Texas A & M, Michigan State University, and received his Master in Education at the University of Mississippi.

He is married to the former Fannie Hurst and they have two daughters: Sabrina and Katrina. He’s a member of the Greenhill Missionary Baptist Church and Coahoma Community College Board of Trustee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Ned Gathwright, who has dedicated his life to serving his country and community.

RECOGNIZING LORI SALTZMAN FOR 34 YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of my constituent, Lori Saltzman. After 34 years of service in the United States federal government, Lori is retiring as the Director of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Lori began her career in the federal government in 1978 as a research scientist in the Pulmonary Branch of the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, while attending graduate school at George Washington University. In 1984, she joined the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission’s Directorate for Health Sciences as a toxicologist, where she spent the remainder of her career.

In 1991, Lori was selected to be a candidate in CPSC’s Women’s Executive Leadership Program, where she learned valuable management skills that helped further CPSC’s regulatory and policy development. In 1994, Lori was named acting director of the Health Effects Division of Health Sciences and eventually Director of the Division of Health Sciences.

Under her leadership, the Health Sciences staff made significant contributions in helping the CPSC address a number of important consumer product issues, including assessing the toxicity and risk associated with the use of lead and cadmium in children’s jewelry, fire retardant chemicals in upholstered furniture and mattresses, phthalates in children’s products, and arsenic from pressure treated wood preservatives used on decks and playgrounds. Lori also represented CPSC on numerous federal interagency groups and task forces. She served as one of the early co-chairs of the federally mandated Committee on Indoor Air Quality (CI AQ), as a federal liaison to the CDC’s Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention (ACCLPP), and as a representative to the recent Interagency Task Force on Problem Drywall.

Because of Lori’s understanding of CPSC’s scientific issues, as well as its compliance and enforcement activities, her opinions and technical expertise were often relied upon by Compliance officials to support their actions against regulated industries. Throughout her career she has been dedicated to developing and mentoring her staff to assure that the Commission’s compliance activities continue to be supported with the best scientific analyses possible. Her talents in both the scientific and policy arenas led to detailed assignments as a special assistant with former CPSC Chairman Ann Brown and Commissioner Nancy Nord, as well as Associate Director in the CPSC’s Office of Compliance. In this capacity, Lori’s technical expertise have been of assistance in guiding the agency’s work as it addresses new consumer issues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Lori Saltzman and in extending our Nation’s gratitude to her for her honorable and dedicated service to the United States government. I wish her the best of luck in her retirement and all her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT
HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this February marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Family and Medical Leave Act. The Family and Medical Leave Act afforded millions of employees leave of their jobs for personal and family emergencies while keeping their job security intact. This bill expanded access to extended medical leave to millions of workers and military caregivers enabling these citizens to take a leave intermittently whenever medically necessary to care for a loved one with a serious injury or illness.

The Family and Medical Leave Act has afforded millions of Americans with up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave in one year for family and health events without jeopardizing their employment or their health insurance. Since enactment, American families have used the law more than 100 million times. The law has given mothers and fathers the ability to care for a new baby or a seriously-ill child. The law has helped adults caring for a sick spouse, child, or parent with serious health conditions—a protection that will grow exponentially in importance as the generation of baby boomers age.

Despite the strides we have taken in protecting our workers, many Americans are not able to take advantage of the time off and protections offered under the Family and Medical Leave Act. For example, businesses with fewer than 50 employees are exempt from the law, leaving tens of millions of workers ineligible. The need for continued improvement to federal law is clear from the story of Toya, as told by the Family Values at Work organization. Working as a substitute teacher at the grade school level, Toya needed to take time off to care for her sick children. After several days her boss posed a question to her that she should never be asked: “What’s more important, your children or your job?” Upon choosing her children, she was told her services were no longer needed. Federal law should not condone, support, or facilitate these situations.

The anniversary of this legislation provides an opportunity to re-affirm that our nation is committed to fair benefits for all workers and to serve as a launching point to strengthen federal laws protecting workers. I celebrate this law and the relief it provides daily to millions of Americans, allowing them the ability to securely take leave from work in order to accommodate emergencies. Such protections constitute a worker’s right, not a privilege. On this anniversary, we should honor and celebrate the law’s success as well as areas for improvement. I celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Family and Medical Leave Act and the piece of mind
it gives families so that they can care for loved ones knowing that their jobs will be waiting for them.

THANKING GORDON BEAUDOIN FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement on February 28, 2013, we would like to thank Mr. Gordon Beaudoin for his twenty-three years of distinguished service to the United States House of Representatives. Gordon has served this great institution as a valued employee of House Information Resources (HIR), within the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO).

Gordon began on the Hill in 1990 as an on-site Voice Service Manager with an outside contractor. He was responsible for all telephone services for the House, the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court. He retired from the company in 2000, and became a full-time employee for the House on April 16, 2001.

Gordon’s first responsibility as Manager of the Voice and Video Branch was to sustain existing systems and ensure the best level of service was provided to the House community. After September 11, 2001, Gordon’s team was tasked with identifying and resolving vulnerabilities in the voice systems necessary for Congress to perform its duties.

Gordon directed the development of a voice network recognized by industry experts as one of the most reliable and sustainable in the country. His team completely revamped the voice system hardware and software to provide multiple backups and redundancy. Additionally, he directed his team to completely redesign the network used to transport phone calls. It was an amazing improvement to reliability of service and one in which Gordon is extremely proud to have been a part.

Then, Gordon’s responsibilities focused on the tracking and implementation of new technology in the House community. Gordon had the foresight to initiate projects which will continue to provide House customers with the world class service they expect from the CAO. Based on his vision, the voice network is being converted to an IP based system in order to provide many benefits now as well as in the future. Additionally, the voicemail system is being upgraded to provide new features and functions allowing customers to communicate in more collaborative ways.

On behalf of the entire House community, we extend congratulations to Gordon Beaudoin for his many years of dedication, outstanding contributions and service to the United States House of Representatives.

We wish him many great years in fulfilling his retirement dreams.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WELFARE INTEGRITY ACT OF 2013

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of Washington ending the cycle of drug abuse by allowing states to perform random drug tests to receive the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits.

The time is now to stop the cruel cycle of drug abuse. Currently, Washington enables people who are addicted to drugs by allowing them to participate in the TANF program while still abusing drugs. This program was designed to provide a safety net for families and children in their time of need. Instead Washington is enabling the drug abuse cycle to continue because Washington does not demand folks who use the program to be drug free.

If Washington wants to help families move toward economic stability it must end the cycle of drug abuse and encourage individuals to become healthy. By allowing for random drug checks, it can ensure that families receiving TANF benefits use the funds for the intended purpose of feeding, clothing, and providing shelter for children while cutting the ties that enables the cycle of drug abuse.

The Welfare Integrity Act of 2013 requires each state participating in the TANF program to certify that applicants and current recipients are being randomly tested for illegal drug use. In order to pass constitutional muster, the Welfare Integrity Act of 2013 requires states to provide a consent and waiver form where applicants are given the choice to waive their Fourth Amendment Rights and submit to a random drug test. The Supreme Court has ruled several times individuals have the right to waive their Fourth Amendment rights.

If an applicant waives their Fourth Amendment Rights and submit to a random drug test, the Supreme Court has ruled several times that individuals have the right to waive their Fourth Amendment Rights.

If an applicant waives their Fourth Amendment Rights and submit to a random drug test, the Supreme Court has ruled several times that individuals have the right to waive their Fourth Amendment Rights.

If an applicant waives their Fourth Amendment Rights and submit to a random drug test, the Supreme Court has ruled several times that individuals have the right to waive their Fourth Amendment Rights.

If an applicant waives their Fourth Amendment Rights and submit to a random drug test, the Supreme Court has ruled several times that individuals have the right to waive their Fourth Amendment Rights.
Captain Biggs’ personal decorations include the Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with one gold star, Navy Commendation Medal with three gold stars, Army Commendation Medal, Navy Achievement Medal and various service related awards and campaign ribbons.

Captain Biggs is married to the former Marina Reese. The Biggs’ have four children; Justin, Eric, Juliana, and Joshua.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Captain Kristian P. Biggs for his thirty years of service to our country. Captain Biggs demonstrated a deep commitment to the security of our nation. His exemplary career is a testament to the level of dedication exhibited among our men and women in the armed forces. I would like to personally wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

NATIONAL MARFAN AWARENESS MONTH

HON. STEVE ISRAEL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Americans affected by Marfan syndrome and related heritable connective tissue disorders across the country.

As February marks National Marfan Awareness Month, it is important to raise awareness to this rare genetic condition. About 1 in 10,000 Americans carries a genetic mutation that impacts connective tissue throughout the entire body. Patients often have disproportionately long limbs, a protruding or indented chest bone, curved spine, and loose joints. However, these are not what most concern Marfan syndrome patients. Internal organs have connective tissue and in Marfan patients the aorta, the large artery that carries blood away from the heart, is weakened and prone to enlargement and potentially fatal rupture.

This year marks the 30th anniversary of the enactment of the Orphan Drug Act. While we have made great strides in addressing rare conditions since the Orphan Drug Act first became law, we must not lose sight of the work that still needs to be done. Patients with Marfan syndrome and related disorders rely on us to provide investment in critical research activities so that treatment options can be improved and, most importantly, so that cures can be found.

I am proud to represent the nation’s foremost organization working to support the Marfan community, the National Marfan Foundation, based in Port Washington, New York. The Foundation was founded in 1981 by Priscilla Ciccariello, and since then the Foundation has worked to improve the lives of those affected. For Marfan syndrome and related disorders by promoting research, raising awareness, and providing support to those afflicted with Marfan.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing National Marfan Awareness Month. I look forward to working with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to make critical investments in medical research and treatment to save the lives of people across the United States.

RECOGNIZING COOK COUNTY SPELLING BEE CHAMPION ALIA ABIAD

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alia Abiad, winner of the Cook County Spelling Bee.

Alia Abiad is a 7th Grader at McClure Junior High School, and a resident of my hometown of Western Springs, IL. In addition to being a skilled tennis player and violinist for the Chicago Youth Symphony Orchestra, her recent performances in local Spelling Bees have demonstrated that she is an extremely dedicated and talented young woman. Alia diligently practices her spelling independently and with her parents every day. She also gains her edge by reading books intended for an audience well beyond her age. Alia initially won the title of best speller at McClure Junior High, and then went on to win the Cook County Regional Spelling Bee. In these competitions she maintained a perfect record, spelling every word correctly. Alia will be representing her school and her peers at the Scripps National Spelling Bee in Washington, DC this upcoming May.

This victory is a reminder of how preparation, practice, and perseverance produce solid results, even when facing difficult challenges. I call on all my colleagues to join me in congratulating Alia Abiad for her tremendous accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING SUSAN RIGBY AS THE 2014 ESCAMBIA COUNTY, FLORIDA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Susan Rigby as the 2014 Escambia County, Florida Teacher of the Year. Mrs. Rigby has been an inspiration to her students, her colleagues, and our community; and I am honored to recognize her success and achievements.

In 1983, Mrs. Rigby graduated from the University of West Florida with a bachelor’s degree in Business Management, and in 2005 she earned a master’s degree from the University of West Florida in Clinical Teaching and Special Education. However, Mrs. Rigby’s passion for teaching began well before 2005. Since 1989, Mrs. Rigby has served the students and community of Northwest Florida, both in the Escambia County and Santa Rosa County school districts. Mrs. Rigby initially served an ESE Teacher Assistant and Substitute Teacher for the Escambia County School District from 1989 to 1999. Since then, she has served twice as an ESE Teacher for Pine Forest High School, Math Teacher for Navarre High School, and is currently the an Algebra 1A Co-Teacher at Pine Forest High School.

The superb quality and effectiveness of the schools in Northwest Florida can no doubt be credited to educators like Susan Rigby. Mrs. Rigby understands the invaluable role teachers play in the lives of their students, and she possesses an unwavering commitment and fervor. She is an exemplary teacher who believes encouraging her students to reach their highest potential is the most crucial to the learning experience. The enthusiasm demonstrated by Mrs. Rigby’s students is truly a testament to her dedication and desire to see her students achieve both in and out of the classroom.

Aside from her involvement at Pine Forest High School, Mrs. Rigby dedicates her time to various community events such as Relay for Life, We Believe in Children 5K, as well as projects that benefit underprivileged classrooms. Mrs. Rigby’s efforts and devotion have not gone unnoticed, and she has been honored for her years of teaching secondary education. In 2004, she was awarded the University of West Florida, Outstanding College of Education Student. She was also the recipient of the Pine Forest High School Teacher of the Year, as well as the Walmart Selection Teacher of the Year in 2005.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Mrs. Susan Rigby as the 2014 Escambia County Teacher of the Year. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mrs. Rigby, and we wish her all the best for continued success.

THE GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT HERITAGE PROTECTION ACT

HON. SUZAN K. DelBENE
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act, along with my colleague Congresswoman Larsen. Green Mountain Lookout, located in the Glacier Peak Wilderness, was built in 1933 as a Civilian Conservation Corps project. During the Second World War, the lookout was used to detect fires and to spot enemy aircraft. It is no surprise that with such a rich history, the Green Mountain Lookout is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Unfortunately, severe weather caused the Green Mountain Lookout to fall into disrepair, and the U.S. Forest Service began taking steps to preserve the historic structure for future generations. However, a group based out of Montana filed a lawsuit against the Forest Service for using machinery in order to conduct repairs, and a U.S. District Court ordered the Forest Service to remove the lookout. This legislation would protect the Green Mountain Lookout, one of the few surviving fire lookouts in the West, by allowing critical maintenance while keeping this iconic structure in its original home.

The Green Mountain Lookout represents a significant piece of the Pacific Northwest’s history and it deserves to be protected for outdoor enthusiasts to enjoy today and in the years to come. I urge my colleagues to preserve a part of our Nation’s history by supporting this bill.
IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the integration of the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

This weekend, a bi-partisan congressional delegation led by Representative JOHN LEWIS of Georgia will travel to Alabama as a part of the 13th annual Faith & Politics Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage. I have the great pleasure of co-hosting the delegation with my fellow Alabama colleagues Representatives SPENCER BACHUS of Alabama, MARTHA ROBY of Alabama, and Congresswoman MARIA BACHUS of Alabama. The Pilgrimage allows participants to retrace the steps of our nation’s Civil Rights icons through the historic civil rights sites in Tuscaloosa, Birmingham, Montgomery, and Selma.

It is also a time to reflect on our painful past while acknowledging our current progress.

This year marks the 50th Anniversary of so many significant civil rights events that occurred in 1963. One of those events was the infamous stand taken by then Governor Wallace at the doors of the University of Alabama to prevent black students from registering. The University of Alabama has come a long way since that infamous day to promote racial diversity within its student body, faculty, and administration.

Today, I pay special tribute to the University of Alabama for remembering the 50th Anniversary of a pivotal event in the struggle for racial equality in America. I believe it is important that we must acknowledge our painful past and frame its significance in the global fight for civil and human rights. The history of the State of Alabama must be remembered for the critical role it played in the Civil Rights Movement which caused a global movement for the quest of human dignity and rights around the world. We, in the 7th Congressional District of Alabama, pay tribute to the University of Alabama as one of the crown jewels of higher education in our district, and honor the courage of the black students—Autherine Lucy, James Hood, and Vivian Malone—who paved the way for the multitude of successes the University enjoys today.

On June 11, 1963, two African-Americans, James Hood and Vivian Malone attempted to enroll at the University of Alabama. Prior to their attempts, only one African-American, Autherine Lucy, had been successful in registering and actually attending classes at the institution.

In 1957, Autherine Lucy and Polly Anne Myers filed suit against the University to clarify their rights and obtain an injunction after being denied admission based on race. The injunction was granted and Ms. Lucy was eventually admitted to the University. She became the first African-American to attend a public white school or university in the State of Alabama.

However, she was unfairly expelled after just three days when the University suggested that her presence was a nuisance to the campus because she could not provide a safe environment for the young student.

In 1963, pursuant to the same injunction, James Hood and Vivian Malone made a second attempt to fully integrate the University. Upon their arrival to the Tuscaloosa campus, former Alabama Governor George Wallace attempted to block Hood and Malone from entering Foster Auditorium to register for classes.

As the world watched, Governor Wallace’s attempts to prevent integration of the University of Alabama from becoming part of the nation’s history as “The Stand in the Schoolhouse Door.” Governor Wallace was determined to defend his now infamous declaration: “Segregation Now, Segregation Tomorrow, and Segregation Forever.” But his efforts to halt the progress were later that day, Hood and Malone with the support of a federal court order and members of the Alabama National Guard, were eventually allowed to register for classes and pursue their degrees.

They are forever recorded in our nation’s history as two of the first African-American students to attend the University. Vivian Malone was the first African-American to graduate from the University of Alabama and James Hood later received his doctorate from the University.

Today, “The Stand in the Schoolhouse Door” is remembered as a pivotal moment in the civil rights movement. As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of this historic event, we recognize its significance in the quest for justice and equality. While there were dark moments, the events of that day are now seen as a catalyst on our road to forming a more perfect union.

Today, the University of Alabama stands as a beacon of inspiration. The diversity represented in today’s student body is a visible reminder of the sacrifices of Autherine Lucy, James Hood, and Vivian Malone. Because of their bravery and courage, the University of Alabama now boast a widely diverse student body, an outstanding academic curriculum and a world class athletic program. Today, the University of Alabama is ably led by its first female President, Dr. Judy Bonner. We recently celebrated having the number one collegiate team in four NCAA sports—including women’s gymnastics and football being named the BCS National Champions for the second year in row.

As a benefactor of the courageous contributions of Autherine Lucy, James Hood and Vivian Malone, I am humbled by the opportunities their bravery has afforded all black Alabamians. As Alabama’s first African-American Congresswoman, I know that my journey would not be possible without their sacrifices.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the University of Alabama and its important place in our nation’s history.

Roll Tide!
He also was the Business Representative of Millwright Local 2734 for 32 years, Secretary for the Carpenters, Millwright and Pile Drivers Mobile District Council for 29 years, and President of the Alabama State Council of Carpenters for 18 years.

Given all these accomplishments, it is remarkable that Mayor Daugherty also found time to live in the Town of McIntosh for all 42 years since its incorporation in 1970. Yet, he has done just that with an equal dedication to public service and integrity.

On behalf of the people of South Alabama, I wish Mayor Daugherty the very best as he leaves public service and embarks on a well-deserved retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY IDENTITY DEFENSE ACT OF 2013

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Social Security Identity Defense Act of 2013, legislation to enhance the ability of the Internal Revenue Service to fight identity theft when that agency becomes aware of the fraudulent use of a taxpayer's personal information.

This legislation is a direct response to the experience of constituents of mine in Princeton, Wisconsin. During a routine review of his credit report, my constituent found accounts opened by another person using his Social Security number. This discovery raised many concerns, not the least of which was that this person’s income might be reported to the IRS under his Social Security number. Upon contacting the IRS, he was told that the IRS knew of the situation and that they had known about it for some time.

Not surprisingly, this answer was not altogether comforting. The IRS knew that someone else had been using his Social Security number, but kept that information under lock and key. While the IRS remained silent, additional frauds were committed, resulting in the further misuse of my constituent’s personal information by another person to establish a fraudulent credit history. When he raised this issue with the IRS, he was astounded by the agency’s answer. Privacy statutes prevent the IRS from discussing the return information of one taxpayer with anyone else. In the view of the IRS, the fraudulent use of my constituent’s Social Security number was the personal return information of another taxpayer, and this fraud could not be disclosed to the rightful owner of that personal identifier, even if this disclosure would help prevent additional frauds.

This policy makes no sense and actually puts the IRS on the wrong side in the fight against identity theft. My legislation aims to correct this problem by changing the privacy statutes to direct the IRS to inform a taxpayer when the agency learns through its normal course of business that a Social Security number assigned to that taxpayer has been used fraudulently by another worker.

Both Congress and our administrative departments and agencies, including the IRS, have made progress in combating identity theft, but more needs to be done. For this reason, the Social Security Identity Defense Act would provide an additional vital tool for our government to deploy.

Under this legislation, the IRS would be required to share any information it possesses about the fraudulent and unauthorized use of a taxpayer’s personal information with that information’s rightful owner. The agency also would be directed to transmit information that may be evidence of an identity theft to the FBI so that the Bureau can make this material available to state and local law enforcement agencies upon their request. Finally, the Social Security Identity Defense Act calls for the IRS to direct employers not to include a Social Security number on a W-2 form when that agency is aware that the employee is making fraudulent use of that number.

These are important steps forward. They will empower both citizens and law enforcement agencies in their efforts to combat identity theft, and they will limit the use of personal identifiers in the commission of future crimes. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by cosponsoring the Social Security Defense Act.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUMGAIT POGROMS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again this year I stand to recognize an important period that remains a strong reminder that we must continue to address violent human tragedies whenever they occurred. The American and Armenian people use this time of year to recommit themselves to preventing any further violence. We do this because we mark the anniversary of the Sumgait pogroms where hundreds of Armenians were murdered as a result of long-running hostilities directed towards the Armenian people.

I ask that my colleagues join me in solemnly commemorating the dtype of these innocent lives. It was on the evening of February 27, 1988 that hundreds of Armenians were brutally murdered, some burned alive and others thrown from windows. Included in the violence was the rape of women and the maiming of children. Armenians saw their belongings stolen, their shops destroyed and thousands were displaced from their homes. To add to the human tragedy, police turned a blind eye thus allowing the pogroms to go on for three days.

Unfortunately, the underlying hostility that led to the outbreak and continued violence of the Sumgait pogroms continues to survive today. For more than two decades, authorities in Azerbaijan have attempted to ignore and cover up these crimes and have instead fostered hatred toward the Armenian people. In an affront to basic senses of justice, the Azerbaijani government recently pardoned Azerbaijani military officer, Ramil Safarov who was sentenced to life in prison for murdering an Armenian military officer during a NATO-sponsored training program in 2004. I continue to be outraged by this promotion of violence against innocent Armenians.

I ask that my colleagues join me in calling on Azerbaijan to fully recognize the Sumgait pogroms and to give an accurate historical account of the events. I also ask my colleagues to join me in calling upon the Azerbaijani government to acknowledge Ramil Safarov as a convicted murderer and immediately take action commensurate with a democratic nation that supports justice under the rule of law. Azerbaijan must break from its current course and take action to create a peaceful future.

As co-chair and founder of the Congressional Armenian Issues Caucus, I know that the caucus will continue its work to ensure that the basic rights of life, liberty and security are promoted throughout the Caucasus region. We will continue to advocate for a peaceful resolution to conflict in the region. We will continue to call on Azerbaijan to cease its hostilities toward the Armenian people and stand for justice whenever it is violated.
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RETIREE OF RICHARD HERTLING

HON. LAMAR SMITH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the call to serve one's country comes to people in many different forms. Some protect our nation in the Armed Forces. Some are elected to public office. Others serve in the three branches of our government. But all work together to protect, preserve and uphold the founding principles of this great nation.

Richard Herdinger has spent the last 27 years serving his country in both the legislative and executive branches. A graduate of the University of Chicago Law School, he began his career at the U.S. Department of Justice. Since then he has worked for Senators, Congressional committees and a presidential campaign.

During the Bush Administration, he oversaw major policy decisions by the Justice Department as the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Legal Policy.

He also managed the Justice Department's communication with Capitol Hill as the Acting Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Legislative Affairs.

Most recently he served as the Staff Director and Chief Counsel for the House Judiciary Committee, which I chaired in the last Congress. With Richard’s help, the House Judiciary Committee passed more substantive bills than any other committee in the last Congress. His strategic thinking was instrumental in achieving this goal.

Today, Richard Hertling is retiring, and we in the House are losing a smart attorney and good friend. But the Senators, members of the House and staff who worked with him will also miss his tutorials in ancient history and his use of Latin in everyday conversations.

We thank him for his service to his country, and wish him the best on his well-deserved retirement.

IN HONOR OF QUEENS COUNTY EXECUTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEY JESSE J. SLIGH

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor a respected leader in my community, Queens County Executive District Attorney Jesse J. Sligh. I have known Jesse Sligh for over 20 years and during that entire time his character and the way he conducts himself has been an example for all.

Since 1991, for twenty-two years, Mr. Sligh has served in the Queens County District Attorney’s Office as an Executive of District Attorney Richard A. Brown’s Special Prosecution Division. The Special Prosecutions Division serves as a bridge between the Queens County District Attorney’s office and the diverse people of Queens. The division proactively fights crime by building strong community partnerships, tackling quality of life issues, and spearheading crime prevention and mentoring programs that educate the youth of Queens about law enforcement and provide a positive structure for children who might otherwise head down the wrong path.

Mr. Sligh, the third of thirteen children, was the first member of his family to attend college, but not only did he attend college he graduated from the Ivy League Columbia University and then he earned his juris doctorate from Georgetown Law School here in Washington D.C. After that, he served our great nation as a Captain in the U.S. Army Jag Corps and earned an exemplary trial record in the process. In 1982, he joined the Queens County District Office. Jesse Sligh’s talent impressed his supervisors and continued to impress them until he reached the position of Executive District Attorney. Thirty-one years later he still serves Queens County.

On February 20, 2013 the Queen’s County District Attorney office honored Jesse Sligh as a part of a Black History Month Celebration and I want to honor him today as well. Jesse, a man of great faith, is a founding member of the Erie Avenue Baptist Church in Philadelphia and he is a member of the Queens Executive Board for the Boy Scouts. Jesse has been a mentor to young and old, he is a true friend to everyone he has known, and he always offers help in times of need. I applaud Mr. Sligh for all he has accomplished and his service to our Country, his family, public service and God. I am proud that he is a member of my district.

Jesse, we thank you for your good and faithful work.

IN MEMORY OF MRS. ATHERLENE MONROE

HON. AL GREEN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the memory of a spiritual leader and a pillar of Houston’s Sunnyside community, Mrs. Atherlene Monroe. With extraordinary dedication, Mrs. Monroe devoted her life to the spiritual instruction of others and her family.

Mrs. Monroe was born in Houston, TX on February 6, 1935. Her parents instilled within her an unshakeable faith, and a desire to spiritually mentor as well as teach others. On December 20, 1953, Mrs. Monroe met and married another pillar of the Sunnyside community, Reverend Rugley Monroe. Jr., Pastor of the El Bethel Missionary Baptist Church. Together Reverend and Mrs. Monroe raised three sons as well as one daughter. They worked to serve their community as well as save the souls of a multitude of people.

Mrs. Monroe served in several roles at the El Bethel Missionary Baptist Church and the local spiritual community. Through her selfless hard work and integrity, she eventually became a member of the choir, president of the Women’s Mission, as well as treasurer of the Southside’s Minister’s Wives Union organization. She was also a faithful companion to her husband of 59 years in all his endeavors.

Finally, Mr. Speaker. Mrs. Monroe will be missed dearly by a host of family and friends. The family includes her husband, four children, Rugley Monroe, Ill, Angeline Stewart, David Monroe, Sr., and Patrick Monroe, Sr., as well as her nine grandchildren, twelve great-grandchildren, and one great-great grandchild. Mrs. Monroe will be remembered in the Sunnyside community as an exemplar of a faithful Christian lady, wife, mother, and teacher.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DUDLEY TERRELL, JR.

HON. JO BONNER
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. BONNER, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of an American hero and a good friend, Mr. John Dudley Terrell, Jr., who recently passed away at the age of 91.

A native and lifelong resident of Mobile, Mr. Terrell graduated from McGill Institute and attended Springhill College.

Like many Alabamians of his generation, John answered his country’s call to serve during World War II. As a young lieutenant with the Army Air Corps, he flew 51 combat missions at the controls of a B24 Liberator bomber in the European Theater of Operations.

His considerable wartime experience included participation in three historic battles: Air Offensive Europe, The Rome-Amo Campaign, and the Battle of Normandy where his bravery and combat piloting skills no doubt helped to advance the Allied efforts against the Axis powers.

For his courageous service, he received the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters and the European Theater Medal with three Bronze Stars.

After the Allied Victory in Europe, Mr. Terrell left the Army Air Corps to return to civilian life where he traded his role as an aviator for that of an Independent Insurance Agent in his hometown.

He partnered with business associates to form the Robertson, Grove and Terrell Agency. Later he joined W.K.P. Wilson and Son’s, Inc. During his long and successful career in the insurance industry, he distinguished himself as exceptional businessman. Among his achievements, he was presented the Chartered Property Casualty Underwriter (CPCU) designation. He later joined TriCorp, Inc., where he worked until his well-deserved retirement.

John was a long time member of St. Ignatius Catholic Church of Mobile. He was also an active member of numerous local community service organizations including several mystic societies.

On behalf of the people of South Alabama, I wish to extend my personal condolences to his wife of 60 years, Annunziata, their three children: Liz, John III, and Kathleen, and their 10 grandchildren. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.
Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Aaron Honeysucker for his dedication to serving our great country.

CONGRATULATING THE 2012 NAVAL ACADEMY OF INVENTORS' CHARTER FELLOWS

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 101 inventors who were recently recognized at the University of South Florida in Tampa and inducted as the 2012 National Academy of Inventors' Charter Fellows by the United States Commissioner of Patents, Margaret A. Focarino. In order to be named as a Charter Fellow, these men and women were nominated by their peers and have undergone the scrutiny of the NAI Selection Committee, having been judged as making significant impact on quality of life, economic development, and welfare of society. Collectively, this elite group holds more than 3,200 patents.

These accomplishments up this year’s class of Charter Fellows include inventors from 56 research universities and non-profit research institutes spanning not just the United States but also the world. This group of inductees touts eight Nobel Laureates, 14 presidents of research universities and non-profit research institutes, 53 members of the National Academies, 11 inductees of the National Inventors Hall of Fame, two Fellows of the Royal Society, five recipients of the National Medal of Technology and Innovation, four recipients of the National Medal of Science, and 31 AAAS Fellows, among other major awards and distinctions.

The contributions made to society through innovation are immeasurable. I commend these individuals, and the organizations that support them, for the work that they do to revitalize the world we live in. As the followers of inventors are inducted, may it encourage future innovators to strive to meet this high honor and continue the spirit of innovation.

The 2012 NAI Charter Fellows include:

- Dharmo P. Agrawal, University of Cincinnati; Anthony Atala, Wake Forest University; Benton F. Baugh, University of Houston; Khasrow M. Behbehani, University of Texas at Arlington; Raymond J. Bergeron, University of Florida; Gerardine G. Botte, Ohio University; Robert H. Brown, Jr., University of Massachusetts Medical Center; Robert L. Byer, Stanford University; Sir Roy Calne, University of Cambridge; Curtis L. Carlson, SRI International.

- Nai Yuen Chen, University of Texas at Arlington; Stephen Z. Q. Cheng, The University of Akron; Joseph P. Kennedy, The University of Akron; Alan F. List, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute; James L. Parks, University of Utah; H. Holden Thorp, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Richard B. Marchase, University of Alabama at Birmingham; Stephen W. S. McKeever, Oklahoma State University; Craig M. Mello, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Shyam Mohapatra, University of South Florida; Theodore D. Moustakas, Boston University.

- George R. Newkome, The University of Akron; C. L. Max Nikitas, University of Southern California; University of Florida; Julio C. Palma, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Thomas N. Parks, University of Utah; C. Kenneth Patel, University of California, Los Angeles; Per S. Paul, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; David W. Pershing, University of Utah; G. F. Peterson, Georgia Institute of Technology; Leonard Polizzotto, Draper Laboratory.

- Huntington Potter, University of Colorado Denver; Paul R. Sanberg, University of South Florida; Thomas A. Lipo, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Sung Wan Kim, University of South Florida; Patrick T. Harker, University of Pennsylvania; Sung-Won Kim, University of Seoul; R. Bowen Loftin, Texas A&M University; Robert M. Layher, Institute for Systems Biology; Ernest B. Liskov, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ivar Giaever, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; John J. Kopchick, Ohio University; Roger Y. Tsien, University of California, San Diego; James L. Park, Massachusetts General Hospital; Eric R. Fossum, Dartmouth College; Richard D. Gillies, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Sir Robert W. Holman, University of Cambridge; Ivar G. Giaever, Polytechnic Institute; John J. Kopchick, The Ohio State University; Roger Y. Tsien, University of California, San Diego; James L. Park, Massachusetts General Hospital; Eric R. Fossum, Dartmouth College; Richard D. Gillies, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

- John J. Kopchick, Ohio University; Roger D. Kornberg, Stanford University; Max G. Moghaddam, University of Wisconsin-Madison; James L. Layher, University of Technology; Brian A. Larkins, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; Victor B. Lawrence, Stevens Institute of Technology; Virginia M.-Y. Lee, University of Pennsylvania; Jean-Marie Lehn, University of Strasbourg; Shinn-Zong Lin, China Medical University; Thomas A. Lipo, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Allen C. Liao, University of Michigan; William J. Marrow, University of Colorado Denver; James L. Park, Massachusetts General Hospital; Ivar G. Giaever, Polytechnic Institute; John J. Kopchick, The Ohio State University; Roger Y. Tsien, University of California, San Diego; James L. Park, Massachusetts General Hospital; Eric R. Fossum, Dartmouth College; Richard D. Gillies, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

- Barbara H. Liskov, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Alan F. List, The University of Akron; H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute; James L. Parks, University of Utah; C. Kenneth Patel, University of California, Los Angeles; Per S. Paul, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; David W. Pershing, University of Utah; G. F. Peterson, Georgia Institute of Technology; Leonard Polizzotto, Draper Laboratory; Huntington Potter, University of Colorado Denver; Paul R. Sanberg, University of South Florida; Thomas A. Lipo, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Sung Wan Kim, University of South Florida; Patrick T. Harker, University of Pennsylvania; Sung-Won Kim, University of Seoul; R. Bowen Loftin, Texas A&M University; Robert M. Layher, Institute for Systems Biology; Ernest B. Liskov, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ivar Giaever, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; John J. Kopchick, Ohio University; Roger Y. Tsien, University of California, San Diego; James L. Park, Massachusetts General Hospital; Eric R. Fossum, Dartmouth College; Richard D. Gillies, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Aaron Honeysucker. Aaron was born in Camden, Mississippi in 1948. He is the father of three adult children—Felicia A. Berry, Marcus M. Honeysucker, and Chelsie B.Coleman. Mr. Honeysucker is a retired military veteran who served during the Vietnam War. While serving in the military, Mr. Honeysucker also worked as an insurance salesman from 1978-1980. He currently is a small business owner and sells real estate.

Mr. Honeysucker graduated from Velma Jackson High School in 1967, Hinds Junior College in 1972, and Jackson State University in 1997. Mr. Honeysucker is a member of several social & civic organizations including the Veteran of Foreign Wars, JSU Alumni Association, Blue Bengal Athletic Association, Woodhaven Homeowners Association, The Retired Active Reserve and Armed Forces Association, and Red Cross Volunteer.

STOP THE SEQUESTER

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 2013

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, in Connecticut last week, I heard a lot of different fears from people in my district about sequestration. Almost everyone is worried about the economy. Small business owners and manufacturers in Torrington and Waterbury are worried about staying above water. Parents in Danbury are worried about their children’s education. Social service providers in New Britain and Meriden are worried about losing funding to help senior who need meal assistance and to help families who need housing assistance. People everywhere are worried about keeping their jobs.

And there’s a question in common. With this imminent, self-inflicted threat to people’s jobs and people’s livelihoods, why isn’t Congress doing anything about it? Why, at the very last, are we not voting on a balanced alternative?

Our constituents deserve more than an answer to that question, they deserve action. There are no business owners and families in Connecticut, or in any state, should be facing this catastrophe. It is entirely of our own doing but it’s the folks back home that suffer the consequences.

I ask unanimous consent that the House now take up H.R. 699, the Stop the Sequester Job Loss Now Act, introduced by Mr. Van HOLLEN to replace the sequestration with commonsense, cost-cutting policies—repealing subsidies for big oil and big gas, refocusing subsidies for big agriculture, and enacting a “Buffett Rule” so that the wealthiest are paying their fair share.

We should be allowed to vote on this bill, and we should vote to remove this threat to the well-being of folks in all of our districts who have worked so hard to get by and to bring our country back from recession.
to the widespread impression among the people of Taiwan that the party was plagued by nepotism, corruption, and economic failure. Tensions increased between the Taiwanese people and the ROC administration. The flashpoint came on February 28, 1947 when in Taipei a group of young cigarette vendors and an officer of the Government’s Office of Monopoly triggered civil disorder and open rebellion by the native Taiwanese against the KMT repression. During the following weeks, Chiang’s government sent troops to crush the rebellion. The Chinese soldiers started to round up and execute a whole generation of an elite of Taiwanese lawyers, doctors, students, professors etc. It is estimated that up to 30,000 people lost their lives during the turmoil. During the following four decades, the Chinese Nationalists continued to rule Taiwan with an iron fist under a Martial Law that would not be lifted until 1987.

Mr. Speaker, the Massacre had far reaching implications. Over the next half century, the Taiwanese democracy movement that grew out of the event helped pave the way for Taiwan’s momentous transformation from a dictatorship under the Chinese Nationalists to a democracy.

In some ways, the 228 incident was Taiwan’s Boston Massacre for both events functioned as the cradle of a move by both peoples to full democracy and helped galvanize the strive to independence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me today in commemorating this important historical event.

**BLACK HISTORY MONTH**

**HON. JOE GARCIA**

**OF FLORIDA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, February 28, 2013*

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observance of Black History Month—an opportunity to celebrate the rich legacy of African-Americans and the many ways they have shaped our Nation’s history. This Black History Month, we commemorate two landmark anniversaries in American history: the 150th anniversary of Emancipation Proclamation and the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington. Separated by a century, these two seminal events underscore what the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., once said—that “the arc of the moral universe is long but it bends towards justice.” Each successive generation of Americans must always do their part to build on the progress of those who came before them in order to advance the ideals of freedom and equality upon which our Nation was founded.

In South Florida, we have benefited tremendously from trailblazing African-American leaders who have broken through color barriers in order to contribute to our communities and our country.

They include individuals who served our country bravely, including Lt. Col. Eldridge Williams—one of the legendary Tuskegee airman—and Col. Brooks Hartley Jr., who has been a leading civil rights leader in South Florida committed to improving quality health care access for those in need. He was formerly a defender Rev. John A. Ferguson, who after serving in the Navy helped found a small congregation in Richmond Heights that would grow to nearly 800 under his leadership and today stands at over 1400.

They include leaders like Al Dotson Sr., a pastor who served as the first elected African American president of the Orange Bowl Committee and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees for Florida International University, as well as Mayor Otis Wallace, who has served Florida City as mayor for over twenty-eight years and is today the longest serving elected official in the State of Florida.

I could name so many others. South Florida is a better place because of their commitment to public service and their strong leadership.

**EXPANDING THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DEFINITION OF “HOMELESS VETERAN”**

**HON. JANICE HAHN**

**OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, February 28, 2013*

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, after over ten years of wars, we have a growing number of veterans in our nation. We have a responsibility to provide support and services for our sons once they return home. This includes the area of domestic violence.

Sadly, our brave soldiers who return home after fighting our nation’s wars are not immune from domestic abuse. As I’ve said previously, we have a duty to our veterans. However, current law fails to fully protect those veterans who have been driven from their homes because of domestic violence.

In order to reflect the modern day reality that there are more women in our military than ever before, it is important that we continue to update our laws to address emerging issues within this new trend.

The civilian definition of homelessness includes people fleeing from domestic violence. However, the current law the Department of Veterans Affairs uses to administer benefits for homeless veterans does not recognize those driven from their homes because of domestic violence.

The full definition of “homeless” under the law includes the following: “Any individual or family who is fleeing, or is attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions in the individual’s or family’s current housing situation, including where the individual or family fears for safety of children are jeopardized, and who have no other residence and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.” However, the Department of Veterans Affairs currently defines “homeless veteran” based on an incomplete definition of the civilian homeless law.

That’s why I have decided to reintroduce this bipartisan legislation with my colleague Congressman RUNYAN that would expand the Department of Veterans Affairs’ definition of...
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HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for
equality and justice through the Civil Rights
Movement would not have attained its level of
success without dedicated leaders such as
"Brooklynites, I have encountered voter dis-

discrimination tactics that has resulted in Kings
County being subjected to the requirements of
Section 5's preclearance rules and provisions.
In 1921, New York State enacted an
English-only literacy test that remained on the
books through the 1960s. During this time,
New York State experienced a "Great Migra-
tion" from the South, as well as, from Puerto
Rico and other areas of Latino decent. Most of
these migrants lived in communities such as
Harlem in Manhattan, the South Bronx, and
the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn.
At that time, New York State law included a lit-
ery test which proved difficult, if not impos-
sible for people with educational or language
barriers. Coincidentally, there were three
counties in New York City with low voter turn-

out in the 1968 election due to large part to
the fact that these literacy tests could not be
passed. This ultimately became the reason
why jurisdictions for Section 5 preclearance
were extended to specific counties in New
York, in particular, Brooklyn, New York.

On May 10, 1967, a federal court ruled that
the hodgepodge of gerrymandered congres-
sional districts that snaked in and out of Bed-
ford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn were unconstitu-
tional, in that they operated "to minimize or
cancel out the voting strength of racial or polit-
cal elements of the voting population". They
were effectively a tool to dilute the power of
the Voting Rights Act and de-

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL
CARROLL THACKSTON

HON. ROBERT HURT
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to rec-
ognize and honor the life of a remarkable pub-
lric servant, my friend Major General Carroll
Thackston, of South Boston in Virginia's 5th
Congressional District.

Major General Thackston had a distin-
guished military career spending six years in
the United States Army and 35 years in the
Virginia National Guard, where he served as
inspector general of the 116th Support Battal-
ion, state military personnel offic-
er, chief of staff, assistant adjutant general,
and adjutant general following his 1994 ap-
pointment by Governor George Allen.

As adjutant general, he provided encour-
aging words as he visited Virginia National
Guard members; he helped those in need as
he engaged in state emergency response op-
erations; and he provided leadership as he

oversaw the transition of Virginia National
Guard operations to Fort Pickett.

The recipient of two Virginia Distinguished

Service Medals, Major General Thackston will

be remembered for his unwavering loyalty and
true devotion to serving and protecting his fel-

low Virginians.

In addition to his role as a highly respected

military veteran, Major General Thackston was

also known for his service to his local commu-

nity. He was a member of the South Boston

Town Council and served as Mayor of South

Boston. He also served on several boards in-

cluding the Halifax County Chamber of Com-

merce, the Richmond and South Boston United

Way, the South Boston School Board, and the

YMCA.

Major General Thackston was a dear friend

and he will be missed by our community. I ask

my colleagues to join me in remembering a
great Virginian and a truly dedicated public

servant who not only made an impression on

the lives of those of us in the Fifth District, but

a man who made a difference in the lives of

all Virginians.

HONORING CAPTAIN TAMIKO
WRIGHT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Spea-
er, I rise today to honor an active soldier, Cap-
tain Tamiko Wright.

Captain Wright is a 1996 graduate of Vicks-
burg High School. Upon graduating from high
school, she attended the University of South-
ern Mississippi, where she earned her bach-
elor's degree in Kinesiology. She also holds a
Masters in Business Administration (MBA)
from Columbia Southern University and is cur-
rently seeking an additional Masters degree in
Logistics.

Captain Wright is employed by the Com-
bined Support Maintenance Shop (CSMS) at
Camp Shelby, Mississippi where she is the
Supervisor of Production Control. Captain
Wright oversees the flow of approximately
1500 work requests per month on various
kinds of military equipment. Her additional du-
ties at CSMS include Anti-Terrorism Officer,
Assistant Safety Officer, Hazardous Waste
Management Coordinator, Sexual Harassment
Officer, Assistant Operating Manager and
SAMS—1E training officer.

Captain Wright and her husband, Larry
Wright, reside in Hattiesburg, Mississippi and
have two lovely daughters: Amari, 7 years old
and Lorrie, 2 years old.

Captain Wright has dedicated over 12 years
to the Mississippi Army National Guard. While
during so, she has served her country in de-
ployment for Operation Iraqi Freedom to Ku-
wat and served on the S1 administrative staff
for Operation Clean-Up during Hurricane
Katrina.
Andrew W. Cooper, a community activist, was the impetus for this historic change. A year after the Voting Rights Act became law he sued New York State officials in a case called Cooper v. Power. The ensuing legal battle led to the redrawing of the new historically based Congressional District of New York (the district was later reapportioned to parts of the 11th District and now 9th Congressional District).

The ruling set in motion a monumental shift in voting rights in New York and beyond, redefining political representation for people of color. It was built on the foundation of civil rights gains made in the south and helped push the agenda for Voting Rights nationwide.

As a woman of color, a witness to the re-election of our nation's first Black President, and the U.S. Representative for the Ninth Congressional District, which is a majority-minority district covered under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, I am deeply concerned by the potential ramifications of this case and the impact of its rulings on people of color and their right to vote.

More recently a Brooklyn elected official wrote an editorial questioning the validity and significance of Brooklyn's classification as a Section 5 covered jurisdiction. Brooklyn NY has one of the largest concentrations of people of color in the nation. It is also worth noting that the Brooklyn elected official from Brooklyn appeared in “Black face,” just this Sunday. These types of hostile inquiries and acts erode the fabric of American democracy and speak to the heart of why Section 5 preclearance is vital to the realization of justice and equality.

In many areas, racially polarized voting and the intent to disenfranchise Black voters demonstrate that the requirements of Section Five remain crucial to the basic function of our democracy.

The 9th Congressional district of New York, which I presently represent, was birthed in 1965 when Andrew Cooper brought suit under the Voting Rights Act against racial gerrymandering and in response to widespread and prolific discriminatory voting practices in Brooklyn. This suit gave birth to New York’s 12th Congressional district and the election in 1968 of Shirley Chisholm, the first Black woman ever elected to the U.S. Congress to whom I have the distinct honor and privilege of succeeding almost 40 years later.

Even in the years after the formation of the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971, people of color remain underrepresented at every level of elected offices.

These are just a few examples of why Section 5, and in particular its preclearance clauses, are essential to ensure that changes to voting rules and practices do not result in voter suppression, retrogression, and discrimination.

Without the existence of majority-minority districts, the voices of millions of Americans will be excluded from Capitol Hill; and their perspectives would not inform public debate. Without Section 5, racially polarized voting and democracy would exist in form, but not in fact.

When I was elected to Congress in 2006, and after Congress had just reauthorized the Voting Rights Act, I would never have thought that today we would be re-litigating issues that I believed were long since settled and resolved.

It took our nation over 200 years to obtain the victories of the Civil Rights Movement, now less than 50 years after the Voting Rights Act was signed into law are we truly to believe that systemic racial discrimination and voter suppression has ended? I think not! These advancements in the struggle for equality, permitting All Americans to freely exercise their right to vote will take more than a lifetime to protect and preserve. Jurists of the Supreme Court, a word of advice—If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it!

**ST. MARKS PAROCHIAL SCHOOL**

**HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK**

**OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, February 28, 2013**

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of St. Mark’s Parochial School in Bristol Borough, PA. On December 27, 1887, St. Mark’s Parochial School was opened and officially blessed, becoming the first parochial school in Bucks County, St. Mark’s School was initially staffed by The Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and Father Ward, who was Pastor of St. Mark Parish from 1879 to 1887, is considered the founder of Catholic education in Bristol. For the next 125 years, the school would become an integral part of the Bristol Borough community.

Thanks to its dedicated teachers and staff, St. Mark’s Parochial School provides students with a high quality and well-rounded education in a Christian environment. It helps children develop a strong sense of morality and concern for their fellow neighbor. Further, members of St. Mark’s routinely demonstrate an active presence in their community. The school has become a great source of pride for the Borough of Bristol.

St. Mark’s shows promise and growth as an institution and will continue to cultivate young minds. Because the school serves as a model of excellence in education and an active participant in community development, it is my pleasure to honor St. Mark’s Parochial School of Bristol Borough on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

**SEQUESTER HARM IS “ABSOLUTELY OVER-HYPED”**

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.**

**OF TENNESSEE**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, February 28, 2013**

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Bloomberg says, “Spare me!”

He said yesterday that the Administration’s efforts to scare people about the sequester have gone too far.

He said, “In all fairness, on Monday, we’ll be able to police the streets.”

He said “there’s a lot of posturing” and that statements about laying off employees, closing down hospitals, and letting prisoners go “are not good for the economy.”

The Mayor said, “Spare me, I live in that world. I mean come on, let’s get serious here.”

In today’s National Journal Daily, Steve Bell, senior director of the Bipartisan Policy Center, says the sequester is completely overhyped.”

He says, “A sequester will occur and the next day the likelihood is that almost no one will know that it started.”

**HONORING MINDY B. THOMPSON**

**OF MISSISSIPPI**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, February 28, 2013**

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Ms. Minnie Dodge, Administrative Manager for the Modesto Chamber of Commerce, who is retiring after 14 years of outstanding service to our community.

Ms. Dodge attended Boise State University. During her time in the state of Idaho, she worked for L.B. Industries, Inc., the Larry Bames Foundation, and was the co-owner of Omega Construction.

Minnie then relocated to California, where she was hired at the Modesto Chamber of Commerce as the Customer Service Manager in February of 1999. During her years at the Chamber, she was on several committees, including the Ag Aware Luncheon, the Harvest Luncheon, the Good Egg Breakfast, and the Modesto Chamber of Commerce Leadership Steering Committee. In July 2002, Minnie was promoted to Administrative Manager.

Minnie and her husband, Tony Meli, will soon be moving back to Boise, Idaho. Her family includes children Nicole, Cherene and her husband Steve, and Shane and his wife Tracy; along with their grandchildren Emily, Ashley, Conner, and Jack.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending Minnie Dodge for her numerous years of selfless service to the betterment of our community.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE**

**OF NEW YORK**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, February 28, 2013**

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the vote on Monday, February 25, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 47, H.R. 667—To redesignate the Dryden Flight Research Center as the Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center and the Western Aeronautical Test Range as the Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range.

**HONORING JESSE J. JOSSELL, JR.**

**OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, February 28, 2013**

Mr. JOSSELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable veteran of the Korean Conflict from 1954–1957, Pastor Jesse J. Jossell, Jr., of Marks, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending Minnie Dodge for her numerous years of selfless service to the betterment of our community.

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

**OF MISSISSIPPI**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, February 28, 2013**

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a remarkable veteran of the Korean Conflict from 1954–1957, Pastor Jesse J. Jossell, Jr., of Marks, Mississippi.
HONORING CONNECTICUT’S PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

HON. JOE COURTNEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of the 26 Peace Corps members from eastern Connecticut who are currently serving in the Peace Corps around the world. For five decades, the Peace Corps has supported international diplomacy through the promotion of peace, goodwill, and social and economic equality. I am proud that these eastern Connecticut residents have devoted part of their lives to help improve the lives of others.

Among these eastern Connecticut volunteers is Keith Esposito, a resident of Gales Ferry and a Boston University graduate who is teaching English at State University. Emily Howell Heller, a Niantic resident and Connecticut College graduate, is serving in Panama as an Environmental Education volunteer. Justin Lamountain, who is serving in the Philippines, is a forest and land management consultant as part of the Peace Corps Response program.

Another volunteer, Chelsea Krieger, is serving as a HIV/AIDS technical health advisor in Malawi. Chelsea previously spent a year in Honduras through the Peace Corps; however, the Honduras program was suspended one year into her service. Chelsea completed a Master’s in Public Health and was motivated to apply for a Peace Corps response position to use her knowledge to assist those in need. Lamanth Avery Jr. is currently serving in Kenya, and currently experiencing unrest in the wake of the upcoming national elections. Additionally, one of my former interns, Gabrielle Tassone from Montville, is serving in Madagascar as an education volunteer. Other eastern Connecticut residents are serving in countries from Armenia to Tanzania to Gambia, and Kenya.

As we recognize the 52nd Anniversary of the founding of the Peace Corps program, it is important to recognize the over 210,000 American volunteers that have participated in this important service program. Volunteers have shown the international community the American value of service in over 139 countries. This program provides the best and brightest of our young people the opportunity to represent their country abroad, by teaching English, by assisting with economic development programs, and by providing necessary support to small communities throughout the world. As we begin Peace Corps month, I am hopeful that we can all recognize all of these invaluable contributions to American values and global understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring these distinguished volunteers from Connecticut and across the country, for their contributions to the developing world and for embodying the core value of service we all share.

RECOGNIZING THE ALLIANCE FOR LUPUS RESEARCH’S 10TH ANNUAL WALK WITH US TO CURE LUPUS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Alliance for Lupus Research’s tenth annual Walk With Us To Cure Lupus. Since its creation, Walk with Us To Cure Lupus has promoted awareness in our community and raised over one million dollars in support of medical research aimed at curing this disease.

Lupus is a chronic autoimmune disease in which a person’s immune system attacks normal, healthy tissues. The underlying causes are unknown, and there is no cure. This disease may cause damage to various parts of the body including skin, joints, and internal organs. As a chronic disease, those who suffer from lupus can endure months of symptoms that may reemerge as flares throughout their lives.

It is estimated that over 1.5 million Americans have lupus, including 100,000 people in my home state of Florida. The worldwide total is now over 5 million. It is important that we continue to support research to develop better treatments and find a cure, educate our friends, families, and health care professionals to improve diagnosis and treatment, and promote awareness of this disease and advocate on the behalf of those who are affected by it.

I am especially proud of the many Floridians who have contributed to the efforts. In particular, I would like to recognize my good friend and the district director for Florida’s 21st Congressional District, Wendi Lipsich. Wendi was diagnosed with lupus 25 years ago. While she is well-known for her energetic advocacy on behalf of seniors, children, and families throughout our community, she deserves special recognition today for her contribution to the Alliance for Lupus Research. Ten years ago, with the help of her friends Allison Rubin and Randy Neiko, Wendi launched the first annual Walk With Us To Cure Lupus event in South Florida. Eight hundred people attended the first walk in 2004 and raised $200,000. Each year since, hundreds of thousands of dollars have been raised exclusively for the purpose of research into curing lupus. In total, the Alliance for Lupus Research has committed $81 million to develop a greater understanding of this disease and find a cure.

This weekend on March 3, 2013, hundreds of participants will join together at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton, Florida to walk together in support of lupus research. I commend all of the participants and donors that will make the tenth annual Walk With Us To Cure Lupus a success. Congratulations to Wendi, Allison, and the other organizers of this year’s walk. Together, you are providing hope to the millions of families touched by lupus and bringing our nation closer to finally discovering a cure.

INTRODUCING THE EVERGLENDES FOR THE NEXT GENERATION ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Everglades for the Next Generation Act.

Everglades restoration is unfortunately at a standstill. All of the projects that can be started are already underway and nearing completion. It has been six years since the last Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Projects (CERP) were authorized. The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) is supposed to be the vehicle for these authorizations, but clearly is not sufficient. In the 12 years since CERP was signed into law, Congress has passed only one WRDA bill. An awkward state of limbo is not the future Congress had in mind for the Everglades when it passed CERP, and it is not the future that the American people deserve. Congressional inaction has persevered for far too long despite bipartisan support for restoration.

Regardless of the real progress, restoration efforts will not succeed without the next generation of projects, which cannot begin without further Congressional authorizations. That is exactly what this bill does: authorizes the shovel-ready projects which have been awaiting another WRDA. Additionally, this legislation will make it easier for the Army Corps of
Engineers to move on many of the remaining projects in order to prevent future Congressional bottlenecks.

Restoration is not a theoretical exercise. CERP has demonstrable successes and biennial reports from the National Academy of Sciences. We know that the federal and state governments can successfully work together with private businesses and landowners to reach mutually beneficial agreements that restore the health of this unique, beautiful, wild, and wonderful resource that is absolutely essential for Florida.

I urge my colleagues to support critically important legislation.

STATEMENT ON SEQUESTRATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with the budget sequester that seems almost certain to occur. These automatic budget cuts will become effective tomorrow, Friday, March 1, 2013 unless Congress acts immediately. Many of my Democratic colleagues have proposed serious alternatives to the cuts, which I fully support.

Since the start of the 113th Congress, House Republicans have failed to bring a single bill to the floor that would prevent the cuts. The sequester will harm every American, especially the constituents of my district. Estimates from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities demonstrate that the Women, Infant and Children nutrition program will be unable to assist between 600,000 and 775,000 individuals. Low income families depend on food assistance programs. Too many children in my district come to school hungry, which leads to the inability to focus on their schoolwork. Sequestration will also undermine federally-funded programs that provide low income, underserved, and uninsured women access to breast and cervical cancer screening and diagnostic testing. The women in my community need these programs to receive proper treatment.

Layoffs and furloughs to the Social Security Administration will slow the processing of Social Security applications. Many of my constituents who are retired or have disabilities depend on Social Security. Americans have worked for their Social Security benefits, and have the right to expect service.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am concerned about cuts to airport security. This issue has enormous importance to me and my fellow New Yorkers, many of whom work in airport security at JFK and LaGuardia airports. The cuts present serious risks to the workers at these airports and to our national security. These men and women have dedicated their lives to serving this country to keep it safe. A reduction in security workers will increase complications in air travel and increase the possibility of danger to this nation and its people.

The sequester will also harm small businesses, by reducing support for loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration as well as government contracts, and training program for small businesses. I am extremely sensitive to the plight of small businesses, as a member of the Small Business Committee.

I urge my colleagues to prevent these cuts to important programs. Our constituents want us to compromise to prevent these drastic cuts. In the words of Mohandas Gandhi, “The best way to find yourself is to lose yourself in the service of others.” We swore an oath to defend, protect and serve this country. Americans are depending on us to make the right decision. We should not delay a vote. We need to come together, make a decision and protect the interests of the people we represent.

VOICING SEQUESTER CONCERNS

HON. JOHN K. DELANEY
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the sequester is bad way to deal with deficit reduction and will likely have a negative effect on our economy, particularly Maryland’s economy, which I have been saying for years is unusually vulnerable to reductions in government spending. We are faced with the sequester because our government has failed to act in a bi-partisan way for the good of the country. The cost of doing nothing is not nothing. Because we failed to take the necessary steps to deal with our deficit in a balanced way—and because special interests were uncompromising in the face of any proposals that affected them—we find ourselves facing a mini-doomsday machine in the sequester.

Unless Congress acts, sequestration would have a serious and disproportionate impact on job creation and economic growth in Maryland. The 60 non-military federal facilities and 17 military facilities in Maryland would see their ability to conduct operations significantly erode; nearly 140,000 federal civilian employees who work in Maryland would face furloughs and potential pay cuts; and thousands of jobs in Maryland would be put at risk. Our students, small businesses, families, and first-responders would also be affected by devastating cuts to investments in education, law enforcement, infrastructure, innovation, research, and other areas that are critical to building a strong middle class.

Our focus should be on avoiding the sequester and passing a grand budget deal along the lines of Simpson-Bowles that reduces the deficit in a balanced way. We should do our job, which is to come together, negotiate in good faith, and find a solution.

THE 52ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise regarding the 52nd anniversary of the Peace Corps to recognize the service, sacrifice and commitment of the men and women who devote a portion of their lives to the task of helping to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between the people of United States and others around the world. These cultural ambassadors embody the legacy of service that is the foundation of this nation’s image abroad. Since 1961, more than 210,000 volunteers have served in 193 countries around the world. Their efforts in Africa, Asia, Central and South America, Europe, the Middle East and elsewhere have made significant and lasting contributions in the areas of agriculture, business development, education, health, and youth development among others.

I know firsthand of the long-lasting benefits of the good work of the Peace Corps. My father served in the Navy and then went on to become a United States Foreign Service officer, proudly representing America in places like Turkey and India and Pakistan, where I was born. I learned a lot about the world as a child in those places, but I also learned a lot about America.

One memory of those years stands out. It was in the early 1970s, and I had just turned 14. One day, I traveled with my parents to a tiny remote village in Sri Lanka. There, I walked into a family’s small hut and as my eyes adjusted to the light, I noticed, hanging on the wall, a portrait of President John F. Kennedy. It was 10 years after he had been in the White House and half a world away from our country, but for these villagers it represented the America that had sent Peace Corps volunteers to help them. It represented the America they looked to as a land of opportunity and as a force for good and justice around the world. That portrait of our president represented an America that was a beacon of hope.

As we celebrate the fifty-second anniversary of the Peace Corps, let us salute the men and women who helped bring the best of America to the people of the world.
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Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S959–S1073

Measures Introduced: Thirty-five bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 399–433, and S. Res. 63–66.

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 64, authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013. Page S1011

Measures Considered:

American Family Economic Protection Act: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 388, to appropriately limit sequestration, to eliminate tax loopholes. Pages S970–91

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 27), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. Page S991

Subsequently, Senator Reid entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. Page S991

Sequester Replacement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 16, to provide for a sequester replacement. Pages S990–91

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 38 yeas to 62 nays (Vote No. 26), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. Page S991

Subsequently, the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill was withdrawn. Page S991

Appointments:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senator as a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 113th Congress: Senator Wicker. Page S1071

Committee Expenditure Authorization—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that on Tuesday, March 5, 2013, at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of S. Res. 64, authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013; that the only amendment in order to the resolution be a Paul amendment striking provisions relative to the National Security Working Group; that there be up to 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form on the Paul amendment; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on or in relation to the Paul amendment; and that upon disposition of the Paul amendment, Senate vote on adoption of the resolution, as amended, if amended. Page S1071

Chen and Failla Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5:00 p.m., on Monday, March 4, 2013, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Pamela Ki Mai Chen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, and Katherine Polk Failla, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on the confirmation of the nominations, in the order listed; and that no further motions be in order. Page S1071

Messages from the House:

Executive Communications:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:
Amendments Submitted: Pages S1030–70
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S1070–71
Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—27) Page S991
Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:31 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 4, 2013. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1071.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS
Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Frederick Vollrath, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Readiness and Force Management, and Eric K. Fanning, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, all of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine addressing the Federal Housing Administration’s financial condition and program challenges, after receiving testimony from Gary Thomas, National Association of Realtors, Mission Viejo, California; Peter H. Bell, National Reverse Mortgage Lenders Association, Sarah Rosen Wartell, Urban Institute, and David H. Stevens, Mortgage Bankers Association, all of Washington, DC; Phillip L. Swagel, University of Maryland School of Public Policy, Chevy Chase; and Theresa Bryce Bazemore, Radian Guaranty, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORM
Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine delivery system reform, focusing on a progress report from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), after receiving testimony from Jonathan Blum, Acting Principal Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Medicare, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of David Medine, of Maryland, to be Chairman and Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, Shelly Deckert Dick, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana, William H. Orrick, III, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Nelson Stephen Roman, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013.

LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATIONS
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine a legislative presentation from Military Officer Association of America, Retired Enlisted Association, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Blinded Veterans Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Wounded Warrior Project, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, and American Ex-Prisoners of War, after receiving testimony from Colonel Robert F. Norton, USA (Ret.), Military Officers Association of America, Master Sergeant Richard J. Delaney, USAF (Ret.), The Retired Enlisted Association, and H. Gene Overstreet, Non Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America, all of Alexandria, Virginia; Tom Tarantino, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Dawn Halfaker, Wounded Warrior Project, and Sam Huhn, Blinded Veterans Association, all of Washington, D.C.; Bruce G. McKenty, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Lakewood, Washington; and Charles Susino, Jr., American Ex-Prisoners of War, Arlington, Texas.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.
Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 54 public bills, H.R. 879–932; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 89–94 were introduced. Pages H813–16

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H817–18

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ros-Lehtinen to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H705


Rejected:

McMorris Rodgers amendment in the nature of a substitute (printed in H. Rept. 113–10) consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–2 (by a yea-and-nay vote of 166 yeas to 257 nays, Roll No. 54). Pages H753–H800

The House agreed to H. Res. 83, the rule that is providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, February 27th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, March 4th for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Page H804

Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following individual on the part of the House to the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise: Ms. Heather Wilson of Albuquerque, NM. Page H806

British-American Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Representatives Petri, Crenshaw, Latta, Aderholt, and Whitfield. Page H806

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China: Representative Smith (NJ), Co-Chairman. Page H806

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H801.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H799–H800, H800–01. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ASSURING VIABILITY OF THE SUSTAINMENT INDUSTRIAL BASE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on assuring viability of the sustainment industrial base. Testimony was heard from John Johns, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Maintenance Policy and Programs, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

NUCLEAR SECURITY: ACTIONS, ACCOUNTABILITY AND REFORM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on Nuclear Security: Actions, Accountability and Reform. Testimony was heard from Brigadier General Sandra E. Finan, USAF, Commander, Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center, Former Principal Assistant Deputy Administrator for Military Applications, National Nuclear Security Administration; Gregory H. Friedman, Inspector General, Department of Energy; Neile L. Miller, Acting Administrator and Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration; Daniel B. Poneman, Deputy Secretary, Department of Energy; and a public witness.

IMPACTS OF A CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND SEQUESTRATION ON ACQUISITION, PROGRAMMING, AND THE INDUSTRIAL BASE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on impacts of a continuing resolution and sequestration on acquisition, programming, and the industrial base. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General James O. Barclay III, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8, U.S. Army; Lieutenant General Charles R. Davis, USAF, Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, U.S. Air Force; Lieutenant General Michael R. Moeller, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Plans and Programs, U.S. Air Force; Vice Admiral Allen G. Myers, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Integration of Capabilities and Resources (N8), U.S. Navy; Heidi Shyu, Assistant Secretary of the Army
Howard E. Tullman, Chief Executive Officer, Lightbank; James Walden, Senior Advocate, New York Civil Liberties Union; and public witnesses.

TOP CHALLENGES FOR SCIENCE AGENCIES: REPORTS FROM THE INSPECTORS GENERAL—PART 1


SMALL BUSINESS TRADE AGENDA

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade held a hearing entitled “Small Business Trade Agenda: Opportunities in the 113th Congress”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUDGET VIEWS AND ESTIMATES; CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS; AND GSA CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND LEASING PROGRAM RESOLUTIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a meeting on the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Views and Estimates of the Committee; a hearing on General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions; House Concurrent Resolution 18, the National Peace Officers’ Memorial; and House Concurrent Resolution 19, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. The Concurrent Resolutions and the General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions were ordered reported, without amendment. The Budget Views and Estimates were approved by the Committee.

PROPOSED WAIVER OF WORK REQUIREMENTS IN THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing entitled “The Proposed Waiver of Work Requirements in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program”. Testimony was heard from Senator Orrin Hatch; Kay E. Brown, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.
Joint Meetings

STATE OF THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of the United States economy, focusing on economic growth and job creation, and what Congress can do to boost them, after receiving testimony from Michael J. Boskin, Stanford University, Stanford, California; and Austan Goolsbee, University of Chicago Booth School of Business, Chicago, Illinois.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
MARCH 1, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the Senate
2 p.m., Monday, March 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Pamela K. Mai Chen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, and Katherine Polk Failla, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, with votes on confirmation of the nominations at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the House of Representatives
12 p.m., Monday, March 4

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.
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