

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JO ANN DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 17, 2005

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was granted a leave of absence for December 16–17, 2005, due to a medical treatment. I would like to state for the record that had I been present, I would have voted the following:

Rollcall 642: Motion to close portions of the Defense Authorization Conference to the Press and Public when matters of National Security are under consideration—Yea.

Rollcall 643: Skelton Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 1815—National Defense Authorization Act for FY06—Yea.

Rollcall 644: Previous Question on Rule for H. Res. 612—Yea—Expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives to achieving victory in Iraq.

Rollcall 645: Adoption of Rule for H. Res. 612—Yea—Expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives to achieving victory in Iraq.

Rollcall 646: Adoption of Rule for H.R. 4437—Yea—Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005.

Rollcall 647: H. Con. Res. 294—Yea—Calling on the international community to condemn the Laogai, the system of forced labor prison camps in the People's Republic of China, as a tool for suppression maintained by the Chinese Government.

Rollcall 648: Final Passage of H. Res. 612—Yea—Expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives to achieving victory in Iraq.

Rollcall 649: H. Res. 409—Yea—Condemning the Government of Zimbabwe's "Operation Murambatsvina".

Rollcall 650: H. Res. 575—Yea—Providing that Hamas and other terrorist organizations should not participate in elections held by the Palestinian Authority.

Rollcall 651: H. Res. 534—Yea—Recognizing the importance and credibility of an independent Iraqi judiciary in the formation of a new and democratic Iraq.

Rollcall 652: Spratt Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4241—Deficit Reduction Act of 2005—NAY.

Rollcall 653: Goodlatte/Herseth Amendment—Yea.

Rollcall 654: Stearns Amendment—Yea.

Rollcall 655: Sensenbrenner Amendment—Yea.

Rollcall 656: Norwood Amendment—Yea.

Rollcall 657: Westmoreland Amendment—Yea.

Rollcall 658: Gonzalez Amendment—NAY.

Rollcall 659: Sullivan Amendment—Yea.

Rollcall 660: Democrat Motion to Recommend—NAY.

Rollcall 661: Final Passage of H.R. 4437—Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005—Yea.

Rollcall 662: H. Res. 598—Condemning actions by the Government of Syria that have hindered the investigation of the assassination of former Prime Minister of Lebanon Rafik Hariri conducted by the United Nations International Independent Investigation Commission—Yea.

Rollcall 663: Adoption of the Rule providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules—Yea.

Rollcall 664: H.R. 2520—Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005—Yea.

ON THE OCCASION OF MR. LARRY E. PRICE'S AWARD OF SUPERINTENDENT OF THE YEAR IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, December 18, 2005

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of one of the finest educators ever produced by the great State of North Carolina.

This year, Superintendent Larry Price of my hometown of Wilson was named the 2006 North Carolina Superintendent of the Year. This is the highest honor for an educator in our State. The award was given by the North Carolina Association of School Administrators and the State school boards' association and announced at an awards banquet Monday night.

Larry Price has served as superintendent in Wilson County since 1998, overseeing 13 elementary schools, 6 middle schools, 3 high schools, and 2 learning centers. Under his guidance, Wilson County schools have produced thousands of students who have gone on to become doctors, lawyers, teachers, ministers, businessmen, and other professions. An increasing number each year meet or excel in reading and math at all grade levels since 1998.

I rise to congratulate Mr. Price on his accomplishment, and wish him many more years of success. Larry, we expect many more great things from you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, December 18, 2005

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 17, 2005, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall numbers 663 and 664. The votes I missed included a vote to agree to resolution H. Res. 623, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, and a motion to suspend the rules and agree to the senate amendment on H.R. 2520, the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act.

Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 663 and "aye" on rollcall vote 664.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2009

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 17, 2005

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and a co-author of the Violence Against Women Act of 2005, I take this opportunity to reemphasize the importance of certain parts of the legislative history of the provisions involving protections for battered immigrants. Additionally, I want to highlight and provide guidance on the reasoning behind and expectations about some of the provisions that are part of the final bill, the engrossed amendment agreed to by the Senate, which passed the Senate on December 16, 2005 and passed the House on December 17, 2005.

Since the section numbers changed between the version of VAWA 2005's Protection of Battered and Trafficked Immigrants provisions that passed the House September 28, 2005, and the version that we are considering today, I will provide a list at the end of my statement that cross references the section numbers in the final bill.

Section 801 enhances protection for immigrant victims of trafficking and certain immigrant crime victims by reuniting them with their children and family members living abroad. In the context of trafficking cases and other immigration functions I wanted to clarify for the record that VAWA 2005 contains language in Sections 801, 803, 804, 813 and 832 that are designed to amend sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to reflect the current delegation of authority and reassignment of immigration functions from the Department of Justice (DOJ) to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). When DOJ and DHS are cited as having shared authority under this Act, that shared authority should be limited to instances in which DHS is making an immigration determination in a case in which DOJ has an active federal investigation or prosecution. In cases where the investigation or prosecution is being conducted by a state or local prosecutor, or by another federal government agency, DOJ involvement may not be appropriate or required.

Section 802 creates an exception to unlawful presence for victims of severe forms of trafficking who demonstrate that their trafficking experience was at least one central reason for their unlawful presence in the United States. For the purposes of this section (and similarly for sections 801, 805 and 812 of this Act), I

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

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

understand that the term “at least one central reason” is intended to mean that the unlawful presence was caused by, or related to, the trafficking experience and its concurrent process of victimization. Just as this section provides a waiver of unlawful presence inadmissibility for T visa victims, I would hope that DHS will exercise its discretion determining good moral character so that T visa recipients are not barred from attaining adjustment of status from a T visa.

Section 804 provides that aliens can qualify for T status if they respond to and cooperate with requests for evidence and information from law enforcement officials. I also want to emphasize that state and local law enforcement officials investigating or prosecuting trafficking-related crimes are permitted to file a request (and certification) asking DHS to grant continued presence to trafficking victims. This section changes references in the INA to conform to the transfer of immigration functions from the Department of Justice to the Department of Homeland Security by replacing references to the Attorney General with references to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

I believe the expansions in protections for children contained in this Act are particularly important. Section 805 ensures that immigrant children who are victims of incest and child abuse get full access to VAWA protections. The application for adjustment of status to permanent residence of an alien who self-petitioned for permanent residence shall also serve as an adjustment application for any derivative children. Derivative children of self-petitioners will receive lawful permanent residency along with their self-petitioning parents. This section removes the requirement that abused adopted children must live with the abusive parent for two years and assures that child VAWA self-petitioners and derivative children have access to VAWA's aging out protections and can additionally access any Child Status Protection Act relief for which they qualify. It allows assures victims of child abuse and incest who were under 21 when abused have additional time until they turn 25 to file VAWA self-petitions. In this context, I understand that the term “at least one central reason” is intended to mean that the they delay in filing was caused by, or related to, the child abuse or incest and its concurrent process or victimization.

Section 811 defines a “VAWA petitioner” as an alien who has applied for classification or relief under a number of provisions of the INA. I want to emphasize the importance of the fact that the law assures that adjudication of all forms of immigration relief related to domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking or victims of violent crime continue to be adjudicated by the specially trained VAWA unit.

In 1997, the Immigration and Naturalization Service consolidated adjudication of VAWA self-petitions and VAWA-related cases in one specially trained unit that adjudicates all VAWA immigration cases nationally. The unit was created “to ensure sensitive and expeditious processing of the petitions filed by this class of at-risk applicants . . .”, to “[engender] uniformity in the adjudication of all applications of this type” and to “[enhance] the Service's ability to be more responsive to inquiries from applicants, their representatives, and benefit granting agencies.” See 62 Fed. Reg. 16607–16608 (1997). T visa and U visa

adjudications were also consolidated in the specially trained VAWA unit. (See, USCIS Interoffice Memorandum HQINV 50/1, August 30, 2001, from Michael D. Cronin to Michael A. Pearson, 67 Fed. Reg. 4784 (Jan. 31, 2002)). This specially trained VAWA unit assures consistency of VAWA adjudications, and can effectively identify eligible cases and deny fraudulent cases. Maintaining a specially trained unit with consistent and stable staffing and management is critically important to the effective adjudication of these applications.

Consistent with these procedures, I recommend that the same specially trained unit that adjudicates VAWA self-petitions, T and U visa applications, process the full range of adjudications, adjustments, and employment authorizations related to VAWA cases (including derivative beneficiaries) filed with DHS: VAWA petitions T and U visas, VAWA Cuban, VAWA NACARA (§§ 202 or 203), and VAWA HRIFA petitions, 106 work authorization under section 814(c) of this Act), battered spouse waiver adjudications under 216(c)(4)(C), applications for parole of VAWA petitioners and their children and applications for children of victims who have received VAWA cancellation. I also encourage DHS to promote consistency in VAWA adjudications by defining references to “domestic violence” in the INA as “battery or extreme cruelty,” the domestic abuse definition codified in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (“VAWA 1994”), the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”) and regulations implementing the battered spouse waiver.

The Secretary of Homeland Security can remove the conditional status of an alien who became a permanent resident, as the spouse of a U.S. citizen or permanent resident without joint filing of a petition with the U.S. citizen or permanent resident spouse, upon the showing of hardship, battery, or certain other factors. Applications for such relief may be amended to change the ground or grounds for such relief without having to be resubmitted.

VAWA 2000 allowed victims of domestic violence abused by U.S. citizen and lawful permanent resident spouses to file VAWA self-petitions from outside of the U.S. if they had been abused in the U.S. or if their abuser was a member of the uniformed services or a government employee. Modeled after the VAWA 2000 protection offered to children on VAWA cancellation of removal grantees, existing parole provisions should be used to ensure that approved VAWA petitioners, their derivative children and children of trafficking victims, can enter the U.S.

Section 812 provides that an alien who is a VAWA petitioner or is seeking cancellation of removal or VAWA suspension as a battered alien is not subject to the penalties for failing to depart after agreeing to a voluntary departure order, if the battery or extreme cruelty, trafficking, or criminal activity provided at least one central reason related to the alien's failure to depart. In this context it is my understanding that the term “at least one central reason” is intended to mean that the failure to depart was caused by, or related to, the battering or extreme cruelty experience and its concurrent process of victimization.

Section 813 is designed to address a number of problems for immigrant victims in removal proceedings. The definition of exceptional circumstances will now include battering or extreme cruelty. Important clarifications are

made to assure that immigration judges can grant victims the domestic violence victim waivers we created in VAWA 2000. I particularly want to emphasize the importance of the protections from reinstatement of removal we create in this Act for immigrant victims. Under current law DHS has the discretionary authority to consent to the readmission of a previously removed alien (using the existing I–212 process). DHS should make use of its discretion in granting readmission to appropriately assist aliens with humanitarian cases including but not limited to, victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, victims of trafficking and crime victims who are cooperating in criminal investigations.

Under current law, victims of domestic abuse, sexual assault, stalking, or trafficking who have been ordered removed, including expedited removal, are subject to reinstatement of removal if they depart the U.S. and attempt to reenter the U.S. Once they are reinstated in removal proceedings, they cannot obtain VAWA, T, and U relief, even if they have a pending application for such relief. Recognizing these harsh consequences, Congress encourages DHS to make use of its discretionary authority to consent to the admission of such previously removed aliens (using the existing I–212 process).

Section 814 provides that an alien whose petition as a VAWA petitioner has been approved may be granted work authorization. U visa applicants are provided work authorization under existing law. I want to emphasize that this section gives DHS statutory authority to grant work authorization to approved VAWA self-petitioners without having to rely upon deferred action. I believe that one of the most important protections offered by this section toward prevention of domestic violence is that Section 814 of this bill provides that an alien spouse admitted under the A (foreign diplomats), E–3 (Australian investor), G (international organizations), or H (temporary worker) visa non-immigrant programs accompanying or following to join a principal alien shall be granted work authorization if the spouse demonstrates that during the marriage he or she (or a child) has been battered or has been subjected to extreme cruelty perpetrated by the principal alien. This section is intended to reduce domestic violence by giving victims tools to protect themselves and hold abusers accountable. Research has found the financial dependence on an abuser is a primary reason that battered women are reluctant to cooperate in their abuser's prosecution. With employment authorization, many abused spouses protected by this section will be able to attain work providing them the resources that will make them more able to safely act to stop the domestic violence. The specially trained CIS unit shall adjudicate these requests.

I believe that Section 817 of this Act contains some of the most important protections for immigrant victims. This section enhances VAWA's confidentiality protections for immigrant victims and directs immigration enforcement officials not to rely on information provided by an abuser, his family members or agents to arrest or remove an immigrant victim from the United States. Threats of deportation are the most potent tool abusers of immigrant victims use to maintain control over and silence their victims and to avoid criminal prosecution. In 1996, Congress created special

protections for victims of domestic violence against disclosure of information to their abusers and the use of information provided by abusers in removal proceedings. In 2000, and in this Act, Congress extended these protections to cover victims of trafficking, certain crimes and others who qualify for VAWA immigration relief. These provisions are designed to ensure that abusers and criminals cannot use the immigration system against their victims. Examples include abusers using DHS to obtain information about their victims, including the existence of a VAWA immigration petition, interfering with or undermining their victims' immigration cases, and encouraging immigration enforcement offices to pursue removal actions against their victims.

Immigration enforcement agents and government officials covered by this section must not initiate contact with abusers, call abusers as witnesses or rely on information furnished by or derived from abusers to apprehend, detain and attempt to remove victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and trafficking, as prohibited by section 384 of IIRIRA. In determining whether a person furnishing information is a prohibited source, primary evidence should include, but not be limited to, court records, government databases, affidavits from law enforcement officials, and previous decisions by DHS or Department of Justice personnel. Other credible evidence must also be considered. Government officials are encouraged to consult with the specially trained VAWA unit in making determinations under the special "any credible evidence" standard. I believe that all investigation and enforcement of these provisions should be done by the Office of Professional Responsibility of the Justice Department. For consistency, these cases need to be centralized in one division and I believe that this office is best equipped to address these cases.

The current practice of granting deferred action to approved VAWA self-petitioners should continue. Aliens with deferred action status should not be removed or deported. Prima facie determinations and deferred action grants should not be revoked by immigration enforcement agents. The specially trained Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) unit should review such cases to determine whether or not to revoke a deferred action grant. Immigration enforcement officials at the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement do not have authority to overrule a CIS grant of deferred action to an alien victim. Immigration enforcement officers should refer aliens they encounter who may qualify for relief under this Act to immigration benefits adjudicators handling VAWA cases at CIS.

VAWA confidentiality protections in IIRAIRA are amended to conform with current practice extending these protections to the Department of Homeland Security in addition to the "Department of Justice and to expand confidentiality protections to the Department of State. These protective provisions were designed to assure that the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State may not use information furnished by, or derived from information provided solely by, an abuser, crime perpetrator or trafficker to make an adverse determination of admissibility or removal of an alien. However, information in the public record and government data-bases can be relied upon, even if government officials first became aware of it through an abuser.

This section provides that this provision shall not apply to prevent information from being disclosed (in a manner that protects victim confidentiality and safety) to the chairs and ranking members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, including the Immigration Subcommittee, in the exercise of their oversight authority. This section also gives the specially trained VAWA unit the discretion to refer victims to non-profit, non-governmental organizations to obtain a range of needed assistance and victim services. Referrals should be made to programs with expertise in providing assistance to immigrant victims of violence and can only be made after obtaining written consent from the immigrant victim. Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the ability of an applicant to designate a safe organization through which governmental agencies may communicate with the applicant.

This section requires that the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice provide guidance to their officers and employees who have access to information protected by Section 384 of IIRAIRA, including protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking and other crimes from the harm that could result from inappropriate disclosure of information. Congress encourages the DHS's specially trained VAWA unit and CIS VAWA policy personnel: (1) to develop a training program that can be used to train DHS staff, trial attorneys, immigration judges, and other DOJ and DOS staff who regularly encounter alien victims of crimes, and (2) to craft and implement policies and protocols on appropriate handling by DHS, DOJ and DOS officers of cases under VAWA 1994, the Acts subsequently reauthorizing VAWA, and IIRIRA.

Section 825 contains a number of amendments particularly important to me. Protecting victims of domestic violence from deportation and assuring that they can have their day in court before an immigration judge to file for VAWA related immigration relief is a central focus of all VAWA immigration protection I have been involved in developing since 1994. This section contains amendments that clarify the VAWA 2000 motions to reopen for abused aliens, enabling otherwise eligible VAWA applicants to pursue VAWA relief from removal, deportation or exclusion. This section provides that the limitation of one motion to reopen a removal proceeding shall not prevent the filing of one special VAWA motion to reopen. In addition, a VAWA petitioner can file a motion to reopen removal proceedings after the normal 90-day cutoff period, measured from the time of the final administrative order of removal. The filing of a special VAWA motion to reopen shall stay the removal of the alien pending final disposition of the motion, including exhaustion of all appeals, if the motion establishes a prima facie case for the relief. One VAWA 2005 post-enactment motion to reopen may be filed by a VAWA applicant. Aliens who filed and were denied special VAWA motions under VAWA 2000 may file one new motion under this Act.

Additionally, I feel it is very important that the system of services we provide to domestic violence victims, rape victims and trafficking victims and our protection order courtrooms and family courts are places to which victims can safely turn for help without worrying that their abuser may have sent immigration en-

forcement officers after them when they are seeking service and protection. Section 825(c) establishes a system to verify that removal proceedings are not based on information prohibited by section 384 of IIRIRA. When any part of an enforcement action was taken leading to such proceedings against an alien at certain places, DHS must disclose these facts in the Notice to Appear issued against the alien. DHS must certify that such an enforcement action was taken but that DHS did not violate the requirements of Section 384 of IIRIRA. The list of locations includes: a domestic violence shelter, a rape crisis center, and a courthouse if the alien is appearing in connection with a protection order or child custody case. Persons who knowingly make a false certification shall be subject to penalties. Removal proceedings filed in violation of section 384 of IIRIRA shall be dismissed by immigration judges. However, further proceedings can be brought if not in violation of section 384.

I also want to highlight the important protections for all battered women and stalking victims contained in Section 827 of this bill. With respect to laws and regulations governing identification cards and drivers' licenses, DHS and the Social Security Administration shall give special consideration to victims of domestic abuse, sexual assault, stalking, or trafficking who are entitled to enroll in state address confidentiality programs, and whose addresses are entitled to be suppressed under State or Federal law (including VAWA confidentiality provisions), or suppressed by a court order.

The REAL ID Act of 2005 imposed a new national requirement that all applicants for driver's licenses or state identification cards must furnish their physical residential address in order to obtain a federally valid license or identification card. This requirement jeopardizes those victims of domestic abuse, sexual assault, stalking, or trafficking who may be living in confidential battered women's shelters or fleeing their abuser, stalker, or trafficker. In recognition of the dangers of this requirement, this provision instructs DHS and the Social Security Administration to give special consideration to victims of domestic abuse, sexual assault, stalking, or trafficking by allowing certain victims to use an alternate safe address in lieu of their physical residential address.

I understand that a driver's license or identification card is necessary for victims to board an airplane or train to flee danger. Many confidentiality programs are currently in place on both federal and state levels to ensure that the dual goals of economic security and victim safety are reached by allowing an individual to choose an alternate address on her driver's license. This will provide an exception for those victims who are entitled to enroll in state address confidentiality programs, whose addresses are entitled to be suppressed under State or Federal law or suppressed by a court order, or who are protected from disclosure of information pursuant to 8 U.S.C. Section 1367, ensuring the continued protection and necessary mobility for these women and their families.

As Ranking Member' of the House Judiciary Committee, I have been particularly concerned about the significant delays that have occurred between the effective dates of VAWA 1994 and VAWA 2000 laws and the issuance of implementing regulations that are needed so that

immigrant victims can receive the protections Congress has created for them. Section 828 requires that regulations implementing both this Act (including materials and dissemination under section 834) and the Act reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act in 2000, ("VAWA 2000"), be issued within 180 days of this Act's enactment. In applying such regulations, in the case of petitions or applications affected by the changes made by the Acts, there shall be no requirement to submit an additional petition, application, or certification from a law enforcement agency with the date of the application for interim relief establishing the priority date of counting time towards adjustment of status. However, the Department of Homeland Security may request additional evidence be submitted when the documentation supporting an outstanding VAWA self-petition or justifying interim reliefs now insufficient. The Department of Homeland Security shall also craft and implement policies and protocols implementing VAWA confidentiality protections under Section 384 of IIRAIRA as amended by this Act.

Lastly, I want to provide important background information about the reasoning behind The International Marriage Broker Regulation Act of 2005 (IMBRA) that is included in this VAWA 2000 legislation. The final IMBRA legislation combines provisions that created a significant role for the government in information collection and distribution to foreign fiancées and spouses with regulation of the International Marriage Broker Industry. IMBRA has been designed to address concerns about U.S. citizen abusers who use the K visa process to petition for aliens outside the United States and abuse them. This Act, establishes the first meaningful federal regulations on international marriage broker agencies (IMBs), companies in the business of matching mostly American male clients to foreign women who will join them in the United States as fiancées or spouses. There have been numerous cases of foreign women who were matched with American men, came to the U.S. live with their new spouses and were subjected to domestic violence, sexual assault or other forms of extreme cruelty. In some cases, the perpetrators have successfully used IMBs and the immigration system to bring in a series of fiancés or spouses who have all suffered from domestic violence from the American sponsor and client. This bill is designed to inform foreign spouses and fiancées entering the United States of the laws relating to such abusive crimes, and the availability of help. In addition, it seeks to prevent abusers from using the immigration system to find new victims.

Sections 832, 833 and 834 are designed to prevent further abuse by instituting measures to distribute information that can help the K visa recipients learn about domestic violence protections available to them in the United States. These sections also provide them with specific information about their U.S. citizen petitioners' criminal conviction history. Additionally, this section limits the ability of abusive U.S. citizens to repeatedly petition for K visas for aliens outside the U.S.

A consular officer may not approve a fiancée visa petition without verifying that the petitioner has not previously petitioned for two or more aliens applying for spousal or fiancée K visas. If the petitioner has had such a petition previously approved, the consular officer must verify that two years have elapsed since

the filing of the previous petition. The Secretary of Homeland Security may grant waivers of the two-year waiting period or the limit on filing more than two petitions. The waivers included here were designed to give DHS the discretion to waive both the time and number limitations when K fiance visa applications are filed by nonabusive U.S. citizens. Such waivers may be appropriate, for example, for nonabusive U.S. citizens who live abroad or were raised abroad and may be more likely to marry foreign spouses, or in cases of unusual circumstances, such as the sudden death of an alien approved for a prior K visa. Section 832(a) includes a domestic violence victim waiver modeled after the waiver created for immigrant victims of domestic violence by VAWA 2000 (INA Section 237(a)(7)). Waivers shall be granted when the U.S. citizen petitioner demonstrates that they have been subjected to battering or extreme cruelty, that there was a connection between the criminal conviction and the abuse, including efforts to escape the abuse and that they were not the primary perpetrator of abuse in the relationship.

Section 832(a)(2) of VAWA 2005 requires that U.S. citizen petitioners filing K visa applications for spouses they married abroad provide under oath the same criminal information required for K fiance visa petitioners. This section also creates a database to track serial K applications. Upon approval of a second K visa for a spouse or fiancé the U.S. citizen petitioner will be entered into the multiple visa tracking database and will be notified that this petition and all future petitions will be entered into the database maintained by the Department of Homeland Security. Once two spousal or fiancé K visas have been approved, for each subsequent petition filed, DHS will notify both the citizen petitioner and foreign-born spouse about the number of previously filed petitions in the database for a 10-year period. All future K applications will trigger similar notice. The domestic violence pamphlet developed under Section 833 of this Act will be sent to the K beneficiary immigrant spouse along with the multiple filing data base information.

Under this Act, IMBs are required to comply with mandatory collection of criminal background information on each U.S. client, including arrest and conviction information, information on any temporary or permanent protection order issued against the U.S. client, and information on where the person has lived, prior marriages and children they have under the age of 21. The IMB must also conduct a sex offender registry search on the U.S. client.

CONCLUSION

I am once again honored to have played a role in reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act and the protections it affords to immigrant women who suffer from battery and extreme cruelty in our Nation. We have made important changes and adjustments to current law that will ensure that the broad range of domestic violence victims have access to the immigration relief they need to escape from abuse and begin to rebuild their lives, and those of their children. I am particularly pleased that Congress was able to agree upon passage of the first legislation to provide fiancées and spouses applying for K visas from abroad the ability arm themselves with what can be life saving information and to truly regulate the international marriage broker industry. I offer my sincere appreciation to the

chairman of the Judiciary Committee, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, who worked with me for the better part of this year on this bill in shared commitment to protect victims of domestic violence. In addition, I must thank Congressman RICK LARSEN of Washington for his leadership on protecting unsuspecting foreign women who become victims of abuse by sponsoring IMBRA and working with Chairman SENSENBRENNER and me on bringing IMBRA into this bill. I also offer special thanks to my Senate colleagues, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, Senator PATRICK LEAHY, Senator JOSEPH BIDEN and Senator TED KENNEDY for their hard cooperative work to ensure that the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 could be passed into law this year.

I worked closely with Chairman SENSENBRENNER to develop legislative history for the protections offered to immigrant victims contained in Protection of Battered and Trafficked Immigrants Title of the Violence Against Women Act of 2005. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives Report to accompany H.R. 3402 that was published on September 22, 2005, provides important legislative history on this Title. Since section numbers have changed in the final bill, I include here cross reference list that will facilitate relating the sections of the final VAWA 2005 provisions we are voting on today with the legislative history sections that describe and support these provisions.

FINAL VAWA 2005 SECTION NUMBER AND HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT SECTION NUMBER

801 (Treatment of Spouse and Children of Victims)—901(a).

802 (Presence of Trafficking Victims)—903(b).

803 (Adjustment of Status for Trafficking Victims)—903 & 903(a).

804 (Protection and Assistance to Trafficking Victims)—901(d).

805 (Protecting Victims of Child Abuse) 805 (a) and (b)—912(b) and (c).

805 (c)—912(d).

805(d)—931.

811 (VAWA Petitioner Definition and VAWA Unit)—911, 902, 914, 918.

812 (Exception to Voluntary Departure)—919.

813(a) (Exceptional Circumstances)—937.

813(b) (Discretion to Readmission Instead of Reinstatement of Removal)—915.

813(c) (Domestic Violence Victim Waiver Clarification)—935.

814(a) (VAWA HRIFA and VAWA Cuban Adjustment Improvements)—936, 917.

814(b) (Work Authorization for VAWA Petitioners)—915(a).

814 (c) and (d) (Work Authorization for Abused A, E-3, G, H Spouses)—933.

814(e) (Limitation on Petitioning for Abuser)—917(g).

815, 823, 824 (Clarification and Corrections Regarding VAWA NACARA VAWA HRIFA, VAWA Cuban Adjustment Applicants)—917.

816 (VAWA Protection for Elder Abuse Victims)—913.

817 (VAWA Confidentiality Protections)—921, 915.

821 (a) and (b) (Duration of T and U Visa Status)—901(b).

821(c) (Change of Status to T or U Visa Status)—901(c).

822 (Technical Corrections)—941.

823 (VAWA Cuban Adjustment Improvements)—917(d).

824 (VAWA HRIFA Improvements)—917(e).

825 (Deportation and Deportation Proceedings)—936, 921(f).

826 (Protection of Abused Juveniles)—921(d).

827 (Identification Documents for Domestic Violence and Crime Victims)—None.

828 (Rulemaking)—900.

831, 832, 833, 834, Subtitle D, International Marriage Broker Regulation—916, 922.

BORDER PROTECTION, ANTI-TERRORISM, AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION CONTROL ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 16, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4437) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to strengthen enforcement of the immigration laws, to enhance border security, and for other purposes:

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my views on H.R. 4437 and this important issue. As a member of the U.S. House Committee on Homeland Security, I have worked actively with both Republicans and Democrats to strengthen our Nation's laws to protect the American people. Many of the provisions of this bill are under the jurisdiction of the Homeland Security committee, although this version differs substantially from the Committee's product.

The debate on immigration reform is an important matter for this country. Last year, I voted to pass the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Implementation Act, which authorized an additional 10,000 Border Patrol agents and 4,000 additional Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers. Unfortunately, the Bush administration's budget funds only 210 additional border agents and 80 ICE officers in fiscal year 2006.

I support several amendments to this bill because they take concrete steps to correct real problems with the immigration status quo. For example, I support the Myrick amendment that provides for the removal of an illegal alien who is convicted of driving drunk. I also support the Shadegg amendment to increase penalties for document fraud and crimes of violence and drug trafficking offenses committed by illegal aliens. In addition, I support the Velázquez amendment to reduce the immigration application processing backlog that has choked the system to a virtual standstill. Unfortunately, these reasonable steps cannot overcome the fundamental flaws of H.R. 4437, which takes an unrealistic approach that will exacerbate the problems of the current system by driving the undocumented further underground, deeper into the black market and further estranged from the laws of our country.

We need to reform the broken immigration system in America, but this bill is harsh, punitive and anti-family and does not fix the many problems with the current system. Rather than pass new laws that make innocent children Federal criminals, we should vigorously enforce the laws against illegal immigration that are already on the books, hire the thousands of additional security personnel that have already been authorized to guard our borders and work for a fair, balanced immigration plan that encourages lawfulness, rewards hard work and safeguards families.

I hope my colleagues will join me in rejection of this legislation, so Congress and the

President can start over on a more productive approach to fix the broken immigration system. Vote against H.R. 4437.

VICTORY IN IRAQ RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 16, 2005

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Iraqi people on a successful election, and movement toward democracy.

I rise today to denounce the Republican leadership for manipulating the War in Iraq for political gain.

However, I want to stand up here and reiterate my opposition to the invasion of Iraq.

I have said it before and I will say it again.

I am against this war. Our troops have become the targets of the insurgents in Iraq who want us out of their country.

I knew that once we got into the war, there was no getting out. Many of our young men and women were going to get killed for the personal gain of the President.

There is no correlation between 9–11 and the War in Iraq.

Let me repeat: There is no correlation between 9–11 and the war in Iraq!

There was no faulty intelligence. We have people in key positions lying to the American people.

Get Us Out of Iraq!

HONORING THE 57TH MAYOR OF BUFFALO, NEW YORK, HON. ANTHONY M. MASIELLO

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, December 18, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the public service and personal strength of character of Anthony M. Masiello, who will complete his third and final term as the 57th Mayor of the City of Buffalo on December 31, 2005. Coupled with his deep and abiding love and loyalty to his beautiful family, Mayor Masiello will always be known for his enthusiastic and unwavering love for the City of Buffalo, New York. Through the triumphs and the tribulations of serving as the Chief Executive Officer of the second largest city in New York State, Mayor Masiello never gave up, never gave in and has led us to a better Buffalo.

Born the oldest of seven children, Tony Masiello learned the value of family, hard work and the importance of giving back to one's community from his parents, Bridget and Dan. Educated in Buffalo Catholic Schools, Mayor Masiello graduated from Canisius College in 1969 after a Hall of Fame basketball career with the Division I Golden Griffins.

In 1971, the voters embraced his competitive spirit and youthful energy and elected him District Councilmember and soon after, he won his first citywide election as an At-Large Councilmember on the Buffalo City Council. In 1980, he was elected to the New York State

Senate becoming "Buffalo's Senator." Re-elected to 7 2-year terms, he rose through the ranks to Minority Whip and Chair of the Democratic Conference. During his tenure in the State Legislature, then-Senator Masiello secured greater funding for the city's public school system, increased financial support for Roswell Park Cancer Institute and Children's Hospital, Buffalo's nationally known health care institutions. He helped fund housing developments and provided leadership in the passage of the Vietnam Veterans Tuition Assistance Bill.

This commitment to education, health care, housing and the needs of others would foreshadow the Mayor's greatest achievements in his next elected office.

Anthony M. Masiello was sworn in as the 57th Mayor of the city of Buffalo on January 1, 1994. Since that time, he has tackled daunting financial challenges while instituting sweeping changes in the way the city conducts its business and delivers essential services. He initiated and implemented the Mayor's Impact team; a hands-on Task Force consisting of various city departments working together to perform comprehensive clean-up, maintenance and inspection services in the city, the Citizens Service Hotline and the Good Neighbors Planning Alliance to ensure real residential participation in planning the city's future.

Mayor Masiello led the creation of the Joint Schools Construction Program, an ambitious, pioneering construction and rehabilitation program to provide a 21st Century learning environment for the city's public school students. In 2000, the Mayor proposed state legislation that allowed the city to construct new schools and renovate existing buildings with private financing and now, more than \$150 million is being spent in Phase I of the Joint Schools Construction Project to renovate nine schools. Eventually all schools will be renovated or rebuilt giving Buffalo School students the proper facilities and the high tech equipment fundamental to meeting the academic challenges of today and tomorrow.

As citizens of Buffalo, we are also indebted to the Mayor for his vision in bringing together the leaders of the local health care and medical school institutions as well as, for the first time, the neighborhood leaders from the Fruit Belt and Allentown, to create the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus in the City's center. Through mutual respect and recognition of the need for improved communication, expert planning for shared needs and future growth, the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus Board of Directors continues to attract local, state and federal funding which has transformed the Campus with more than \$300 million dollars of investment in state-of-the-art health care and research facilities. Recruiting efforts for national and international medical, scientific and research talent is succeeding and all efforts have the shared goal of enhancing the opportunities for the Campus' neighbors and its neighborhood. The story and the success of the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus is rightly attributable to the ability of Mayor Masiello to bring people together, impart the absolute need to work together and help direct the first \$14 million in "seed money" that led to hundreds of millions of dollars in real private/public investments.

And it is the Mayor's commitment to implementation that led to one of the greatest