

□ 1518

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

□ 1520

PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The form of the motion is as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO THE MESQUITE LANDS ACT OF 1986

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 4970

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.*
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.*
- Sec. 3. VAWA definitions and grant conditions.*
- Sec. 4. Accountability provisions.*
- Sec. 5. Effective date.*
- TITLE I—ENHANCING JUDICIAL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**
- Sec. 101. STOP grants.*
- Sec. 102. Grants to encourage arrest policies and enforcement of protection orders.*
- Sec. 103. Legal assistance for victims.*
- Sec. 104. Consolidation of grants to support families in the justice system.*
- Sec. 105. Court-appointed special advocate program.*
- Sec. 106. Outreach and services to underserved populations grant.*
- Sec. 107. Culturally specific services grant.*
- Sec. 108. Reduction in rape kit backlog.*

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

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

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

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

TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

- Sec. 701. National Resource Center on Workplace Responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence.

TITLE VIII—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

- Sec. 801. Fraud prevention initiatives.
- Sec. 802. Clarification of the requirements applicable to U visas.
- Sec. 803. Protections for a fiancée or fiancé of a citizen.
- Sec. 804. Regulation of international marriage brokers.
- Sec. 805. GAO report.
- Sec. 806. Temporary Nature of U Visa Status.
- Sec. 807. Annual report on immigration applications made by victims of abuse.
- Sec. 808. Protection for children of VAWA self-petitioners.
- Sec. 809. Public charge.
- Sec. 810. Age-Out Protection for U Visa Applicants.
- Sec. 811. Hardship waivers.
- Sec. 812. Disclosure of Information for National Security Purpose.
- Sec. 813. GAO report on requirements to cooperate with law enforcement officials.
- Sec. 814. Consideration of other evidence.

TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

- Sec. 901. Grants to Indian tribal governments.
- Sec. 902. Grants to Indian tribal coalitions.
- Sec. 903. Consultation.
- Sec. 904. Analysis and research on violence against Indian women.
- Sec. 905. Assistant United States attorney domestic violence tribal liaisons.

TITLE X—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 1001. Criminal provisions relating to sexual abuse.
- Sec. 1002. Sexual abuse in custodial settings.
- Sec. 1003. Criminal provision relating to stalking, including cyberstalking.
- Sec. 1004. Amendments to the Federal assault statute.
- Sec. 1005. Mandatory minimum sentence.

SEC. 3. VAWA DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Subsection (a) of section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “to an unemancipated minor” after “serious harm”;
- (2) in paragraph (3), by striking “an organizational” and inserting “a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization that serves a specific geographic community”;
- (3) in paragraph (6) by inserting “or intimate partner” after “former spouse” and after “as a spouse”;
- (4) by amending paragraph (16) to read as follows:

“(16) **LEGAL ASSISTANCE.**—The term ‘legal assistance’—

“(A) includes assistance to adult and youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in—

“(i) family, tribal, territorial, immigration, employment, administrative agency, housing matters, campus administrative or protection or

stay away order proceedings, and other similar matters; and

“(ii) criminal justice investigations, prosecutions and post-trial matters (including sentencing, parole, and probation) that impact the victim’s safety and privacy; and

“(B) may include services and assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are also victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons as defined by section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

except that intake or referral, without other action, does not constitute legal assistance.”.

(5) by amending paragraph (18) to read as follows:

“(18) **PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION OR PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—The term ‘personally identifying information’ or ‘personal information’ means individually identifying information for or about an individual, including information likely to disclose the location of a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, regardless of whether the information is encoded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected, including—

“(A) a first and last name;

“(B) a home or other physical address;

“(C) contact information (including a postal, e-mail or Internet protocol address, or telephone or facsimile number);

“(D) a social security number, driver license number, passport number, or student identification number; and

“(E) any other information, including date of birth, racial or ethnic background, or religious affiliation, that would serve to identify any individual.”;

(6) in paragraph (19), by striking “services” and inserting “assistance”;

(7) in paragraph (21)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(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 proscribed by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.”;

(10) by amending paragraph (33) to read as follows:

“(33) **UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.**—The term ‘underserved populations’ means populations who face barriers to accessing and using victim services, and includes populations underserved because of geographic location or religion, underserved racial and ethnic populations, populations underserved because of special needs (such as language barriers, disabilities, alienage status, or age), and any other population determined to be underserved by the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as appropriate.”;

(11) by amending paragraph (37) to read as follows:

“(37) **YOUTH.**—The term ‘youth’ means a person who is 11 to 24 years of age.”;

(12) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(38) **ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGE.**—The term ‘Alaska Native village’ has the same meaning given such term in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

“(39) **CHILD.**—The term ‘child’ means a person who is under 11 years of age.

“(40) **CULTURALLY SPECIFIC.**—The term ‘culturally specific’ (except when used as part of the term ‘culturally specific services’) means primarily composed of racial and ethnic minority

groups (as defined in section 1707(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–6(g))).

“(41) **CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES.**—The term ‘culturally specific services’ means community-based services and resources that are culturally relevant and linguistically specific to culturally specific communities.

“(42) **HOMELESS, HOMELESS INDIVIDUAL, HOMELESS PERSON.**—The terms ‘homeless’, ‘homeless individual’, and ‘homeless person’—

“(A) mean an individual who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; and

“(B) includes—

“(i) an individual who—

“(I) is sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason;

“(II) is living in a motel, hotel, trailer park, or campground due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations;

“(III) is living in an emergency or transitional shelter;

“(IV) is abandoned in a hospital; or

“(V) is awaiting foster care placement;

“(ii) an individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings; or

“(iii) migratory children (as defined in section 1309 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; 20 U.S.C. 6399) who qualify as homeless under this section because the children are living in circumstances described in this paragraph.

“(43) **POPULATION SPECIFIC ORGANIZATION.**—The term ‘population specific organization’ means a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that primarily serves members of a specific underserved population and has demonstrated experience and expertise providing targeted services to members of that specific underserved population.

“(44) **POPULATION SPECIFIC SERVICES.**—The term ‘population specific services’ means victim services that—

“(A) address the safety, health, economic, legal, housing, workplace, immigration, confidentiality, or other needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(B) are designed primarily for, and are targeted to, a specific underserved population.

“(45) **RAPE CRISIS CENTER.**—The term ‘rape crisis center’ means—

“(A) a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization that provides intervention and related assistance, as specified in section 41601(b)(2)(C), to victims of sexual assault without regard to the age of the victims; or

“(B) a governmental entity that—

“(i) is located in a State other than a Territory;

“(ii) provides intervention and related assistance, as specified in section 41601(b)(2)(C), to victims of sexual assault without regard to the age of the victims;

“(iii) is not a law enforcement agency or other entity that is part of the criminal justice system; and

“(iv) offers a level of confidentiality to victims that is comparable to a nonprofit entity that provides similar victim services.

“(46) **SEX TRAFFICKING.**—The term ‘sex trafficking’ means any conduct proscribed by section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, whether or not the conduct occurs in interstate or foreign commerce or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

“(47) **TRIBAL COALITION.**—The term ‘tribal coalition’ means an established nonprofit, nongovernmental Indian organization, Alaska Native organization, or a Native Hawaiian organization that—

“(A) provides education, support, and technical assistance to member Indian service providers in a manner that enables those member providers to establish and maintain culturally appropriate services, including shelter and rape

crisis services, designed to assist Indian women and the dependents of those women who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(B) is comprised of board and general members that are representative of—

“(i) the member service providers described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the tribal communities in which the services are being provided.

“(48) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘unit of local government’ means any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.

“(49) VICTIM SERVICES.—The term ‘victim services’—

“(A) means services provided to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including telephonic or web-based hotlines, legal advocacy, economic advocacy, emergency and transitional shelter, accompaniment and advocacy through medical, civil or criminal justice, immigration, and social support systems, crisis intervention, short-term individual and group support services, information and referrals, culturally specific services, population specific services, and other related supportive services; and

“(B) may include services and assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are also victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons as defined by section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(50) VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ‘victim service provider’ means a nonprofit, nongovernmental or tribal organization or rape crisis center, including a State sexual assault coalition or tribal coalition, that—

“(A) assists domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victims, including domestic violence shelters, faith-based organizations, and other organizations; and

“(B) has a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”; and

(13) by striking paragraphs (17), (29), and (36), and then reordering the remaining paragraphs of such subsection (including the paragraphs added by paragraph (12) of this subsection) in alphabetical order based on the headings of such paragraphs, and renumbering such paragraphs as so reordered.

(b) GRANTS CONDITIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by amending clauses (i) and (ii) to read as follows:

“(i) disclose, reveal, or release any personally identifying information or individual information collected in connection with services requested, utilized, or denied through grantees’ and subgrantees’ programs, regardless of whether the information has been encoded, encrypted, hashed, or otherwise protected; or

“(ii) disclose, reveal, or release individual client information without the informed, written, reasonably time-limited consent of the person (or in the case of an unemancipated minor, the minor and the parent or guardian or in the case of legal incapacity, a court-appointed guardian) about whom information is sought, whether for this program or any other Federal, State, tribal, or territorial grant program, except that—

“(I) consent for release may not be given by the abuser of the minor, incapacitated person, or the abuser of the other parent of the minor; and

“(II) if a minor or a person with a legally appointed guardian is permitted by law to receive services without the parent’s or guardian’s consent, such minor or person with a guardian may release information without additional consent.”;

(B) by amending subparagraph (D), to read as follows:

“(D) INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Grantees and subgrantees may share—

“(I) nonpersonally identifying data in the aggregate regarding services to their clients and nonpersonally identifying demographic information in order to comply with Federal, State, tribal, or territorial reporting, evaluation, or data collection requirements;

“(II) court-generated information and law enforcement-generated information contained in secure, governmental registries for protection order enforcement purposes; and

“(III) law enforcement-generated and prosecution-generated information necessary for law enforcement, intelligence, national security, or prosecution purposes.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS.—Grantees and subgrantees may not—

“(I) require an adult, youth, or child victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to provide a consent to release his or her personally identifying information as a condition of eligibility for the services provided by the grantee or subgrantee; or

“(II) share any personally identifying information in order to comply with Federal reporting, evaluation, or data collection requirements, whether for this program or any other Federal grant program.”;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F);

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) STATUTORILY MANDATED REPORTS OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT.—Nothing in this paragraph prohibits a grantee or subgrantee from reporting suspected abuse or neglect, as those terms are defined by law, when specifically mandated by the State or tribe involved.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) CONFIDENTIALITY ASSESSMENT AND ASSURANCES.—Grantees and subgrantees shall certify their compliance with the confidentiality and privacy provisions required under this section.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) APPROVED ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the activities under this title, grantees and subgrantees may collaborate with and provide information to Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial public officials and agencies to develop and implement policies, and develop and promote State, local, or tribal legislation or model codes, designed to reduce or eliminate domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.”;

(3) in paragraph (7), by inserting at the end the following:

“Final reports of such evaluations shall be made publically available on the website of the disbursing agency.”; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) DELIVERY OF LEGAL ASSISTANCE.—Any grantee or subgrantee providing legal assistance with funds awarded under this title shall comply with the eligibility requirements in section 1201(d) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-6(d)).

“(13) CIVIL RIGHTS.—

“(A) NONDISCRIMINATION.—No person in any State shall on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability be denied the assistance of, or excluded from receiving services from, a grantee under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103-322; 108 Stat. 1902), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against

Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women.

“(B) REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent consideration of an individual’s gender for purposes of a program or activity described in subparagraph (A) if the grantee involved determines that gender segregation or gender-specific programming is necessary to the essential operation of such program or activity. In such a case, alternative reasonable accommodations are sufficient to meet the requirements of this paragraph.

“(C) APPLICATION.—The provisions of paragraphs (2) through (4) of section 809(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3789d(c)) shall apply to violations of subparagraph (A).

“(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed, interpreted, or applied to supplant, displace, preempt, or otherwise diminish the responsibilities and liabilities of grantees under other Federal or State civil rights law, whether statutory or common.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 41403(6) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (14043e-2(6)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) the terms ‘homeless’, ‘homeless individual’, and ‘homeless person’ have the meanings given such terms in section 40002(a);”.

SEC. 4. ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISIONS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR DOJ GRANT APPLICANTS TO INCLUDE CERTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT FEDERAL GRANTS IN DOJ GRANT APPLICATIONS.—Each applicant for a grant from the Department of Justice shall submit, as part of the application for the grant, the following information:

(1) A list of each Federal grant the applicant applied for during the one-year period preceding the date of submission of the application.

(2) A list of each Federal grant the applicant received during the five-year period preceding the date of submission of the application.

(b) ENHANCING GRANT EFFICIENCY AND COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall, to the greatest extent practicable, take actions to further the coordination of the administration of grants within the Department of Justice to increase the efficiency of such administration.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the actions taken by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) and the progress of such actions in achieving coordination described in such paragraph.

(c) REQUIRING OFFICE OF AUDIT, ASSESSMENT, AND MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS TO APPLY TO VAWA GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 109(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended—

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

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

“(3) Any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103-322; 108 Stat. 1902), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to grant periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **VAWA GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.**—Section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All grants awarded under this title shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—Beginning in fiscal year 2013, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall conduct an audit of not fewer than 10 percent of all grantees under this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by such grantees.

“(2) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A grantee described in paragraph (1) that is found by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, as applicable, to have an unresolved audit finding (as defined in paragraph (5)) shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in such paragraph.

“(3) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this title during any period in which the entity is prohibited from receiving funds under paragraph (2), the head of the Federal agency administering a grant program under this title shall—

“(A) deposit into the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee; and

“(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the Fund from the entity that was erroneously awarded such grant funds.

“(4) **UNRESOLVED AUDIT FINDING DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means, with respect to a grantee described in paragraph (1), an audit report finding, statement, or recommendation by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Service, as applicable, that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date of an initial notification of the finding, statement, or recommendation.

“(5) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

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

“(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program under this title to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(6) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 5.0 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Office on Violence Against Women.

“(7) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

“(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice or Department of Health and Human Services under this title may be used by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or by any individual or organization awarded funds under this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences, unless in the case of the Department of Justice, the Dep-

uty Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, or in the case of the Department of Health and Human Services the Deputy Secretary, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host or support any expenditure for such a conference.

“(B) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written authorization under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

“(C) **REPORT.**—The Deputy Attorney General and Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved and denied during the fiscal year for which the report is submitted.

“(8) **PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may not be utilized by any grantee or subgrantee to lobby any representative of the Federal Government (including the Department of Justice) or a State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

“(B) **PENALTY.**—If the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable determines that any grantee or subgrantee receiving funds under this title has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General or the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall—

“(i) require the grantee or subgrantee to repay such funds in full; and

“(ii) prohibit the grantee or subgrantee from receiving any funds under this title for not less than 5 years.

“(9) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women, and the Deputy Secretary for Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a certification for such year that—

“(A) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs;

“(B) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (2) have been issued;

“(C) all reimbursements required under paragraph (3) have been made; and

“(D) includes a list of any grantees and subgrantees excluded during the previous year under paragraph (2).”

(e) **TRAINING AND RESOURCES FOR VAWA GRANTEES.**—Section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) is further amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “**AND GRANT PROVISIONS**” and inserting “**, GRANT PROVISIONS, AND TRAINING AND RESOURCES FOR VAWA GRANTEES**”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **TRAINING AND RESOURCES FOR VAWA GRANTEES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services, as applicable, shall—

“(A) develop standards, protocols, and sample tools and forms to provide guidance to grantees and subgrantees under any program or activity described in paragraph (2) regarding financial recordkeeping and accounting practices required of such grantees and subgrantees as recipients of funds from the disbursing agency;

“(B) provide training to such grantees and subgrantees regarding such standards, protocols, and sample tools and forms; and

“(C) publish on the public Internet website of the Office of Violence Against Women information to assist such grantees and subgrantees with compliance with such standards, protocols, and sample tools and forms.

“(2) **VAWA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a program or activity described in this paragraph is any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this title, the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1491), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women.”

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the provisions of titles I, II, III, IV, VII, and sections 3, 602, 901, and 902 of this Act shall not take effect until the first day of the fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act.

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

SEC. 101. STOP GRANTS.

(a) **STOP GRANTS.**—Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2001(b) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(b)), as amended by paragraph (2)—

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

(i) by striking “equipment” and inserting “resources”; and

(ii) by inserting “for the protection and safety of victims,” before “and specifically,”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “sexual assault” and all that follows through “dating violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

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

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

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting “, classifying,” after “identifying”; and

(ii) by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

(F) in paragraph (5)—

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

(ii) by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”; and

(iii) by striking “including crimes” and all that follows and inserting “including crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

(G) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (6) through (13), respectively;

(H) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking “sexual assault and domestic violence” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

(I) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking “and dating violence” and inserting “dating violence, and stalking”;

(J) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)—

(i) by striking “domestic violence or sexual assault” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking”; and

(ii) by striking “such violence or assault” and inserting “such violence, assault, or stalking”;

(K) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “triage protocols to ensure that dangerous or potentially lethal cases are identified and prioritized” and inserting “the use of evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of domestic and dating violence homicide and prioritize dangerous or potentially lethal cases”; and

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

(L) in paragraph (13), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “to provide” and inserting “providing”;

(II) by striking “nonprofit nongovernmental”;

(III) by striking the comma after “local governments”;

(ii) by inserting “and” after the semicolon in subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a semicolon;

(M) by inserting after paragraph (13), as so redesignated by subparagraph (G), the following:

“(14) developing and promoting State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

“(15) developing, implementing, or enhancing Sexual Assault Response Teams, or other similar coordinated community responses to sexual assault;

“(16) developing and strengthening policies, protocols, best practices, and training for law enforcement agencies and prosecutors relating to the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases and the appropriate treatment of victims;

“(17) developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing sexual assault against men, women, and youth in correctional and detention settings;

“(18) identifying and conducting inventories of backlogs of sexual assault evidence collection kits and developing protocols and policies for responding to and addressing such backlogs, including protocols and policies for notifying and involving victims; and

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

(N) in the flush text at the end, by striking “paragraph (14)” and inserting “paragraph (13)”;

(2) in section 2007 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-1)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “nonprofit nongovernmental victim services programs” and inserting “victim service providers”;

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

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

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

“(A) the State sexual assault coalition;

“(B) the State domestic violence coalition;

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

“(D) prosecution offices;

“(E) State and local courts;

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

“(G) representatives from underserved populations;

“(H) victim service providers;

“(I) population specific organizations; and

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

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) grantees shall coordinate the State implementation plan described in paragraph (2) with the State plans described in section 307 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10407) and the plans described in the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601 et seq.) and section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1b); and”;

(iv) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

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

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (D) and (E);

(III) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following:

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

“(C) for each fiscal year beginning on or after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, not less than 20 percent shall be allocated for programs or projects that meaningfully address sexual assault, including stranger rape, acquaintance rape, alcohol or drug-facilitated rape, and rape within the context of an intimate partner relationship.”;

(IV) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated by subclause (II), by striking “; and” and inserting a period;

(D) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—An application for a grant under this part shall include—

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

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

“(3) proof of compliance with the requirements for paying fees and costs relating to domestic violence and protection order cases described in section 2011;

“(4) proof of compliance with the requirements prohibiting polygraph examinations of victims of sexual assault described in section 2013;

“(5) an implementation plan required under subsection (i); and

“(6) any other documentation that the Attorney General may require.”;

(E) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “domestic violence and sexual assault” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

(II) in subparagraph (D), by striking “linguistically and”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CONDITIONS.—In disbursing grants under this part, the Attorney General may impose reasonable conditions on grant awards disbursed after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012 to ensure that the States meet statutory, regulatory, and other program requirements.”;

(F) in subsection (f), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, except that, for purposes of this subsection, the costs of the projects for victim services or tribes for which there is an exemption under section 40002(b)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)(1)) shall not count toward the total costs of the projects.”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

“(2) submit to the Attorney General as part of the application submitted in accordance with subsection (d)—

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

“(B) documentation from each member of the planning committee with respect to the member’s participation in the planning process;

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

“(i) the need for the grant funds;

“(ii) the intended use of the grant funds;

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

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

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

“(E) demographic data on the distribution of underserved populations within the State and a description of how the State will meet the needs of underserved populations, including the minimum allocation for population specific services required under subsection (c)(4)(C);

“(F) a description of how the State plans to meet the requirements pursuant to regulations issued under subsection (e)(2);

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

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

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

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

“(2) the State does not receive sufficient eligible applications to award the full funding within the allocations under subsection (c)(4).”;

(3) in section 2010 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-4)—

(A) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government shall not be entitled to funds under this subchapter unless the State, Indian tribal government, unit of local government, or another governmental entity—

“(A) incurs the full out-of-pocket cost of forensic medical exams described in subsection (b) for victims of sexual assault; and

“(B) coordinates with health care providers in the region to notify victims of sexual assault of the availability of rape exams at no cost to the victims.”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;

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

(iii) by striking paragraph (3);

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “, except that such funds” and all that follows and inserting a period; and

(D) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) NONCOOPERATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be in compliance with this section, a State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government shall comply with subsection (b) without regard to whether the

victim participates in the criminal justice system or cooperates with law enforcement.

“(2) COMPLIANCE PERIOD.—States, territories, and Indian tribal governments shall have 3 years from the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012 to come into compliance with this subsection.”; and

(4) in section 2011(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–5(a)(1))—

(A) by inserting “modification, enforcement, dismissal,” after “registration,” each place it appears; and

(B) by striking “domestic violence, stalking, or sexual assault” and inserting “domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(18) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(18)), is amended by striking “\$225,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$222,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

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

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

(1) in section 2101 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

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

(ii) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and enforcement of protection orders across State and tribal lines” before the period;

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

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

(v) in paragraph (5), by inserting “and other victim services” after “legal advocacy service programs”;

(vi) in paragraph (6), by striking “judges” and inserting “Federal, State, tribal, territorial, and local judges, and court-based and court-related personnel”;

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

(viii) in paragraph (10), by striking “non-profit, non-governmental victim services organizations,” and inserting “victim service providers, population specific organizations,”; and

(ix) by adding at the end the following:

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

“(15) To develop or strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and the judiciary in recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(16) To develop and promote State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including the appropriate treatment of victims.

“(17) To develop, implement, or enhance sexual assault nurse examiner programs or sexual assault forensic examiner programs, including the hiring and training of such examiners.

“(18) To develop, implement, or enhance Sexual Assault Response Teams or similar coordinated community responses to sexual assault.

“(19) To develop and strengthen policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement officers and prosecutors regarding the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases and the appropriate treatment of victims of sexual assault.

“(20) To provide the following human immunodeficiency virus services for victims of sexual assault:

“(A) Testing.

“(B) Counseling.

“(C) Prophylaxis.

“(21) To identify and inventory backlogs of sexual assault evidence collection kits and to develop protocols for responding to and addressing such backlogs, including policies and protocols for notifying and involving victims.

“(22) To develop multidisciplinary high-risk teams focusing on reducing domestic violence and dating violence homicides by—

(A) using evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of homicide and link high-risk victims to immediate crisis intervention services;

(B) identifying and managing high-risk offenders; and

(C) providing ongoing victim advocacy and referrals to comprehensive services including legal, housing, health care, and economic assistance.”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “except for a court,” before “certify”;

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting “except for a court,” before “demonstrate”;

(iii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by inserting “modification, enforcement, dismissal,” after “registration,” each place it appears;

(II) by inserting “dating violence,” after “domestic violence,”; and

(III) by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “, not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section,”;

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(III) in clause (ii), as redesignated by subparagraph (II) of this clause, by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “clause (i)”;

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

(v) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5), as amended by this subparagraph, as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(vi) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as redesignated by clause (v) of this subparagraph—

(I) by striking the second comma; and

(II) by striking “grantees are States” and inserting the following: “grantees are—

“(1) States”;

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) A State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition or a victim service provider that partners with a State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government that certifies that the State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government meets the requirements under paragraph (1).”;

(C) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, policy,” after “law”;

(II) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and the defendant is in custody or has been served with the information or indictment” before the semicolon; and

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

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ALLOCATION FOR TRIBAL COALITIONS.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 5 percent shall be available for grants under section 2001(d) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(d)).

“(g) ALLOCATION FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 25 percent shall be available for projects that address sexual assault, including stranger rape, acquaintance rape, alcohol or drug-facilitated rape, and rape within the context of an intimate partner relationship.”; and

(2) in section 2102(a) (42 U.S.C. 3796hh–1(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “court,” after “tribal government,”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “nonprofit, private sexual assault and domestic violence programs” and inserting “victim service providers and, as appropriate, population specific organizations”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(19) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(19)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$75,000,000” and all that follows through “2011” and inserting “\$73,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”;

(2) by striking the second period.

SEC. 103. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS.

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

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “arising as a consequence of” and inserting “relating to or arising out of”;

(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”;

(B) by inserting “and grant conditions” after “definitions”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “victim service organizations” and inserting “victim service providers”;

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) to implement, expand, and establish efforts and projects to provide competent, supervised pro bono legal assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (c) has completed” and all that follows and inserting the following: “this section—”

“(A) has demonstrated expertise in providing legal assistance or advocacy to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the targeted population; or

“(B)(i) is partnered with an entity or person that has demonstrated expertise described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) has completed, or will complete, training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault and related legal issues, including training on evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “stalking organization” and inserting “stalking victim service provider”;

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “this section” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “this section \$57,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) Of the amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year, not more than 10 percent may be used for purposes described in subsection (c)(3).”.

SEC. 104. CONSOLIDATION OF GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Title III of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1509) is amended by striking the section preceding section 1302 (42 U.S.C. 10420), as amended by section 306 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3016), and inserting the following:

“SEC. 1301. COURT TRAINING AND SUPERVISED VISITATION IMPROVEMENTS.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, courts (including juvenile courts), Indian tribal governments, nonprofit organizations, legal services providers, and victim services providers to improve the response of all aspects of the civil and criminal justice system to families with a history of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or in cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse.

“(b) *USE OF FUNDS.*—A grant under this section may be used to—

“(1) provide supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange of children and youth by and between parents in situations involving domestic violence, dating violence, child sexual abuse, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(2) develop and promote State, local, and tribal legislation, policies, and best practices for improving civil and criminal court functions, responses, practices, and procedures in cases involving a history of domestic violence or sexual assault, or in cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse, including cases in which the victim proceeds pro se;

“(3) educate court-based and court-related personnel (including custody evaluators and guardians ad litem) and child protective services workers on the dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including information on perpetrator behavior, evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide, and on issues relating to the needs of victims, including safety, security, privacy, and confidentiality, including cases in which the victim proceeds pro se;

“(4) provide adequate resources in juvenile court matters to respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault (including child sexual abuse), and stalking and ensure necessary services dealing with the physical health and mental health of victims are available;

“(5) enable courts or court-based or court-related programs to develop or enhance—

“(A) court infrastructure (such as specialized courts, consolidated courts, dockets, intake centers, or interpreter services);

“(B) community-based initiatives within the court system (such as court watch programs, victim assistants, pro se victim assistance programs, or community-based supplementary services);

“(C) offender management, monitoring, and accountability programs;

“(D) safe and confidential information-storage and information-sharing databases within and between court systems;

“(E) education and outreach programs to improve community access, including enhanced access for underserved populations; and

“(F) other projects likely to improve court responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

“(6) collect data and provide training and technical assistance, including developing State, local, and tribal model codes and policies, to improve the capacity of grantees and communities to address the civil justice needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking who have legal representation, who are proceeding pro se, or who are proceeding with the assistance of a legal advocate; and

“(7) improve training and education to assist judges, judicial personnel, attorneys, child wel-

fare personnel, and legal advocates in the civil justice system regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or child abuse.

“(c) *CONSIDERATIONS.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In making grants for purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (b), the Attorney General shall consider—

“(A) the number of families to be served by the proposed programs and services;

“(B) the extent to which the proposed programs and services serve underserved populations;

“(C) the extent to which the applicant demonstrates cooperation and collaboration with nonprofit, nongovernmental entities in the local community with demonstrated histories of effective work on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including State or tribal domestic violence coalitions, State or tribal sexual assault coalitions, local shelters, and programs for domestic violence and sexual assault victims; and

“(D) the extent to which the applicant demonstrates coordination and collaboration with State, tribal, and local court systems, including mechanisms for communication and referral.

“(2) *OTHER GRANTS.*—In making grants under subsection (b)(8) the Attorney General shall take into account the extent to which the grantee has expertise addressing the judicial system's handling of family violence, child custody, child abuse and neglect, adoption, foster care, supervised visitation, divorce, and parentage.

“(d) *APPLICANT REQUIREMENTS.*—The Attorney General may make a grant under this section to an applicant that—

“(1) demonstrates expertise in the areas of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or child sexual abuse, as appropriate;

“(2) ensures that any fees charged to individuals for use of supervised visitation programs and services are based on the income of those individuals, unless otherwise provided by court order;

“(3) if the applicant proposes to operate supervised visitation programs and services or safe visitation exchange, demonstrates that adequate security measures, including adequate facilities, procedures, and personnel capable of preventing violence, and adequate standards are, or will be, in place (including the development of protocols or policies to ensure that confidential information is not shared with courts, law enforcement agencies, or child welfare agencies unless necessary to ensure the safety of any child or adult using the services of a program funded under this section);

“(4) certifies that the organizational policies of the applicant do not require mediation or counseling involving offenders and victims being physically present in the same place, in cases where domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking is alleged;

“(5) certifies that any person providing legal assistance through a program funded under this section has completed or will complete training on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including child sexual abuse, and related legal issues; and

“(6) certifies that any person providing custody evaluation or guardian ad litem services through a program funded under this section has completed or will complete training, developed with input from and in collaboration with a tribal, State, territorial, or local domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victim service provider or coalition, on the dynamics of domestic violence and sexual assault, including child sexual abuse, that includes training on how to review evidence of past abuse and the use of evidenced-based theories to make recommendations on custody and visitation.

“(e) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$22,000,000 for each of the fiscal

years 2013 through 2017. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended.

“(f) *ALLOTMENT FOR INDIAN TRIBES.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not less than 10 percent of the total amount available under this section for each fiscal year shall be available for grants under the program authorized by section 2015 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-10).

“(2) *APPLICABILITY OF PART.*—The requirements of this section shall not apply to funds allocated for the program described in paragraph (1).”.

(b) *TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Subtitle J of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 105. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM.

Subtitle B of title II of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13011 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 216 (42 U.S.C. 13012), by striking “January 1, 2010” and inserting “January 1, 2015”;

(2) in section 217 (42 U.S.C. 13013)—

(A) in subsection (c)(2)(A), by striking “Code of Ethics” and inserting “Standards for Programs”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) *REPORTING.*—An organization that receives a grant under this section for a fiscal year shall submit to the Administrator a report regarding the use of the grant for the fiscal year, including a discussion of outcome performance measures (which shall be established by the Administrator) to determine the effectiveness of the programs of the organization in meeting the needs of children in the child welfare system.”; and

(3) in section 219(a) (42 U.S.C. 13014(a)), by striking “fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

SEC. 106. OUTREACH AND SERVICES TO UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS GRANT.

Section 120 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 120. GRANTS FOR OUTREACH AND SERVICES TO UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.

“(a) *GRANTS AUTHORIZED.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Of the amounts appropriated under the grant programs identified in paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall take 2 percent of such appropriated amounts and combine them to award grants to eligible entities described in subsection (b) of this section to develop and implement outreach strategies targeted at adult or youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations and to provide victim services to meet the needs of adult and youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in underserved populations. The requirements of the grant programs identified in paragraph (2) shall not apply to this grant program.

“(2) *PROGRAMS COVERED.*—The programs identified in this paragraph are the programs carried out under the following provisions:

“(A) Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (STOP grants).

“(B) Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Grants to encourage arrest policies).

“(b) *ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.*—Eligible entities under this section are—

“(1) population specific organizations that have demonstrated experience and expertise in providing population specific services in the relevant underserved communities, or population specific organizations working in partnership with a victim service provider or domestic violence or sexual assault coalition;

“(2) victim service providers offering population specific services for a specific underserved population; or

“(3) victim service providers working in partnership with a national, State, or local organization that has demonstrated experience and expertise in providing population specific services in the relevant underserved population.

“(c) **PLANNING GRANTS.**—The Attorney General may use up to 20 percent of funds available under this section to make one-time planning grants to eligible entities to support the planning and development of specially designed and targeted programs for adult and youth victims in one or more underserved populations, including—

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

“(2) conducting a needs assessment of the community and the targeted underserved population or populations to determine what the barriers are to service access and what factors contribute to those barriers, using input from the targeted underserved population or populations;

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

“(4) developing a plan, with the input of the targeted underserved population or populations, for—

“(A) implementing prevention, outreach, and intervention strategies to address the barriers to accessing services;

“(B) promoting community engagement in the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the targeted underserved populations; and

“(C) evaluating the program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(g) **DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.**—In this section the definitions and grant conditions in section 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 2013 through 2017.”

SEC. 107. CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES GRANT.

Section 121 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045a) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**and linguistically**”;

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

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

(4) by amending paragraph (2) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(2) **PROGRAMS COVERED.**—The programs identified in this paragraph are the programs carried out under the following provisions:

“(A) Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh) (Grants to encourage arrest policies).

“(B) Section 1201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–6) (Legal assistance for victims).

“(C) Section 40295 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13971) (Rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and child abuse enforcement assistance).

“(D) Section 40802 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041a) (Enhanced training and services to end violence against women later in life).

“(E) Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–7) (Education, training, and enhanced services to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities).”; and

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

SEC. 108. REDUCTION IN RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

Section 2(c)(3) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(c)(3)), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “2014” and inserting “2012”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) For each of the fiscal years 2013 and 2014, not less than 75 percent of the grant amounts shall be awarded for purposes under subsection (a)(2).”

SEC. 109. ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT TRAINING PROGRAMS.

Section 40152(c) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13941(c)) is amended by striking “to carry out this section” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.”

SEC. 110. CHILD ABUSE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR JUDICIAL PERSONNEL AND PRACTITIONERS.

Section 224(a) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13024(a)) is amended by striking “\$2,300,000” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$2,300,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.”

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

SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

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

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

(2) in paragraph (2)—

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

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

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by inserting “and territory” after “each State”;

(ii) by striking “1.50 percent” and inserting “0.75 percent”; and

(iii) by striking “, except that” and all that follows through “of the total appropriations”; and

(B) in the last sentence, by striking “the preceding formula” and inserting “this paragraph”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043g(f)(1)) is amended by striking “\$50,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$40,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

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

Section 40295 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13971) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(H), by inserting “, including sexual assault forensic examiners” before the semicolon;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “victim advocacy groups” and inserting “victim service providers”; and

(ii) by inserting “, including developing multidisciplinary teams focusing on high-risk cases with the goal of preventing domestic and dating violence homicides” before the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “and other long- and short-term assistance” and inserting “legal assistance, and other long-term and short-term victim services and population specific services”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

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

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) to develop, expand, or strengthen programs addressing sexual assault, including sexual assault forensic examiner programs, Sexual Assault Response Teams, law enforcement training, and programs addressing rape kit backlogs.”; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “\$55,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

SEC. 203. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN WITH DISABILITIES GRANTS.

Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–7) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “(including using evidence-based indicators to assess the risk of domestic and dating violence homicide)” after “risk reduction”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “victim service organizations” and inserting “victim service providers”; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “victim services organizations” and inserting “victim service providers”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(D), by striking “non-profit and nongovernmental victim services organization, such as a State” and inserting “victim service provider, such as a State or tribal”; and

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “\$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011”

and inserting “\$9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

SEC. 204. GRANT FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN LATER LIFE.

Section 40802 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14041a) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 40802. GRANT FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN LATER LIFE.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that—

“(A) is—

“(i) a State;

“(ii) a unit of local government;

“(iii) a tribal government or tribal organization;

“(iv) a population specific organization with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals in later life;

“(v) a victim service provider; or

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

“(B) is partnered with—

“(i) a law enforcement agency;

“(ii) an office of a prosecutor;

“(iii) a victim service provider; or

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

“(2) The term ‘elder abuse’ means domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking committed against individuals in later life.

“(3) The term ‘individual in later life’ means an individual who is 60 years of age or older.

“(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in paragraph (2). In awarding such grants, the Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that the activities funded under this section are not duplicative with the activities funded under the elder abuse prevention programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

“(2) MANDATORY AND PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—

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

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

“(ii) provide or enhance services for victims of elder abuse;

“(iii) establish or support multidisciplinary collaborative community responses to victims of elder abuse; and

“(iv) conduct cross-training for law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, attorneys, health care providers, population specific organizations, faith-based advocates, victim service providers, and courts to better serve victims of elder abuse.

“(B) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section may use not more than 10 percent of the funds received under the grant to—

“(i) provide training programs to assist attorneys, health care providers, faith-based leaders, or other community-based organizations in recognizing and addressing instances of elder abuse; or

“(ii) conduct outreach activities and awareness campaigns to ensure that victims of elder abuse receive appropriate assistance.

“(3) UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to proposals providing culturally specific or population specific services.

“(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.”.

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

SEC. 301. RAPE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION GRANT.

Section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, territorial, or tribal” after “crisis centers, State”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by inserting “and alcohol” after “about drugs”;;

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “\$80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”; and

(3) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) FUNDING FORMULA.—Amounts provided under this section shall be allotted to each State, territory, and the District of Columbia based on population. If the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) exceed \$48,000,000 in any fiscal year, a minimum allocation of \$150,000 shall be awarded to each State and territory and the District of Columbia. Any remaining funds shall be allotted to each State and territory and the District of Columbia based on population.”.

SEC. 302. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle L of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043c et seq.) is amended by striking sections 41201 through 41204 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 41201. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH (CHOOSE CHILDREN AND YOUTH).

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

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

“(1) SERVICES TO ADVOCATE FOR AND RESPOND TO YOUTH.—To develop, expand, and strengthen victim interventions and services that target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Services may include victim services, counseling, advocacy, mentoring, educational support, transportation, legal assistance in civil, criminal and administrative matters, such as family law cases, housing cases, child welfare proceedings, campus administrative proceedings, and civil protection order proceedings, services to address sex trafficking, population specific services, and other activities that support youth in finding safety, stability, and justice and in addressing the emotional, cognitive, and physical effects of trauma on youth. Funds may be used to—

“(A) assess and analyze available services for youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, determining relevant barriers to such services in a particular locality, and developing a community protocol to address such problems collaboratively;

“(B) develop and implement policies, practices, and procedures to effectively respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against youth; or

“(C) provide technical assistance and training to enhance the ability of school personnel, victim service providers, child protective service

workers, staff of law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, court personnel, individuals who work in after school programs, medical personnel, social workers, mental health personnel, and workers in other programs that serve children and youth to improve their ability to appropriately respond to the needs of children and youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, as well as homeless youth, and to properly refer such children, youth, and their families to appropriate services.

“(2) SUPPORTING YOUTH THROUGH EDUCATION AND PROTECTION.—To enable secondary or elementary schools that serve students in any of grades five through twelve and institutions of higher education to—

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

“(B) develop and implement age-appropriate prevention and intervention policies in accordance with State law in secondary or elementary schools that serve students in any of grades five through twelve, including appropriate responses to, and identification and referral procedures for, students who are experiencing or perpetrating domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and procedures for handling the requirements of court protective orders issued to or against students;

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

“(D) provide evidence-based educational programs for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; or

“(E) develop strategies to increase identification, support, referrals, and prevention programs for youth who are at high risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(c) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—

“(A) a victim service provider, tribal nonprofit organization, population specific organization, or community-based organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth, including runaway or homeless youth, who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or

“(B) a victim service provider that is partnered with an entity that has a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth.

“(2) PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(A) EDUCATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2), an entity described in paragraph (1) shall be partnered with an elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), charter school (as defined in section 5210 of such Act), a school that is operated or supported by the Bureau of Indian Education, or a legally operating private school, a school administered by the Department of Defense under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, or section 1402 of the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978, a group of such schools, a local educational agency (as defined in section 9101(26) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), or an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965).

“(B) OTHER PARTNERSHIPS.—All applicants under this section are encouraged to work in partnership with organizations and agencies that work with the relevant youth population. Such entities may include—

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

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

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

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

“(d) GRANTEE REQUIREMENTS.—Applicants for grants under this section shall establish and implement policies, practices, and procedures that—

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

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

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

“(4) ensure that parents are informed of the programs funded under this program that are being offered at their child’s school.

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

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

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017.

“(h) ALLOTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 50 percent of the total amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be used for the purposes described in subsection (b)(1).

“(2) INDIAN TRIBES.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be made available for grants under the program authorized by section 2015 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–10).”

(b) VAWA GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4002(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)), as amended by section 3(b)(4), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) REQUIREMENT FOR EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMS.—Any educational programming, training, or public awareness communications regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are funded under this title must be evidence-based.”

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

Section 304 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “and” after “stalking on campuses,”;

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

(iii) by inserting “, and to develop and strengthen prevention education and awareness programs” before the period; and

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

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

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

(ii) by striking “assault and stalking,” and inserting “assault, and stalking, including the use of technology to commit these crimes,”;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting “and population specific services” after “strengthen victim services programs”;

(ii) by striking “entities carrying out” and all that follows through “stalking victim services programs” and inserting “victim service providers”; and

(iii) by inserting “, regardless of whether the services provided by such program are provided by the institution or in coordination with community victim service providers” before the period at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) To provide evidence-based educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

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

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “any non-profit” and all that follows through the first occurrence of “victim services programs” and inserting “victim service providers”;

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

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

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

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “2007 through 2011” and inserting “2013 through 2017”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

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

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

“(A) The grantee shall create a coordinated community response including both organizations external to the institution and relevant divisions of the institution.

“(B) The grantee shall establish a mandatory prevention and education program on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking for all incoming students.

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

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

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “\$12,000,000” and all that follows through the period and inserting “\$12,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017.”.

SEC. 304. NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART LL—NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY

“SEC. 3021. NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.

“(a) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE CENTER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services is authorized to establish and operate a National Center for Campus Public Safety (referred to in this section as the ‘Center’).

“(2) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services is authorized to award grants to institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations to assist in carrying out the functions of the Center required under subsection (b).

“(b) FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTER.—The center shall—

“(1) provide quality education and training for campus public safety agencies of institutions of higher education and the agencies’ collaborative partners, including campus mental health agencies;

“(2) foster quality research to strengthen the safety and security of institutions of higher education;

“(3) serve as a clearinghouse for the identification and dissemination of information, policies, procedures, and best practices relevant to campus public safety, including off-campus housing safety, the prevention of violence against persons and property, and emergency response and evacuation procedures;

“(4) develop protocols, in conjunction with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Education, State, local, and tribal governments and law enforcement agencies, private and nonprofit organizations and associations, and other stakeholders, to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from, natural and man-made emergencies or dangerous situations involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of the campus community;

“(5) promote the development and dissemination of effective behavioral threat assessment and management models to prevent campus violence;

“(6) coordinate campus safety information (including ways to increase off-campus housing safety) and resources available from the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education, State, local, and tribal governments and law enforcement agencies, and private and nonprofit organizations and associations;

“(7) increase cooperation, collaboration, and consistency in prevention, response, and problem-solving methods among law enforcement, mental health, and other agencies and jurisdictions serving institutions of higher education;

“(8) develop standardized formats and models for mutual aid agreements and memoranda of understanding between campus security agencies and other public safety organizations and mental health agencies; and

“(9) report annually to Congress and the Attorney General on activities performed by the Center during the previous 12 months.

“(c) COORDINATION WITH AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—In establishing the Center, the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services shall—

“(1) consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Education, and the Attorney General of each State; and

“(2) coordinate the establishment and operation of the Center with campus public safety resources that may be available within the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Education.

“(d) DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—In this section, the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).”.

(b) JUSTICE PROGRAM CONSOLIDATIONS.—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Office of Dispute Resolution of the Department of Justice and the jurisdiction and employees of such office shall be—

(1) transferred to the Office of Legal Policy of the Department of Justice; and

(2) funded through the general administration appropriation of the Office of Legal Policy.

TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES

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

Section 402(c) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b–4(c)) is amended by striking “\$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007

through 2011” and inserting “\$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

SEC. 402. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION GRANTS.

(a) SMART PREVENTION.—Section 41303 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043d-2) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 41303. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION (SMART PREVENTION).

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, is authorized to award grants for the purpose of preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by taking a comprehensive approach that focuses on youth, children exposed to violence, and men as leaders and influencers of social norms.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided under this section may be used for the following purposes:

“(1) TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION.—To develop, maintain, or enhance programs that change attitudes and behaviors around the acceptability of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking to young individuals and individuals who influence young individuals. The prevention program may use evidence-based, evidence-informed, or innovative strategies and practices focused on youth. Such a program should include—

“(A) evidence-based age education on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sexual coercion, as well as healthy relationship skills, in school, in the community, or in health care settings;

“(B) community-based collaboration and training for those with influence on youth, such as parents, teachers, coaches, health care providers, faith-leaders, older teens, and mentors;

“(C) education and outreach to change environmental factors contributing to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(D) policy development targeted to prevention, including school-based policies and protocols.

“(2) CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE AND ABUSE.—To develop, maintain or enhance programs designed to prevent future incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by preventing, reducing and responding to children’s exposure to violence in the home. Such programs may include—

“(A) providing services for children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, including direct counseling or advocacy, and support for the non-abusing parent; and

“(B) training and coordination for educational, after-school, and childcare programs on how to safely and confidentially identify children and families experiencing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and properly refer children exposed and their families to services and violence prevention programs.

“(3) ENGAGING MEN AS LEADERS AND ROLE MODELS.—To develop, maintain or enhance programs that work with men to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by helping men to serve as role models and social influencers of other men and youth at the individual, school, community or state-wide levels.

“(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—

“(1) a victim service provider, community-based organization, tribe or tribal organization, or other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and expertise in the specific area for which they are applying for funds; or

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

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

“(B) A local community-based organization, population-specific organization, or faith-based organization that has established expertise in providing services to youth.

“(C) A community-based organization, population-specific organization, university or health care clinic, faith-based organization, or other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization.

“(D) A nonprofit, nongovernmental entity providing services for runaway or homeless youth affected by domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(E) Health care entities eligible for reimbursement under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, including providers that target the special needs of children and youth.

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

“(d) GRANTEE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Applicants for grants under this section shall prepare and submit to the Director an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require that demonstrates the capacity of the applicant and partnering organizations to undertake the project.

“(2) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Applicants under this section shall establish and implement policies, practices, and procedures that are consistent with the best practices developed under section 402 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b-4) and—

“(A) include appropriate referral systems to direct any victim identified during program activities to highly qualified follow-up care;

“(B) protect the confidentiality and privacy of adult and youth victim information, particularly in the context of parental or third-party involvement and consent, mandatory reporting duties, and working with other service providers;

“(C) ensure that all individuals providing prevention programming through a program funded under this section have completed or will complete sufficient training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking; and

“(D) document how prevention programs are coordinated with service programs in the community.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to applicants that—

“(A) include outcome-based evaluation; and

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

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section, the definitions and grant conditions provided for in section 40002 shall apply.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.

“(g) ALLOTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 25 percent of the total amounts appropriated under this section in each fiscal year shall be used for each set of purposes described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b).

“(2) INDIAN TRIBES.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amounts appropriated under this section in each fiscal year shall be made available for grants to Indian tribes or tribal organizations.”

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

(1) Sections 41304 and 41305 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043d-3 and 14043d-4).

(2) Section 403 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045c).

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

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

(a) GRANTS.—Section 399P of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-4) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 399P. GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM’S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

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

“(1) the development or enhancement and implementation of interdisciplinary training for health professionals, public health staff, and allied health professionals;

“(2) the development or enhancement and implementation of education programs for medical, nursing, dental, and other health profession students and residents to prevent and respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(3) the development or enhancement and implementation of comprehensive statewide strategies to improve the response of clinics, public health facilities, hospitals, and other health settings (including behavioral and mental health programs) to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) REQUIRED USES.—Amounts provided under a grant under this section shall be used to—

“(A) fund interdisciplinary training and education programs under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) that—

“(i) are designed to train medical, psychology, dental, social work, nursing, and other health profession students, interns, residents, fellows, or current health care providers to identify and provide health care services (including mental or behavioral health care services and referrals to appropriate community services) to individuals who are or who have been victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(ii) plan and develop clinical training components for integration into approved internship, residency, and fellowship training or continuing medical or other health education training that address physical, mental, and behavioral health issues, including protective factors, related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and other forms of violence and abuse, focus on reducing health disparities and preventing violence and abuse, and include the primacy of victim safety and confidentiality; and

“(B) design and implement comprehensive strategies to improve the response of the health care system to domestic or sexual violence in clinical and public health settings, hospitals, clinics, and other health settings (including behavioral and mental health), under subsection (a)(3) through—

“(i) the implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of policies and procedures to guide health professionals and public health staff in identifying and responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including strategies to ensure that health information is maintained in a manner that protects the patient’s privacy and safety, and safely uses health information technology to improve documentation, identification, assessment, treatment, and follow-up care;

“(ii) the development of on-site access to services to address the safety, medical, and mental health needs of patients by increasing the capacity of existing health care professionals and public health staff to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, or by contracting with or hiring domestic or sexual assault advocates to provide such services or to model other services appropriate to the geographic and cultural needs of a site;

“(iii) the development of measures and methods for the evaluation of the practice of identification, intervention, and documentation regarding victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including the development and testing of quality improvement measurements; and

“(iv) the provision of training and followup technical assistance to health care professionals, and public health staff, and allied health professionals to identify, assess, treat, and refer clients who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including using tools and training materials already developed.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—

“(A) CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE.—To the extent consistent with the purpose of this section, a grantee may use amounts received under this section to address, as part of a comprehensive programmatic approach implemented under the grant, issues relating to child or elder abuse.

“(B) RURAL AREAS.—Grants funded under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) may be used to offer to rural areas community-based training opportunities (which may include the use of distance learning networks and other available technologies needed to reach isolated rural areas) for medical, nursing, and other health profession students and residents on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and, as appropriate, other forms of violence and abuse.

“(C) OTHER USES.—Grants funded under subsection (a)(3) may be used for—

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

“(ii) the development, expansion, and implementation of sexual assault forensic medical examination or sexual assault nurse examiner programs;

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

“(iv) the integration of knowledge of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking into health care accreditation and professional licensing examinations, such as medical, dental, social work, and nursing boards, and where appropriate, other allied health exams.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTEEES.—

“(1) CONFIDENTIALITY AND SAFETY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Grantees under this section shall ensure that all programs developed with grant funds address issues of confidentiality and patient safety and comply with applicable confidentiality and nondisclosure requirements under section 4002(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and that faculty and staff associated with delivering educational components are fully trained in procedures that will protect the immediate and ongoing security and confidentiality of the patients, patient records, and staff. Such grantees shall consult entities with demonstrated expertise in the confidentiality and safety needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking on the development and adequacy of confidentiality and security procedures, and provide documentation of such consultation.

“(B) ADVANCE NOTICE OF INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.—Grantees under this section shall provide to patients advance notice about any circumstances under which information may be disclosed, such as mandatory reporting laws, and shall give patients the option to receive information and referrals without affirmatively disclosing abuse.

“(2) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A grantee shall use not more than 10 percent of the amounts received under a grant under this section for administrative expenses.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to applicants based on the strength of their evaluation strategies, with priority given to outcome-based evaluations.

“(4) APPLICATION.—

“(A) SUBSECTION (a) (1) AND (2) GRANTEEES.—An entity desiring a grant under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

“(i) documentation that the applicant represents a team of entities working collaboratively to strengthen the response of the health care system to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and which includes at least one of each of—

“(I) an accredited school of allopathic or osteopathic medicine, psychology, nursing, dentistry, social work, or other health field;

“(II) a health care facility or system; or

“(III) a government or nonprofit entity with a history of effective work in the fields of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(ii) strategies for the dissemination and sharing of curricula and other educational materials developed under the grant, if any, with other interested health professions schools and national resource repositories for materials on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(B) SUBSECTION (a)(3) GRANTEEES.—An entity desiring a grant under subsection (a)(3) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

“(i) documentation that all training, education, screening, assessment, services, treatment, and any other approach to patient care will be informed by an understanding of violence and abuse victimization and trauma-specific approaches that will be integrated into prevention, intervention, and treatment activities;

“(ii) strategies for the development and implementation of policies to prevent and address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking over the lifespan in health care settings;

“(iii) a plan for consulting with State and tribal domestic violence or sexual assault coalitions, national nonprofit victim advocacy orga-

nizations, State or tribal law enforcement task forces (where appropriate), and population-specific organizations with demonstrated expertise in addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(iv) with respect to an application for a grant under which the grantee will have contact with patients, a plan, developed in collaboration with local victim service providers, to respond appropriately to and make correct referrals for individuals who disclose that they are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other types of violence, and documentation provided by the grantee of an ongoing collaborative relationship with a local victim service provider; and

“(v) with respect to an application for a grant proposing to fund a program described in subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii), a certification that any sexual assault forensic medical examination and sexual assault nurse examiner programs supported with such grant funds will adhere to the guidelines set forth by the Attorney General.

“(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive funding under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), an entity shall be—

“(A) a nonprofit organization with a history of effective work in the field of training health professionals with an understanding of, and clinical skills pertinent to, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and lifetime exposure to violence and abuse;

“(B) an accredited school of allopathic or osteopathic medicine, psychology, nursing, dentistry, social work, or allied health;

“(C) a health care provider membership or professional organization, or a health care system; or

“(D) a State, tribal, territorial, or local entity.

“(2) SUBSECTION (a)(3) GRANTEEES.—To be eligible to receive funding under subsection (a)(3), an entity shall be—

“(A) a State department (or other division) of health, a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition or victim service provider, or any other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization with a history of effective work in the fields of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and health care, including physical or mental health care; or

“(B) a local victim service provider, a local department (or other division) of health, a local health clinic, hospital, or health system, or any other community-based organization with a history of effective work in the field of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and health care, including physical or mental health care.

“(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants or enter into contracts to provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program, activity or service carried out pursuant to this section. Not more than 8 percent of the funds appropriated under this section in each fiscal year may be used to fund technical assistance under this subsection.

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

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

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

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

“(f) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may use not more than 20 percent to make a grant or enter into a contract for research and evaluation of—

“(A) grants awarded under this section; and
 “(B) other training for health professionals and effective interventions in the health care setting that prevent domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault across the lifespan, prevent the health effects of such violence, and improve the safety and health of individuals who are currently being victimized.

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

“(A) research on the effects of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and childhood exposure to domestic violence, dating violence, or sexual assault on health behaviors, health conditions, and health status of individuals, families, and populations, including underserved populations;

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

“(C) research on the impact of domestic, dating, and sexual violence, childhood exposure to such violence, and stalking on the health care system, health care utilization, health care costs, and health status; and

“(D) research on the impact of adverse childhood experiences on adult experience with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and adult health outcomes, including how to reduce or prevent the impact of adverse childhood experiences through the health care setting.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the definitions in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 apply to this section.”

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

(1) Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (relating to research on effective interventions to address violence; 42 U.S.C. 13973; as added by section 505 of Public Law 109—162 (119 Stat. 3028)).

(2) Section 758 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294h).

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

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

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the subtitle heading the following:

“CHAPTER 1—GRANT PROGRAMS”;

(2) in section 41402 (42 U.S.C. 14043e–1), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subtitle” and inserting “chapter”;

(3) in section 41403 (42 U.S.C. 14043e–2), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subtitle” and inserting “chapter”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 2—HOUSING RIGHTS

“SEC. 41411. HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this chapter:

“(1) AFFILIATED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘affiliated individual’ means, with respect to an individual—

“(A) a spouse, parent, brother, sister, or child of that individual, or an individual to whom that individual stands in loco parentis; or

“(B) any individual, tenant, or lawful occupant living in the household of that individual.

“(2) APPROPRIATE AGENCY.—The term ‘appropriate agency’ means, with respect to a covered

housing program, the Executive department (as defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code) that carries out the covered housing program.

“(3) COVERED HOUSING PROGRAM.—The term ‘covered housing program’ means—

“(A) the program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q);

“(B) the program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

“(C) the program under subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.);

“(D) each of the programs under title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.);

“(E) the program under subtitle A of title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12741 et seq.);

“(F) the program under paragraph (3) of section 221(d) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715l(d)) for insurance of mortgages that bear interest at a rate determined under the provision under paragraph (5) of such section 221(d);

“(G) the program under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715e–1);

“(H) the programs under sections 6 and 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d and 1437f);

“(I) rural housing assistance provided under sections 514, 515, 516, 533, and 538 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, and 1490p–2); and

“(J) the low-income housing tax credit program under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(b) PROHIBITED BASIS FOR DENIAL OR TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE OR EVICTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An applicant for or tenant of housing assisted under a covered housing program may not be denied admission to, denied assistance under, terminated from participation in, or evicted from the housing program or housing on the basis that the applicant or tenant is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the applicant or tenant otherwise qualifies for admission, assistance, participation, or occupancy.

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

“(A) a serious or repeated violation of a lease for housing assisted under a covered housing program by the victim or threatened victim of such incident; or

“(B) good cause for terminating the assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program of the victim or threatened victim of such incident.

“(3) TERMINATION ON THE BASIS OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.—

“(A) DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE, TENANCY, AND OCCUPANCY RIGHTS PROHIBITED.—No person may deny assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program to a tenant solely on the basis of criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is engaged in by a member of the household of the tenant or any guest or other person under the control of the tenant, if the tenant or an affiliated individual of the tenant is the victim or threatened victim of such domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(B) BIFURCATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program may bifurcate a lease for the housing in order to evict, remove, or terminate assistance to any individual who is a tenant or lawful occupant of the housing and who engages in criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against an affiliated individual or

other individual, without evicting, removing, terminating assistance to, or otherwise penalizing a victim of such criminal activity who is also a tenant or lawful occupant of the housing.

“(ii) EFFECT OF EVICTION ON OTHER TENANTS.—If a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program evicts, removes, or terminates assistance to an individual under clause (i), and the individual is the sole tenant eligible to receive assistance under a covered housing program, the public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under the covered housing program shall provide any remaining tenant an opportunity to establish eligibility for the covered housing program. If a tenant described in the preceding sentence cannot establish eligibility, the public housing agency or owner or manager of the housing shall provide the tenant a reasonable time, as determined by the appropriate agency, to find new housing or to establish eligibility for housing under another covered housing program.

“(C) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed—

“(i) to limit the authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program, when notified of a court order, to comply with a court order with respect to—

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

“(II) the distribution or possession of property among members of a household in a case;

“(ii) to limit any otherwise available authority of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to evict or terminate assistance to a tenant for any violation of a lease not premised on the act of violence in question against the tenant or an affiliated person of the tenant, if the public housing agency or owner or manager does not subject an individual who is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to a more demanding standard than other tenants in determining whether to evict or terminate;

“(iii) to limit the authority to terminate assistance to a tenant or evict a tenant from housing assisted under a covered housing program if a public housing agency or owner or manager of the housing can demonstrate that an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or individuals employed at or providing service to the property would be present if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant is not evicted; or

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

“(c) DOCUMENTATION.—

“(1) REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTATION.—If an applicant for, or tenant of, housing assisted under a covered housing program represents to a public housing agency or owner or manager of the housing that the individual is entitled to protection under subsection (b), the public housing agency or owner or manager may request, in writing, that the applicant or tenant submit to the public housing agency or owner or manager a form of documentation described in paragraph (3).

“(2) FAILURE TO PROVIDE CERTIFICATION.—

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

“(i) deny admission by the applicant or tenant to the covered program;

“(ii) deny assistance under the covered program to the applicant or tenant;

“(iii) terminate the participation of the applicant or tenant in the covered program; or

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

“(B) EXTENSION.—A public housing agency or owner or manager of housing may extend the 14-day deadline under subparagraph (A) at its discretion.

“(3) FORM OF DOCUMENTATION.—A form of documentation described in this paragraph is—

“(A) a certification form approved by the appropriate agency that—

“(i) states that an applicant or tenant is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

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

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

“(B) a document that—

“(i) is signed by—

“(I) an employee, agent, or volunteer of a victim service provider, an attorney, a medical professional, or a mental health professional from whom an applicant or tenant has sought assistance relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or the effects of the abuse; and

“(II) the applicant or tenant; and

“(ii) states under penalty of perjury that the individual described in clause (i)(I) believes that the incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is the ground for protection under subsection (b) meets the requirements under subsection (b);

“(C) a record of a Federal, State, tribal, territorial, or local law enforcement agency, court, or administrative agency; or

“(D) at the discretion of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program, a statement or other evidence provided by an applicant or tenant.

“(4) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Any information submitted to a public housing agency or owner or manager under this subsection, including the fact that an individual is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking shall be maintained in confidence by the public housing agency or owner or manager and may not be entered into any shared database or disclosed to any other entity or individual, except to the extent that the disclosure is—

“(A) requested or consented to by the individual in writing;

“(B) required for use in an eviction proceeding under subsection (b); or

“(C) otherwise required by applicable law.

“(5) DOCUMENTATION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program to request that an individual submit documentation of the status of the individual as a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(6) COMPLIANCE NOT SUFFICIENT TO CONSTITUTE EVIDENCE OF UNREASONABLE ACT.—Compliance with subsection (b) by a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program based on documentation received under this subsection, shall not be sufficient to constitute evidence of an unreasonable act or omission by the public housing agency or owner or manager or an employee or agent of the public housing agency or owner or manager. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the liability of a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program for failure to comply with subsection (b).

“(7) RESPONSE TO CONFLICTING CERTIFICATION.—If a public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program receives documentation under this subsection that contains conflicting information, the public housing agency or owner or manager may require an applicant or tenant to submit third-party documentation, as described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (3).

“(8) PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law that provides greater protection than this subsection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(d) NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop a notice of the rights of individuals under this section, including the right to confidentiality and the limits thereof, and include such notice in documents required by law to be provided to tenants assisted under a covered housing program.

“(2) PROVISION.—The applicable public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program shall provide the notice developed under paragraph (1) to an applicant for or tenant of housing assisted under a covered housing program—

“(A) at the time the applicant is denied residency in a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program;

“(B) at the time the individual is admitted to a dwelling unit assisted under the covered housing program; and

“(C) in multiple languages, consistent with guidance issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in accordance with Executive Order 13166 (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1 note; relating to access to services for persons with limited English proficiency).

“(e) EMERGENCY RELOCATION AND TRANSFERS.—Each appropriate agency shall develop a model emergency relocation and transfer plan for voluntary use by public housing agencies and owners or managers of housing assisted under a covered housing program that—

“(1) allows tenants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to relocate or transfer to another available and safe dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program and retain their status as tenants under the covered housing program if—

“(A) the tenant expressly requests to move;

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

“(ii) the sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking occurred on the premises during the 90-day period preceding the request to move; and

“(C) the tenant has provided documentation as described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C) or (D) of subsection (c)(3) if requested by a public housing agency or owner or manager;

“(2) incorporates reasonable confidentiality measures to ensure that the public housing agency or owner or manager does not disclose the location of the dwelling unit of a tenant to a person that commits an act of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against the tenant;

“(3) describes how the appropriate agency will coordinate relocations or transfers between dwelling units assisted under a covered housing program;

“(4) takes into consideration the existing rules and regulations of the covered housing program;

“(5) is tailored to the specific type of the covered housing program based on the volume and availability of dwelling units under the control or management of the public housing agency, owner, or manager; and

“(6) provides guidance for use in situations in which it is not feasible for an individual public housing agency, owner, or manager to effectuate a transfer.

“(f) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY TRANSFER.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall establish policies and procedures under which a victim requesting an emergency transfer under subsection (e) may receive, subject to the availability of tenant protection vouchers for assistance under section 8(o)(16) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(16)), assistance under such section.

“(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—The appropriate agency with respect to each covered housing program shall implement this section, as this section applies to the covered housing program.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 6.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (3); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(B) in subsection (1)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by striking “, and that an incident” and all that follows through “victim of such violence”; and

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking “; except that” and all that follows through “stalking.”; and

(C) by striking subsection (u).

(2) SECTION 8.—Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (9);

(B) in subsection (d)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and that an applicant” and all that follows through “assistance or admission”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking “, and that an incident” and all that follows through “victim of such violence”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “, except that:” and all that follows through “stalking.”;

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (6), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (7), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11);

(D) in subsection (o)—

(i) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking the last sentence;

(ii) in paragraph (7)—

(I) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and that an incident” and all that follows through “victim of such violence”; and

(II) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; except that” and all that follows through “stalking.”; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (20); and

(E) by striking subsection (ee).

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to limit the rights or remedies available to any person under section 6 or 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d and 1437f), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) to limit any right, remedy, or procedure otherwise available under any provision of part 5, 91, 880, 882, 883, 884, 886, 891, 903, 960, 966, 982, or 983 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, that—

(i) was issued under the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 2960) or an amendment made by that Act; and

(ii) provides greater protection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking than this Act or the amendments made by this Act; or

(C) to disqualify an owner, manager, or other individual from participating in or receiving the benefits of the low-income housing tax credit program under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 because of noncompliance with the provisions of this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

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

Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13975; as added by section 611 of Public Law 108–21 (117 Stat. 693)) is amended—

(1) in the chapter heading, by striking “**CHILD VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, OR SEXUAL ASSAULT**” and inserting “**VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING**”; and

(2) in section 40299 (42 U.S.C. 13975)—

(A) in the header, by striking “**CHILD VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, STALKING, OR SEXUAL ASSAULT**” and inserting “**VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING**”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “fleeing”;
(C) by striking subsection (f); and
(D) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$40,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “eligible” and inserting “qualified”; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **QUALIFIED APPLICATION DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘qualified application’ means an application that—

“(i) has been submitted by an eligible applicant;

“(ii) does not propose any significant activities that may compromise victim safety;

“(iii) reflects an understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(iv) does not propose prohibited activities, including mandatory services for victims, background checks of victims, or clinical evaluations to determine eligibility for services.”.

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

Subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 41404(i) (42 U.S.C. 14043e–3(i)), by striking “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”; and

(2) in section 41405(g) (42 U.S.C. 14043e–4(g)), by striking “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “\$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

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

Section 41501(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043f(e)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

TITLE VIII—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. FRAUD PREVENTION INITIATIVES.

(a) **CREDIBLE EVIDENCE CONSIDERED.**—Section 240A(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229b) is amended by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) **CREDIBLE EVIDENCE CONSIDERED.**—In acting on applications under this paragraph, the Attorney General shall consider any credible

evidence relevant to the application, including credible evidence submitted by a national of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence accused of the conduct described in subparagraph (A)(i) so long as this evidence is not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.”.

(b) **APPLICATION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR BATTERED SPOUSE, PARENT, OR CHILD.**—Section 204(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“(III)(aa) Upon filing, each petition under this clause shall be assigned to an investigative officer for adjudication and final determination of eligibility.

“(bb) During the adjudication of each petition under this paragraph, an investigative officer from a local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall conduct an in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition. The investigative officer may also gather other evidence so long as this evidence is not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. The investigative officer who conducted the in-person interview shall provide to the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility a summary of the interview and any other evidence gathered and a determination of the credibility of the interviewee and other evidence gathered.

“(cc) All interviews under this clause shall be conducted under oath and subject to applicable penalties for perjury.

“(dd) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall determine whether the petitioner had filed previous applications or petitions for immigration benefits that had been denied and whether the petitioner had been the beneficiary of a previous petition filed pursuant to this section that had been denied. If either was the case, the investigative officer shall consider the denials and the reasons for the denials as part of the adjudication of the petition.

“(ee) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall as part of the adjudication of the petition consult with the investigative officer at the local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services who had conducted the in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition.

“(ff) Upon the conclusion of the adjudication process under this subparagraph, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall issue a final written determination to approve or deny the petition. The investigative officer shall not approve the petition unless the officer finds, in writing and with particularity, that all requirements under this paragraph, including proof that the alien is a victim of the conduct described in clause (iii)(I)(bb), have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

“(IV) During the adjudication of a petition under this clause—

“(aa) the petition shall not be granted unless the petition is supported by a preponderance of the evidence; and

“(bb) all credible evidence submitted by an accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be considered so long as this evidence was not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

“(V)(aa) During the adjudication of a petition under this paragraph, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall determine whether any Federal, State, territorial, tribal, or local law enforcement agency has undertaken an investigation or prosecution of the abusive conduct alleged by the petitioning alien.

“(bb) If an investigation or prosecution was commenced, the investigative officer shall—

“(AA) obtain as much information as possible about the investigation or prosecution; and

“(BB) consider that information as part of the adjudication of the petition.

“(cc) If an investigation or prosecution is pending, the adjudication of the petition shall be stayed pending the conclusion of the investigation or prosecution. If no investigation has been undertaken or if a prosecutor’s office has not commenced a prosecution after the matter was referred to it, that fact shall be considered by the investigative officer as part of the adjudication of the petition.

“(VI) If a petition filed under this paragraph is denied, any obligations under an underlying affidavit of support previously filed by the accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be terminated.”.

(2) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by adding at the end the following: “The petition shall be adjudicated according to the procedures that apply to self-petitioners under clause (iii).”.

(3) in subparagraph (A)(vii), by adding at the end the following continuation text:

“The petition shall be adjudicated according to the procedures that apply to self-petitioners under clause (iii).”.

(4) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“(III)(aa) Upon filing, each petition under this clause shall be assigned to an investigative officer for adjudication and final determination of eligibility.

“(bb) During the adjudication of each petition under this paragraph, an investigative officer from a local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall conduct an in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition. The investigative officer may also gather other evidence so long as this evidence is not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. The investigative officer who conducted the in-person interview shall provide to the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility a summary of the interview and any other evidence gathered and a determination of the credibility of the interviewee and other evidence gathered.

“(cc) All interviews under this clause shall be conducted under oath and subject to applicable penalties for perjury.

“(dd) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall determine whether the petitioner had filed previous applications or petitions for immigration benefits that had been denied and whether the petitioner had been the beneficiary of a previous petition filed pursuant to this section that had been denied. If either was the case, the investigative officer shall consider the denials and the reasons for the denials as part of the adjudication of the petition.

“(ee) The investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall as part of the adjudication of the petition consult with the investigative officer at the local office of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services who had conducted the in-person interview of the alien who filed the petition.

“(ff) Upon the conclusion of the adjudication process under this subparagraph, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall issue a final written determination to approve or deny the petition. The investigative officer shall not approve the petition unless the officer finds, in writing and with particularity, that all requirements under this paragraph, including proof that the alien is a victim of the conduct described in clause (ii)(I)(bb), have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

“(IV) During the adjudication of a petition under this clause—

“(aa) the petition shall not be granted unless the petition is supported by a preponderance of the evidence; and

“(bb) all credible evidence submitted by an accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be considered so long as this evidence was not gathered in violation of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

“(V)(aa) During the adjudication of a petition under this clause, the investigative officer who is responsible for the adjudication and final determination of eligibility shall determine whether any Federal, State, territorial, tribal, or local law enforcement agency has undertaken an investigation or prosecution of the abusive conduct alleged by the petitioning alien.

“(bb) If an investigation or prosecution was commenced, the investigative officer shall—

“(AA) obtain as much information as possible about the investigation or prosecution; and

“(BB) consider that information as part of the adjudication of the petition.

“(cc) If an investigation or prosecution is pending, the adjudication of the petition shall be stayed pending the conclusion of the investigation or prosecution. If no investigation has been undertaken or if a prosecutor’s office has not commenced a prosecution after the matter was referred to it, that fact shall be considered by the investigative officer as part of the adjudication of the petition.

“(VI) If a petition filed under this clause is denied, any obligations under an underlying affidavit of support previously filed by the accused national of the United States or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be terminated.”; and

(5) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by adding at the end the following: “The petition shall be adjudicated according to the procedures that apply to self-petitioners under clause (ii).”.

SEC. 802. CLARIFICATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO U VISAS.

Section 214(p)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)(1)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking “The petition” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The petition”.

(2) By adding at the end the following:

“(B) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each certification submitted under subparagraph (A) shall confirm under oath that—

“(i) the criminal activity is actively under investigation or a prosecution has been commenced; and

“(ii) the petitioner has provided to law enforcement information that will assist in identifying the perpetrator of the criminal activity or the perpetrator’s identity is known.

“(C) REQUIREMENT FOR CERTIFICATION.—No application for a visa under section 101(a)(15)(U) may be granted unless accompanied by the certification as described in this paragraph.”.

SEC. 803. PROTECTIONS FOR A FIANCÉE OR FIANCÉ OF A CITIZEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “crime.” and inserting “crime described in paragraph (3)(B) and information on any permanent protection or restraining order issued against the petitioner related to any specified crime described in paragraph (3)(B)(i).”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking “abuse, and stalking.” and inserting “abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.”; and

(2) in subsection (r)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “crime.” and inserting “crime described in paragraph (5)(B) and information on any permanent protection or restraining order issued against the petitioner

related to any specified crime described in subsection (5)(B)(i).”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(B)(i), by striking “abuse, and stalking.” and inserting “abuse, stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.”.

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO K NON-IMMIGRANTS.—Section 833 of the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1375a) is amended in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking “or” after “orders” and inserting “and”.

SEC. 804. REGULATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKERS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKER ACT OF 2005.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that includes the name of the component of the Department of Justice responsible for prosecuting violations of the International Marriage Broker Act of 2005 (subtitle D of Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3066) and the amendments made by this title.

(b) REGULATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE BROKERS.—Section 833(d) of the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act of 2005 (8 U.S.C. 1375a(d)) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) PROHIBITION ON MARKETING OF OR TO CHILDREN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An international marriage broker shall not provide any individual or entity with personal contact information, photograph, or general information about the background or interests of any individual under the age of 18.

“(B) COMPLIANCE.—To comply with the requirements of subparagraph (A), an international marriage broker shall—

“(i) obtain a valid copy of each foreign national client’s birth certificate or other proof of age document issued by an appropriate government entity;

“(ii) indicate on such certificate or document the date it was received by the international marriage broker;

“(iii) retain the original of such certificate or document for 5 years after such date of receipt; and

“(iv) produce such certificate or document upon request to an appropriate authority charged with the enforcement of this paragraph.”.

(2) In paragraph (2)(B)(ii), by striking “or stalking.” and inserting “stalking, or an attempt to commit any such crime.”.

SEC. 805. GAO REPORT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report regarding the adjudication of petitions and applications under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)) and the self-petitioning process for VAWA self-petitioners (as that term is defined in section 101(a)(51) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(51))).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) assess the efficiency and reliability of the process for reviewing such petitions and applications, including whether the process includes adequate safeguards against fraud and abuse; and

(2) identify possible improvements to the adjudications of petitions and applications in order to reduce fraud and abuse.

SEC. 806. TEMPORARY NATURE OF U VISA STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 245(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255(m)) is amended by striking “the alien is not described” and inserting “the individual who was convicted of the criminal activity referred to in sec-

tion 101(a)(15)(U)(i)(I) that was the basis for the alien being admitted into the United States (or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status) under section 101(a)(15)(U) was himself or herself an alien and has been physically removed to the foreign state of which the alien with nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U) is a national, and if the alien with nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U) is not described”.

(b) DURATION OF NONIMMIGRANT STATUS.—Section 214(p)(6) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)(6)) is amended by striking “if the alien is eligible for relief under section 245(m) and is unable to obtain such relief because regulations have been issued to implement such section and shall be extended”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to applications for adjustment of status submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and to previously filed applications that are pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 807. ANNUAL REPORT ON IMMIGRATION APPLICATIONS MADE BY VICTIMS OF ABUSE.

Not later than December 1, 2012, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes the following:

(1) The number of aliens who—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(6) The actions being taken to combat fraud and to ensure program integrity.

(7) Each type of criminal activity by reason of which an alien received nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)) during the preceding fiscal year and the number of occurrences of that criminal activity that resulted in such aliens receiving such status.

SEC. 808. PROTECTION FOR CHILDREN OF VAWA SELF-PETITIONERS.

Section 204(l)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(l)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

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

“(F) a child of an alien who filed a pending or approved petition for classification or application for adjustment of status or other benefit specified in section 101(a)(51) as a VAWA self-petitioner; or”.

SEC. 809. PUBLIC CHARGE.

Section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED ALIEN VICTIMS.—Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) shall not apply to an alien who—

“(i) is a VAWA self-petitioner;

“(ii) is an applicant for, or is granted, non-immigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(U); or

“(iii) is a qualified alien described in section 431(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1641(c)).”

SEC. 810. AGE-OUT PROTECTION FOR U VISA APPLICANTS.

Section 214(p) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) AGE DETERMINATIONS.—

“(A) CHILDREN.—An unmarried alien who seeks to accompany, or follow to join, a parent granted status under section 101(a)(15)(U)(i), and who was under 21 years of age on the date on which such parent petitioned for such status, shall continue to be classified as a child for purposes of section 101(a)(15)(U)(ii), if the alien attains 21 years of age after such parent’s petition was filed but while it was pending.

“(B) PRINCIPAL ALIENS.—An alien described in clause (i) of section 101(a)(15)(U) shall continue to be treated as an alien described in clause (ii)(I) of such section if the alien attains 21 years of age after the alien’s application for status under such clause (i) is filed but while it is pending.”

SEC. 811. HARDSHIP WAIVERS.

Section 216(c)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

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

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon and “or”;

and

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

“(D) the alien meets the requirements under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii)(II)(aa)(BB) and following the marriage ceremony was battered by or subject to extreme cruelty perpetrated by the alien’s intended spouse and was not at fault in failing to meet the requirements of paragraph (1).”

SEC. 812. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSE.

(a) INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 384(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the” before “Attorney General may”;

and

(B) by inserting “Secretary’s or the” before “Attorney General’s discretion”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security or the” before “Attorney General may”;

(B) by inserting “Secretary or the” before “Attorney General for”;

and

(C) by inserting “in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information” after “law enforcement purpose”;

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

and

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

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

for a national security purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.”

(b) GUIDELINES.—Subsection (d) (as added by section 817(4) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005) of section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)) is amended by inserting “and severe forms of trafficking in persons or criminal activity listed in section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(u))” after “domestic violence”.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the guidance required by section 384(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)), consistent with the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 384(a)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 is amended by striking “241(a)(2)” in the matter following subparagraph (F) and inserting “237(a)(2)”.

SEC. 813. GAO REPORT ON REQUIREMENTS TO COOPERATE WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report regarding the adjudication of petitions and applications under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) assess the effectiveness of the requirements set out in Section 802 of this Act in ensuring that potential U visa recipients aid in the investigation, apprehension, and prosecution of criminals;

(2) determine the effect of the requirements set out in Section 802 of this Act, on the number of U visas issued annually; and

(3) determine the effect of the requirements set out in Section 802 of this Act, on the number of individuals seeking U visas.

SEC. 814. CONSIDERATION OF OTHER EVIDENCE.

Section 237(a)(2)(E)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)(E)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “If the conviction records do not conclusively establish whether a crime of domestic violence constitutes a crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code), the Attorney General may consider any other evidence that the Attorney General determines to be reliable in making this determination, including sentencing reports and police reports.”

TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN**SEC. 901. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**

Section 2015(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–10(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “sexual assault,”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “sexual assault,”;

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “and stalking” and all that follows and inserting “sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking”;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by inserting “sex trafficking,” after “sexual assault,” each place it appears; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(5) in paragraph (8)—

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

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

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) provide services to address the needs of youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, or stalking and the needs of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including support for the nonabusing parent or the caretaker of the child; and

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

SEC. 902. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL COALITIONS.

Section 2001(d) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

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

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

and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) developing and promoting State, local, or tribal legislation and policies that enhance best practices for responding to violent crimes against Indian women, including the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “individuals or”.

SEC. 903. CONSULTATION.

Section 903 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14045d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

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

(B) by inserting “, and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012” before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services” and inserting “Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of the Interior,”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “and stalking” and inserting “stalking, and sex trafficking”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Attorney General shall submit to Congress an annual report on the annual consultations required under subsection (a) that—

“(1) contains the recommendations made under subsection (b) by Indian tribes during the year covered by the report;

“(2) describes actions taken during the year covered by the report to respond to recommendations made under subsection (b) during the year or a previous year; and

“(3) describes how the Attorney General will work in coordination and collaboration with Indian tribes, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of the Interior to address the recommendations made under subsection (b).”

“(d) NOTICE.—Not later than 120 days before the date of a consultation under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall notify tribal leaders of the date, time, and location of the consultation.”

SEC. 904. ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIAN WOMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 904(a) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–10 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “The National” and inserting “Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the National”;

(B) by inserting “and in Native villages (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602))” before the period at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2)(A)—

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

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) sex trafficking.”;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012”; and

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking “this section \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008” and inserting “this subsection \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 905(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2007 through 2011” and inserting “fiscal years 2013 through 2017”.

SEC. 905. ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TRIBAL LIAISONS.

(a) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Attorney General is authorized and encouraged to appoint the Assistant United States Attorney Tribal Liaison appointed in each judicial district that includes Indian country to also serve as a domestic violence tribal liaison.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The duties of a domestic violence tribal liaison appointed under this section shall include the following:

(1) Encouraging and assisting in arrests and Federal prosecution for crimes, including misdemeanor crimes, of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that occur in Indian country.

(2) Conducting training sessions for tribal law enforcement officers and other individuals and entities responsible for responding to crimes in Indian country to ensure that such officers, individuals, and entities understand their arrest authority over non-Indian offenders.

(3) Developing multidisciplinary teams to combat domestic and sexual violence offenses against Indians by non-Indians.

(4) Consulting and coordinating with tribal justice officials and victims’ advocates to address any backlog in the prosecution of crimes, including misdemeanor crimes, of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that occur in Indian country.

(5) Developing working relationships and maintaining communication with tribal leaders, tribal community and victims’ advocates, and tribal justice officials to gather information from, and share appropriate information with, tribal justice officials.

(c) **INDIAN COUNTRY.**—In this section, the term “Indian country” has the meaning given such term in section 1151 of title 18.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

TITLE X—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1001. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO SEXUAL ABUSE.

(a) **SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR OR WARD.**—Section 2243(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) OF A WARD.—

“(1) **OFFENSES.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly engage, or knowingly attempt to engage, in a sexual act with another person who is—

“(A) in official detention or supervised by, or otherwise under the control of, the United States—

“(i) during arrest;

“(ii) during pretrial release;

“(iii) while in official detention or custody; or

“(iv) while on probation, supervised release, or parole;

“(B) under the professional custodial, supervisory, or disciplinary control or authority of the person engaging or attempting to engage in the sexual act; and

“(C) at the time of the sexual act—

“(i) in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States;

“(ii) in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of, or pursuant to a contract or agreement with, the United States; or

“(iii) under supervision or other control by the United States, or by direction of, or pursuant to a contract or agreement with, the United States.

“(2) **PENALTIES.**—Whoever violates paragraph (1)(A) shall—

“(A) be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both; and

“(B) if, in the course of committing the violation of paragraph (1), the person engages in conduct that would constitute an offense under section 2241 or 2242 if committed in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, be subject to the penalties provided for under section 2241 or 2242, respectively.”.

(b) **PENALTIES FOR SEXUAL ABUSE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 250. Penalties for sexual abuse

“(a) **OFFENSE.**—It shall be unlawful for any person, in the course of committing an offense under this chapter or under section 901 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3631) to engage in conduct that would constitute an offense under chapter 109A if committed in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

“(b) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates subsection (a) shall be subject to the penalties under the provision of chapter 109A that would have been violated if the conduct was committed in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, unless a greater penalty is otherwise authorized by law.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“250. Penalties for sexual abuse.”.

SEC. 1002. SEXUAL ABUSE IN CUSTODIAL SETTINGS.

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

(b) **UNITED STATES AS DEFENDANT.**—Section 1346(b)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or the commission of a sexual act (as defined in section 2246 of title 18)”.

(c) **ADOPTION AND EFFECT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.**—Section 8 of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607) is amended—

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

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

“(c) **APPLICABILITY TO DETENTION FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish a final rule adopting national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of rape and sexual assault in facilities that maintain custody of aliens detained for a violation of the immigrations laws of the United States.

“(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The standards adopted under paragraph (1) shall apply to detention fa-

ilities operated by the Department of Homeland Security and to detention facilities operated under contract with, or pursuant to an intergovernmental service agreement with, the Department.

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

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

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

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

“(d) **APPLICABILITY TO CUSTODIAL FACILITIES OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish a final rule adopting national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of rape and sexual assault in facilities that maintain custody of unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))).

“(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The standards adopted under paragraph (1) shall apply to facilities operated by the Department of Health and Human Services and to facilities operated under contract with the Department.

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

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

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

“(4) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In adopting standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall give due consideration to the recommended national standards provided by the Commission under section 7(e).”.

SEC. 1003. CRIMINAL PROVISION RELATING TO STALKING, INCLUDING CYBERSTALKING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2261A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 2261A. Stalking.

“(a) Whoever uses the mail, any interactive computer service, or any facility of interstate or foreign commerce to engage in a course of conduct or travels in interstate or foreign commerce or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or enters or leaves Indian country, with the intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate another person, or place another person under surveillance with the intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate such person and in the course of, or as a result of, such travel or course of conduct—

“(1) places that person in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury to such person, a member of their immediate family (as defined in section 115), or their spouse or intimate partner; or

“(2) causes or attempts to cause serious bodily injury or serious emotional distress to such person, a member of their immediate family (as defined in section 115), or their spouse or intimate partner;

shall be punished as provided in subsection (b).

“(b) The punishment for an offense under this section is the same as that for an offense under section 2261, except that if—

“(1) the offense involves conduct in violation of a protection order; or

“(2) the victim of the offense is under the age of 18 years or over the age of 65 years, the offender has reached the age of 18 years at the time the offense was committed, and the offender knew or should have known that the victim was under the age of 18 years or over the age of 65 years;

the maximum term of imprisonment that may be imposed is increased by 5 years over the term of imprisonment otherwise provided for that offense in section 2261.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 2261A in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: “2261A. Stalking.”.

SEC. 1004. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL ASSAULT STATUTE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 113 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) Assault with intent to commit murder or a violation of section 2241 or 2242, by a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “felony under chapter 109A” and inserting “violation of section 2241 or 2242”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “and without just cause or excuse.”;

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking “six months” and inserting “1 year”;

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking “1 year” and inserting “5 years”;

(F) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking “substantial bodily injury to an individual who has not attained the age of 16 years” and inserting “substantial bodily injury to a spouse or intimate partner, a dating partner, or an individual who has not attained the age of 16 years”;

(ii) by striking “fine” and inserting “a fine”;

and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Assault of a spouse, intimate partner, or dating partner by strangling, suffocating, or attempting to strangle or suffocate, by a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) As used in this subsection—” and inserting the following:

“(b) In this section—”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the terms ‘dating partner’ and ‘spouse or intimate partner’ have the meanings given those terms in section 2266;

“(4) the term ‘strangling’ means knowingly or recklessly impeding the normal breathing or circulation of the blood of a person by applying pressure to the throat or neck, regardless of whether that conduct results in any visible injury or whether there is any intent to kill or protractedly injure the victim; and

“(5) the term ‘suffocating’ means knowingly or recklessly impeding the normal breathing of a person by covering the mouth of the person, the nose of the person, or both, regardless of whether that conduct results in any visible injury or whether there is any intent to kill or protractedly injure the victim.”.

(b) INDIAN MAJOR CRIMES.—Section 1153(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “assault with intent to commit murder, assault with a dangerous weapon, assault resulting in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365 of this title)” and inserting “a felony assault under section 113”.

SEC. 1005. MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCE.

Section 2241 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2), by striking “any term of years or life” and inserting “not less than 10 years or imprisoned for life”; and

(2) in subsection (b), in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2), by striking “any term of years or life” and inserting “not less than 5 years or imprisoned for life”.

SEC. 1006. FEDERAL PROTECTION ORDERS.

(a) FEDERAL PROTECTION ORDERS.—Chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2262 the following:

“§2262A. Federal domestic violence protection orders involving Indians and Indian country

“(a) PETITION FOR PROTECTION ORDER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A victim of an act of domestic violence, or an Indian tribe as *parens patriae* on behalf of the victim of an act of domestic violence, may petition a district court of the United States to issue a protection order against the person (whether an Indian or a non-Indian) who is alleged to have committed the act of domestic violence if—

“(A) the victim is an Indian or a minor who resides with or is in the care and custody of an Indian;

“(B) the victim resides or is employed at a place located in the Indian country of the Indian tribe that files the petition; and

“(C) the person against whom the order is sought is alleged to have committed an act of domestic violence in the Indian country.

“(2) CONTENTS OF PETITION.—A petition filed under this section shall contain—

“(A) the facts that meet the requirements under paragraph (1);

“(B) the name of each victim on whose behalf the protection order is sought;

“(C) the name and, if known, the residential address of the person against whom the order is sought;

“(D) a detailed description of the alleged act of domestic violence, including the date or approximate date and the location of the act of domestic violence; and

“(E) the relief sought.

“(3) ISSUANCE OF PROTECTION ORDER.—The court may issue a protection order in accordance with this section and subsections (b) and (c) of section 2265 and Rule 65(d)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if the court finds that such order is reasonably necessary to provide protection against violence, threats, or harassment against, contact or communication with, or physical proximity to—

“(A) a spouse or intimate partner who resides or is employed at a location in the Indian country of the Indian tribe involved in the proceeding; or

“(B) a minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of a spouse or intimate partner who resides or is employed at a location in the Indian country.

“(4) SCOPE OF PROTECTION ORDERS.—Any protection order under this section may—

“(A) prohibit the person against whom the order is sought from—

“(i) threatening to commit or committing an act of domestic violence against or otherwise harassing the spouse or intimate partner or minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner;

“(ii) communicating, directly or indirectly, with the spouse or intimate partner or minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner; and

“(iii) knowingly coming within a specified distance from the spouse or intimate partner or minor who resides with or is in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner;

“(B) direct the person against whom the order is sought to stay away from the residence, school, or place of employment of the spouse or intimate partner, or any other specified place frequented by the spouse or intimate partner, regardless of whether the residence, school, place

of employment, or other specified place is located in Indian country; and

“(C) exclude or bar the person against whom the order is sought from the Indian country of the Indian tribe involved in the proceeding or any portion or area of that Indian country.

“(5) EMERGENCY EX PARTE ORDERS.—If a petition requests an emergency ex-parte protection order and from the facts alleged in the petition there appears to be a danger of a further, imminent act of domestic violence against a victim, the court may grant an emergency ex-parte protection order against the person against whom the order is sought in accordance with the requirements of section 2265(b)(2).

“(6) DURATION OF PROTECTION ORDER.—A protection order under this section may be permanent or of such other shorter duration as the court determines necessary to protect a victim from a further act of domestic violence by the person against whom the order is sought.

“(b) VIOLATION OF PROTECTION ORDER.—A person who intentionally violates a protection order under this section shall be punished as provided in section 2262(b).”.

(b) VIOLATION OF FEDERAL PROTECTION ORDER.—Section 2262(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “this section” and inserting “this section or a protection order issued under section 2262A”.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2266 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) ACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term ‘act of domestic violence’ means an act or attempted act of violence or stalking, or a threatened act of violence, by a person against a spouse or intimate partner, or a minor residing with or in the care or custody of the spouse or intimate partner.

“(12) INDIAN.—The term ‘Indian’ means a person who is a member of any Indian tribe, regardless of whether that Indian tribe is the plaintiff Indian tribe under section 2262A.

“(13) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

“(14) MINOR.—The term ‘minor’ means a person under the age of 18 years.”.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2262 the following:

“2262A. Federal domestic violence protection orders involving Indians and Indian country.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4970, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I'm proud to stand in support of this important and life-saving bill.

According to national statistics, an average three women are killed by a

current or former intimate partner a day, every day, and 24 people per minute are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner. For me, these statistics are way too real.

Some of you may already know that at the age of 17 I dropped out of high school and joined the Air Force. I soon married by 18 and had a young daughter. For me, it was a blessing, but I soon found out that the man I married had a penchant for drinking and was very violent when he drank. I gave him the chance to be the father I thought he could be, and it didn't happen. So I took my daughter, our clothing, and we left.

Like many women who leave an abusive relationship, there were times that the only thing that kept me going was knowing that I was responsible for my daughter, and she depended on me to make a better life for both of us where we both felt safe.

Years later, I experienced another side of domestic violence while working as a deputy sheriff for the Orange County Sheriff's Office. I encountered many victims who had been abused, whether it was from domestic violence, rape, or stalking. These victims were always victims. That's what victims are, all inclusive. Back then, issues like domestic violence and sexual assault weren't really discussed; they were hidden behind closed doors, leaving many of the victims to either underreport or not report at all. They didn't turn for help because they felt helpless. So when the Violence Against Women Act was enacted in 1994, it brought attention to an issue that was underreported, or maybe not even reported at all.

Eighteen years ago, VAWA established within the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services a number of life-saving grant programs for State, local, and Indian tribal governments. Since then, the act has encouraged collaboration among law enforcement officers, judicial personnel, and public and private sector providers to provide help for the victims of domestic and sexual violence. It also addressed the needs of victims of domestic and sexual violence who are elderly, disabled, children, youth, and individuals of ethnic and racial communities, including Native Americans.

Congress has twice reauthorized the VAWA grant programs with strong bipartisan support, once in 2000 and again in 2006. Keeping with the bipartisan nature of the act, the House bill, H.R. 4970, reauthorizes the grant programs in VAWA for a third time at the same funding levels as our colleagues in the Senate agreed to last month.

In addition to making several key improvements to the Senate bill, including nearly doubling resources for eliminating the backlog of unprocessed rape evidence kits, the House bill brings greater accountability to VAWA grant administration by ensuring that

funding is spent on the victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and not on Washington bureaucrats.

To achieve these goals, H.R. 4970 requires that the inspectors general of DOJ and HHS conduct an annual audit of at least 10 percent of all VAWA grant recipients and limits the use of funds for OVW salaries and administrative expenses to 5 percent of the annual authorization. H.R. 4970 also requires the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to improve the coordination of grants within the Department in order to eliminate duplication and overlap.

Make no mistake about it: this is a victim-centered bill which includes all victims—an all-inclusive, victim-centered bill. Turning this reauthorization into a political issue is not only wrong, but it is dangerous. It is dangerous. We cannot allow domestic violence in this country to become a campaign issue. It must be a reflection of our best efforts as Americans united against breaking a cycle of violence and helping victims become survivors.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me today in supporting this life-saving legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, because it is a title that does not represent what it ought to underneath.

We've had these kinds of incidents before. In the past, we've always been able to set aside partisan differences and work together to protect the most vulnerable women of our society, abused and battered women. Today, unfortunately, this bill sets aside 20 years of bipartisan progress in our efforts to protect these women.

The bill, as amended by the manager's amendment, rolls back existing protections for battered immigrant women. It fails to include provisions from the bipartisan Senate-passed bill—which all the women in the Senate voted for—which protect native women's lives by authorizing limited tribal criminal domestic violence. It eliminates the language from the bipartisan Senate-passed bill that would help lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender victims of domestic violence receive Violence Against Women Act services without facing additional discrimination.

□ 1530

Now, I'm going to reserve my time here, but I want to just point this out: there are more than 300 organizations—women's organizations, law enforcement organizations, church organizations—that have registered their opposition to H.R. 4970 for the reason that I've suggested. The National Organization for Women, the Leadership Con-

ference on Civil and Human Rights, the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, the American Civil Liberties Union, more than 20 faith-based leaders of organizations, the National Congress of American Indians, and it goes on and on, police chiefs, captains, detectives, lieutenants and prosecutors.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for all victims of domestic violence and oppose this dangerous proposal that is on the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentlewoman from Florida, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee herself, for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to co-sponsor H.R. 4970, and I want to again thank my colleague from Florida, SANDY ADAMS, for her work on this legislation.

H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, provides funding for VAWA grant programs for 5 years at the same levels as the Senate-passed bill. There are only a few minor differences between this House bill and the Senate bill.

H.R. 4970 doesn't include language to provide special protected status to certain categories of people because they are already covered under VAWA. H.R. 4970 doesn't include language to allow Indian tribes to prosecute non-Indians because that is unconstitutional. H.R. 4970 does include provisions that prevent fraud and abuse in the immigration process.

This bill authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for valuable services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Those who have supported VAWA in the past should be eager to support this legislation today.

Violence against women doesn't occur along party lines, and neither should reauthorization of these programs. Instead of working with Republicans in a bipartisan effort to protect women from domestic violence, rape, and stalking, some Democrats have chosen to place partisan posturing above the urgent needs of victims of violence.

If Members choose to oppose this bill for political reasons, that's their decision; but there is no good reason to oppose this bill for substantive reasons. A vote against this bill, in my judgment, is a vote against common sense and a vote against helping abused women.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to remind my colleagues on the other side that the 200 or 300 organizations and people that oppose this bill supported the previous legislation. Now, come on.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, ZOE LOFGREN, a senior member of the committee.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Before today, every VAWA bill we've considered over the last 20 years had three things in common: they've all been bipartisan, they've all been written in consultation with the advocates and service providers on the front lines against domestic violence, and they've all increased protections for victims of domestic violence.

This bill, even as amended, shares none of those attributes. It actually reduces protections that exist in current law for victims of domestic violence, rape, and sexual assault. It was developed without any support or consultation from the minority or from the domestic violence advocates. And it is not bipartisan.

Now, the bill's opposed by every leading domestic violence organization. It's opposed by the National Association of Evangelicals and the Willow Creek Church, the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference, all the leading women's groups. It's opposed by law enforcement officials with years of experience fighting domestic violence. It's opposed by tribal authorities, immigration advocates, LGBT groups. The list goes on and on.

So the question really is this: If everyone from the National Organization for Women and Planned Parenthood to the National Association of Evangelicals and the Catholic Church have extreme concerns about this bill, who thinks this is a step in the right direction?

And as far as I can tell, the only groups who openly support the bill and the amendments are groups like SAVE and A Voice for Men, who align themselves, not with battered women, but with the men who abuse them.

I will insert into the RECORD an article from Leith Anderson, the president of the National Association of Evangelicals, and Lynne Hybels, the co-founder of the Willow Creek Community Church. This is what they say:

Nicole came to the U.S. from Indonesia on a temporary fiancée visa, expecting to enjoy life as a spouse. Instead was trafficked.

They oppose the bill.

[From CNN, May 16, 2012]

PROTECT IMMIGRANT WOMEN FROM VIOLENCE
(By Leith Anderson and Lynne Hybels)

Nicole came to the United States from Indonesia on a temporary fiancée visa, fully expecting that she would enjoy life in a new country with the U.S. citizen she intended to marry. Instead, she found herself trapped as a victim of sex trafficking.

Nicole (not her real name), like thousands of other women, was forced to engage in commercial sex acts against her will. We heard about her when she received support from the Salvation Army STOP-IT Program in Illinois, which serves victims who have been harmed by the sex trade. (The Salvation Army is a denominational member of the National Association of Evangelicals.) Eventually, Nicole escaped from her trafficker and assisted law enforcement in the prosecution of the crime committed against her.

Though Nicole's fiancée visa had lapsed, leaving her susceptible to deportation, our

nation's anti-trafficking law provided a legal option for her to be granted permanent legal status by helping law enforcement to prosecute her trafficker. With the help of a non-profit legal service provider and the Salvation Army, Nicole was able to petition on her own for legal status—and obtain it—through a special "U" visa for immigrant victims of crime, allowing her to get back on her feet and begin rebuilding her life.

This week the House of Representatives is considering a proposal to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, first enacted in 1994, but in a new version that would significantly undermine the same U visa program that provided Nicole with safety and permanency in the United States.

The U.S. government estimates that as many as 17,500 foreign-born victims are illegally trafficked in from abroad each year, and academic estimates suggest that at least 100,000 victims of human trafficking live in the United States today.

By force, fraud or coercion, traffickers keep victims enslaved in prostitution or forced labor.

If the House proposal is enacted, thousands like Nicole could remain enslaved, too afraid to speak out because some of their most effective safeguards will have disappeared. The proposal introduced by Rep. Sandy Adams, R-Florida, would dramatically roll back important protections for battered immigrant women and their children. It could face a vote Wednesday afternoon.

Several provisions would leave immigrant victims of human trafficking and domestic abuse no legal way to break the cycle of violence in which they are trapped.

Specifically, this version would remove the incentive of permanent safe haven in the United States for women who help bring abusers to justice. By changing the U visa from permanent to temporary, the bill could validate an abuser's threat that a call to police could result in deportation. Many women would keep quiet rather than risk immigration consequences.

The bill would also allow abusive partners in domestic violence cases to provide input as to whether their victim should qualify for immigration relief, stripping confidentiality provisions that currently protect victims. Abusive spouses, who are in a position to petition to adjust the status of their immigrant wives through marriage, can choose not to do so as a tool of abuse and fear. Abusers frequently deny guilt and falsely accuse victims of fraud or abuse.

We don't want a bill that endangers some of the women and children it purports to help. Overall, this bill's proposed changes to current law would discourage immigrant victims from escaping abuse and reporting crimes, and make all of us less safe.

Women—and, often, their children—come to our churches for sanctuary and hope. We believe Adams' proposal would put more lives in danger. It would perpetuate abusers' use of immigration status as part of the cycle of exploitation.

As evangelical Christians, we are committed to Jesus' great commandment to love God and to love our neighbor, with a particular concern for those who are most vulnerable. Through local churches and ministries, we extend that love when we provide counseling and support for victims of human trafficking and domestic violence. In doing so, we point to the ultimate healing and restoration that we believe is found only in Jesus.

We also love our neighbor by speaking up when laws are proposed that could cause harm, intentionally or not. Loving our neighbor not only means reaching out to those in need, but also means addressing systemic problems that harm those in need.

That's why we're asking Speaker John Boehner and the House leadership to make sure that the Violence Against Women Act continues to protect vulnerable immigrant women who are victims of human trafficking or domestic violence. They need our protection.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO). She is a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the sponsor of the bill, my colleague from Florida, for her work and her courage in bringing this forward.

I rise in support of H.R. 4970. Quickly, I'd like to tell a story about a situation in my hometown where a young boy was in the car with his mother. She was being beaten by her boyfriend, or her friend. She pulls the car over. He steps out of the car to try to flag somebody down to help his mother. He's 11 years old. He's hit and killed in the middle of a domestic violence situation. Tremendously tragic.

We know that sexual and domestic violence can happen to anyone at any age, race, income group, religion, or gender. Worldwide, one in four women is abused. In 2001, in my own home State, 13,000 domestic violence offenses were reported to law enforcement; and half of these offenses were between family members and household members, like that young man on the interstate that night. To be safe in your community, women first need to be safe in their own homes.

We have made great progress, I think, with the Violence Against Women Act that was enacted in 1994; but this current reauthorization builds on the successes of the last decade and will prevent more women and families from suffering. These women are our mothers, our daughters, our sisters, our friends, and our colleagues.

VAWA is working to break the cycle of violence in this country. And by speaking and lending a hand to our neighbors, our friends, our family members, we can break the cycle and take a vocal stand against abuse.

We've heard how this bill has been bipartisan in the past. It can be bipartisan right now. It can be bipartisan today. We can work out the difference. We can do the right thing. That's what we're here for, for that little boy on that interstate that night.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, Mr. NADLER has agreed to permit DALE KILDEE, the gentleman from Michigan, because of an emergency, to be recognized out of order for 1 minute.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill which is grossly inadequate in renewing vital protections for domestic violence victims. For the first time, we have a VAWA authorization that actually makes women less safe by taking away protections from previously covered groups like Native Americans living on reservations.

My Republican colleague will argue that this bill protects Native women by

giving them access to Federal courts, but in many cases the nearest Federal court is over 300 miles away. Do we really expect a woman who has just been abused to get in a car and drive 300 miles for protection? And even then there is no guarantee that a Federal prosecutor will do anything.

Every community in the Nation, except for constitutionally recognized tribal governments, has the authority to protect its residents. The only logical solution is to return local control to tribal governments to stop domestic violence before it escalates.

Instead of voting on partisan H.R. 4970, we should be considering the Senate bill, S. 1925, which included protection for Indian women.

□ 1540

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK), who is a cosponsor of this important victim legislation.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, which is just as I did in 2000 and once again in 2005. It was a critically important bill back then, and it is a critically important bill now. That's why I am urging my colleagues today to stand up for all women in America.

I thank my colleague, SANDY ADAMS, for her very hard work and dedication and also for sharing her personal experiences and turning them into a reason to champion this bill.

Yet, Madam Speaker, despite a lot of hard work by advocacy groups, law enforcement, churches, schools, and so many others around our Nation, violence against women continues to be an alarming problem—murder, sexual violence, domestic violence. More than 1 million women in the U.S. will be victimized this year alone, and it's estimated that one in four women in the U.S. will experience domestic violence at some point in her lifetime. That's one out of every four women.

As a society, we can't seem to find a way to stop this terrible sickness, but this legislation gives victims and their families a safe place to turn for help, such as to community violence prevention programs; protections for victims who are evicted from their homes because of events related to domestic violence or stalking; funding for victim assistance services like grief crisis centers and hotlines; and programs to meet the needs of women of different races or ethnicities.

A vote for this legislation is a vote to protect women—not some women, but all women.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud to represent a facility sheltered from the storm in my congressional district, and I thank them for their hard work and for their dedication in helping victims of domestic violence.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from California, LUCILLE ROYBAL-

ALLARD, for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). While I agree with my colleagues that we must reauthorize VAWA, I cannot support this version of the bill given the numerous ways it fails to protect women and families.

Despite the significant progress we have made as a nation addressing violence against women, nearly one-third of women in the U.S. still report being physically or sexually abused by a husband or boyfriend in their lifetime. Domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking lead to severe social, health, and economic consequences for our communities, with the estimated cost of violence exceeding 70 billion dollars each year.

Historically, each time VAWA has come up for reauthorization, Congress has added beneficial provisions to the bill and passed it with strong bipartisan support. In 2005, we included language referencing culturally and linguistically specific services to help eliminate barriers for many racial and ethnic minorities. My colleagues and I also successfully included a new health title in the last VAWA reauthorization that strengthened our health care system's capacity to prevent violence and develop effective interventions to abuse.

The version of VAWA before us today threatens to roll back those gains and limit protections for victims, ultimately endangering their safety in life-threatening ways. H.R. 4970 omits provisions in the Senate-passed bill that ensure equal treatment and access to services for LGBT survivors. It denies justice for tribal women abused by non-Indians, negating the reality that Native American women suffer domestic violence at epidemic proportions, but remain largely unprotected under current law. It also jeopardizes the personal security of victims who rely on public housing by forcing some to choose between swiftly moving away from an abuser and losing their housing subsidy.

Equally egregious, H.R. 4970 eradicates protections that have benefited immigrant women for nearly 20 years. The legislation creates barriers for immigrant crime victims seeking U-visas and silences those who fear deportation. H.R. 4970 overturns the current ability of immigrant victims of domestic violence to confidentially self-petition for permanent residency, thereby returning power to abusive U.S. citizen and legal permanent resident spouses who wield their status as a tool of dominance and control. Since VAWA's inception in 1994, nearly 75,000 self-petitions have been approved for immigrant victims who would have otherwise remained dependent on an abusive spouse to adjust their status. We cannot reverse course on this important self-petition provision and turn our backs on immigrant women and families.

I am also disappointed that, yet again, provisions to alleviate the economic factors that keep victims in abusive relationships have not been included. For the last 16 years, I have introduced legislation, the Security and Financial Empowerment Act (SAFE Act), to address this issue. The SAFE Act extends eligibility for

unemployment benefits to victims forced to leave their jobs due to circumstances stemming from domestic violence, allows victims to take unpaid leave to make court appearances and seek necessary assistance, and it prohibits employers or insurance providers from basing hiring or coverage on an individual's history of abuse. These provisions ensure that domestic violence survivors have the financial security they need to escape an abusive situation. Failing to address these economic concerns is just another way this legislation fails to adequately protect survivors of domestic violence.

It's unfortunate that Republicans are playing politics with women's lives and pushing a bill that deviates so sharply from the kind of VAWA reauthorization that victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking truly need. Hundreds of organizations across the country have opposed HR. 4970 on the grounds that it harms our families and communities. Unconscionably, the GOP appears more concerned about advancing a political agenda than listening to the American people. This is grossly insensitive to the lived experiences of those who tragically find themselves in abusive situations and count on our support.

Victim safety is at the core of VAWA and always has been. I cannot in good conscience vote to pass this version of VAWA, as it erases 18 years of bipartisan efforts to respond to the needs of victims of domestic violence. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting this bill down so that we may consider an alternative VAWA reauthorization proposal that improves protections for all survivors, including immigrant women and other vulnerable populations.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the committee, the gentleman from New York, JERROLD NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, this is a partisan Republican bill that not only rejects the bipartisan reforms to VAWA that were passed in the Senate but that would roll back protections for immigrant women that exist in current law.

For example, with respect to immigration, the House Republican bill, even as amended by the manager's amendment, favors abusers by eliminating the requirement that abuser-provided evidence be investigated and corroborated before it can be used to deny victims protection. It also delays protection to battered victims by staying adjudications during pending investigations or prosecutions.

The bill also fails to fully address the astronomically high rates of domestic violence against Native American women. A major cause is jurisdictional. Tribal governments cannot take action against non-Native Americans who commit acts of domestic violence even on tribal land. The Senate bill, which passed with bipartisan support, would fix this problem. The House Republican bill ignores this issue.

Finally, H.R. 4970 fails to make VAWA fully inclusive. The bipartisan Senate bill would add sexual orientation and gender identity to the eligibility for grant programs under VAWA

so that groups could focus on victims amongst this underserved population. The Senate bill would also include sexual orientation and gender identity as classes in the new VAWA antidiscrimination language. The House Republican bill fails to include these provisions.

The bottom line is that House Republicans have taken the issue of protecting women from violence, which used to be bipartisan, and have made it partisan—just like everything else. Maybe women across America should not be surprised, as this majority has been waging a war on them since the beginning of this Congress. But, my friends, we do not have to let this stand.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill. Let us reject this partisan VAWA reauthorization and work, as the Senate did, on passing a bipartisan measure—or better yet, simply pass the very good, bipartisan Senate bill. We don't need a retrogressive House bill that goes back on existing protections. The Senate did a fine job on a bipartisan basis. We should pass its bill.

Mrs. ADAMS. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), who is also a cosponsor of this important pro-woman legislation.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, in every State and every congressional district—I dare say in every community in our Nation—there is domestic violence. It's a tragedy, and it's often a silent tragedy in a home or in a situation where victims feel trapped. They need to know that the resources to help them are there, and the people who commit these crimes need to understand that the penalties for their abuses are severe. We all need to send the message that this law is important and that this Congress has zero tolerance for violence against women.

I've been to many shelters for victims of domestic violence in Missouri. They can't publish their addresses publicly. Still today, there is a network of women who can get you to a safe place, but you might not know who they are in your community until they save your life.

Domestic violence, rape, sexual abuse, and sexual assault are rarely discussed because they are such painful and shameful subjects, but they afflict women of all ages and from all walks of life. We can bring some small relief to all of the victims of these atrocities by speaking with one voice today and not trying to make this a political issue.

These crimes are not acceptable—ever. The criminals who commit them deserve every bit of the stringent punishments contained in this legislation, making any one of them think twice before raising a hand in anger. Giving one woman the courage to escape grave danger in her own home or sending one young person out into the world with an understanding of the seriousness of these crimes all make today in the House and this bill worthwhile. I urge the bipartisan passage of this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, JUDY CHU, a member of the committee.

Ms. CHU. As a former rape counselor, I've gone to emergency rooms and have seen the damage that sexual assault and domestic violence have caused. That is why I was so relieved when the Violence Against Women Act passed. And for the last 20 years, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have come together for legislation to protect women from violence. But not anymore.

Though the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to reauthorize VAWA, with the support of 15 Republicans, including every female Republican Senator, this Republican House bill differs greatly. It declares war on women. The manager's amendment tries to make some changes, but don't be fooled. They are just small tweaks designed to pull the wool over women's eyes. They are trying to sneak in a bill that still fails to protect all women, that leaves LGBT victims out, and that prevents Native American women from seeing their abusers prosecuted.

Let me be clear. This bill still rolls back existing law. For instance, with this bill, there is new, expedited deportation for any abused immigrant woman coming forth who has had even the slightest of errors in her report. If she goes to an emergency room and is in pain but has an error in her report, then she would be deported.

Let's make sure that this bill does not pass. I urge its defeat.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), who is a cosponsor of the legislation and the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I can't believe what I am hearing on the other side of the aisle.

I was the author of the last reauthorization of VAWA. It passed this House 415-4. Many of the Members who are complaining about the inadequacy of the present law weren't around to try to strengthen it, and they didn't attempt to propose amendments. Instead, they seemed to have fallen for the contagion that started on the other side of the Capitol by expanding the scope of the law in a very controversial manner and by making an issue of whether a non-Indian can be prosecuted in a tribal court, which brings up huge constitutional issues because the Bill of Rights does not apply in tribal courts.

I don't think it is the authors of this bill, and particularly the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS), who have anything to do with making this a partisan bill. It is the people on the other side of the aisle on both sides of the Capitol who have decided to use this as a political issue.

□ 1550

And there was one Member of the other body that said the Republican

Party has declared war on women. That's not the case. This bill increases authorizations. It makes it more effective, and it limits administrative expenses so that the money is spent on victims. It really is a victims' rights bill.

If those who are up here complaining about this legislation and strongly opposing it cause its defeat, the first casualty of the war on women is going to be the most important bill that has protected women for the last 18 years, the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, if the people on the other side are successful, the blood of the defeat of this bill will be on your hands, not on ours.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to remind my dear friend from Wisconsin, when he was chairman of the committee, in the 2005 Judiciary Committee report, he said:

These protections are designed to ensure that abusers and criminals cannot use the immigration system against their victims, as abusers are known for interfering or undermining their victim's immigration cases and encouraging immigration officers to pursue removal actions against their victims.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member from Illinois, MIKE QUIGLEY.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I agree, it's not political, but the Senate had it right.

Every year we reauthorize this, we expand who we're protecting. The scenery is moving behind us, as well. We need to make sure we take those people into consideration. Strive as you might to avoid trying to protect LGBT victims, the Senate had it right, and we should do that here.

According to a recent survey of service providers who work with LGBT victims, 85 percent work with victims who have been denied services because of his or her sexual orientation or gender identity. Gender-neutral language is not sufficient. Gay men are not turned away from shelters because they're men; they're turned away because of discrimination based on their sexual orientation.

Discrimination is real. Violence is violence. Personal stories matter, but they should matter to everyone. Every one of these people are citizens of our country that deserve equal protection. Discrimination is real, and we can't pretend it doesn't exist or hope that we don't have to have—

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I know there are folks who don't want to, in any way, have a pro-gay vote on it, but this is protecting human beings. It's the right thing to do. It should have been in this part of the bill. I suggest everyone vote "no."

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to myself just to point out that the survey that we've heard about was received back, and the complaint was the lack of data that it received. I will remind my colleagues on

the other side that this bill and the current law protects all victims.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), who is a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012. And I would like to commend my good friend, Mrs. ADAMS from Florida, for spearheading this reauthorization. Mrs. ADAMS is a former law enforcement officer and knows the effects of domestic violence all too well and the chronic problems that we are faced with in this country.

We've all heard the statistics. The following are directly from the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence:

One in four women will experience domestic violence in her lifetime;

The health-related costs of intimate partner violence equals at least \$5.8 billion annually;

One in six women and one in 33 men have experienced an attempted or completed rape. Men aren't immune from this either;

Thirty to 60 percent of perpetrators of intimate partner violence also abuse the children in the household;

Domestic violence is one of the most chronically underreported crimes, for good reason.

These are difficult statistics, Madam Speaker, and they are certainly not easy to think about, but that's the reality we face in America. H.R. 4970 goes a long way to help the victims, their families, and law enforcement in working to lower those statistics by providing authorization for 5 years, enough time for agencies and departments to make plans and programs, as well as carry them through. Penalties for sexual assault and abuse are made stronger, improvements are made in emergency housing for victims, and great strides are made to end the backlog of testing rape kits.

I've been blessed to never have experienced this personally, but as a child, I witnessed it. My mother had a friend who ended up so violently attacked, so physically harmed, that she stayed at our house until she could finally get well enough, and my mother finally talked her into getting out of that environment. But that was the fourth or the fifth time that that lady, Rita, ended up staying in our house.

When I was a young adult having children, a friend of mine, again, had the same issue happen to her. What I realized was we didn't have anything in Clermont County to help them, but we had a homeless shelter that was very marginal. So I worked with the county prosecutor. You know I'm a runner. For 15 years, we put on a 5K to put money in the pot to keep that homeless shelter open so that women had a place to go.

Madam Speaker, we can't continue to go back on the backs of good volunteers in America. We, as a government, have to help these women, too. If we

had those programs in place, Rita wouldn't have ended up in our house. She would have ended up in a place that could have psychologically and physically helped her. If we had had these programs in place, my friend Karen wouldn't have had to have been on the street, as well.

I urge my colleagues to face this reality head-on, and let's vote for this bill. It's time we do it for our women.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

More than 300 organizations oppose this bill, including the American Red Cross and the National Council Against Domestic Violence.

I ask the floor manager: Who supports it?

I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the committee, HANK JOHNSON of Georgia, himself a former magistrate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, the so-called VAWA bill, also known as the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. It should be renamed WAWA, or "War Against Women Act." This bill rolls back existing protections and is simply shocking in its callousness towards women and victims of abuse.

Native American women, they are women, too. Three out of five are victims of domestic and sexual violence. They are murder victims at the rate of 10 times the national average, but yet H.R. 4970 denies protections to help those women. It also rolls back U visa protections for certain immigrant women who depend on their spouses for their immigration status. These women are particularly vulnerable to abuse. LGBT victims are excluded also.

Instead of this flawed bill, we should be considering the bipartisan Senate bill. And domestic violence does not recognize political parties. I urge House Republicans to come back to the table with a bill that we can all be proud to call the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

□ 1600

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4970. The bill, as reported out of the Judiciary Committee, lacked provisions protecting tribal women. But Chairman SMITH and his staff, along with Leader CANTOR and Congresswoman ADAMS, worked with me to ensure that the protections for tribal women were added and included in this bill.

This bill does not change any existing authority that tribal courts possess but adds an additional tool in Federal court to combat violence against tribal women. The bill includes a mechanism for tribes to petition a Federal court on the victim's behalf, which is important to victims of limited means living in remote locations.

I support the tribal provisions of the Senate-passed VAWA and the provisions found in the SAVE Native Women Act, H.R. 4154, of which I'm a cosponsor. I believe that those provisions are, indeed, constitutional. But the protections found in this bill will have a positive effect in Indian country. These provisions aren't perfect, but they improve current law considerably. I support the progress made in this bill. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4970. We cannot improve a bill and strengthen tribal sovereignty if we can't get a bill to conference.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Why do we find ourselves here today having this kind of debate that calls upon the higher angels of all Members, recognizing that as I stand on the floor today, some woman is losing her life. She may be a Native American woman. That individual may be from the LGBT community or the immigrant community.

Why are we here today divided when all we needed to do was to work in a bipartisan manner? The Senate bill, which tracked the process and the strategy and the approach that we've used in all of the reauthorizations of VAWA; we have always expanded it to reach the needs of new victims. What do you say to a Native American woman when you limit the ability for that woman to be protected? In fact, in particular, you make it that much harder, for what you do is that it authorizes tribal governments to seek protection orders on behalf of victims with or without their protection or permission, violating the core principles that such victims must have autonomy. Why that language?

With respect to the LGBT community, my friends on the other side will say, They're already protected. But we realize that the clarity of the law gives the protection that is necessary when someone is desperate, because as the Federal Government passes laws, it permeates to counties and cities and hamlets that need to have the interpretation to ensure that the law is equally applied. So this is why we call for the passage of the Senate bill and a bipartisan bill.

And my friends on the other side of the aisle—seven Republicans wrote Chairman SMITH and said, We want the bipartisan bill. That's what we're asking for, not anything extraordinary.

When you talk about providing for rape kits and someone says on the other side, We've increased it to 75 percent to address the backlog—well, in actuality, they have not because they've taken money from some other programs. So, Madam Speaker, all I can say is, Why are we here? Let us stand united to help women. Let us not default on our allowance that we've

been given to serve the American people, and the women are desperate. Someone is dying as I speak.

Vote for the Senate bill. Let us do this in a bipartisan way.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) who is also a cosponsor of this very good legislation.

Mrs. MYRICK. I would like to thank the Judiciary Committee for bringing this bill forward and a special thanks to SANDY ADAMS for the incredible work she's done on this bill. It took tremendous courage on her part to produce a good bill in the face of tremendous relentless partisan attacks. Sandy has seen the challenges women face daily as a former law enforcement officer.

As a woman, I'm proud of this bill. It reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act programs for 5 years and provides more than \$600 million per year to help prevent domestic violence and protect those victims of abuse. For almost two decades, VAWA provisions have helped women across the country, and Congress needs to continue these important initiatives.

Most of us know of domestic violence situations that take place in our districts all the time, unfortunately. Again, unfortunately, this problem is increasing all across the country. The need for help is huge. So it's very important that we provide the resources to the women who are being abused, and they can have a place to go and someone to help them get through what has to be an absolutely horrible experience in their life. Thank goodness I have never experienced it.

Our bill offers significant improvements. There is greater accountability and transparency with the funding of these programs. We have strengthened the penalties against abusers, which is so important, and we've improved the services and protections for younger victims. Lastly, we've streamlined and updated the immigration provisions in the bill to address considerable fraud while still offering protections under the Violence Against Women Act, the statutes that are there to protect immigrant victims.

So I'm very proud to offer my support for the bill, and I'm very proud to be a cosponsor. I would urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this reauthorization.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to LINDA SÁNCHEZ, a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose this Republican bill that dangerously leaves victims of domestic violence worse off than they are under current law. To say that this legislation builds on current law is patently false.

Our Senate colleagues passed a strong version of the Violence Against Women Act with broad bipartisan sup-

port. Every Republican woman in the Senate voted in favor of it. Instead of crafting a bill of similar strength, my Republican friends in this body have insisted on taking back crucial protections for abused victims throughout our country. This Republican bill makes it more difficult for immigrant victims to work with law enforcement to report and help prosecute serious and violent criminals.

This Republican bill pretends the LGBT community doesn't exist and would allow victim service organizations to discriminate against LGBT victims when they seek help.

This Republican bill would further endanger the lives of Native American women who suffer abuse in epidemic proportions in this country. This Republican bill doesn't expand protections for women; it puts more women at risk by weakening current protections.

America's women deserve better. I encourage all of my colleagues to reject this Republican bill and support the Democratic alternative.

Mrs. ADAMS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from Minnesota, BETTY MCCOLLUM.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I oppose this bill. For the first time, the Violence Against Women Act is now a divisive piece of legislation. We could be voting on a bipartisan bill already passed by the Senate, but instead, the Tea Party majority of the Republicans has chosen to bring a bipartisan discriminatory bill to the floor today, and it eliminates protections for victims of violent crime.

All women who experience violence have the right to be protected. They need to know that their attackers will be tried in a court of law. And the purpose of VAWA has always been to ensure that all victims of violence are protected and that all their basic human rights are upheld no matter what one's sexual orientation, ethnicity, or legal status in this country is.

This country failed to protect all women, and that's why this legislation failed to get the support from the advocates and from women all across this country.

I oppose this measure, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 1610

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Michigan has 13¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington, RICK LARSEN.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, in 2006, I, along with Senator CANTWELL, made sure that the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act, or IMBRA, was enacted as part of the last reauthorization of VAWA. It put regulations in place to protect foreign women brought here through the mail-order bride industry to keep them from falling prey to serial abusers.

Pushing this legislation forward 6 years ago was important to me because a young woman named Anastasia King, a so-called mail-order bride, was found dead. She had been strangled to death by her husband and buried in a shallow grave in 2000 in a wooded area in my district. Her husband had a domestic violence protection order issued against him from a previous wife. Indle King killed Anastasia because he wanted to get a new bride and didn't want to pay for a divorce.

The VAWA bill being considered in the House today does not go far enough to strengthen those same protections that we established in 2006. It leaves out important amendments to IMBRA that passed in the bipartisan Senate bill, like putting penalties in place to keep a man like Indle King from simply lying about his violent history so as to lure another woman here to be abused and then discarded.

We must use this reauthorization process to strengthen protections against abusers, not strengthen abusers' upper hand. We must use this reauthorization process to reaffirm that VAWA's protections are for all victims, including tribal women and LGBT individuals.

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

This is the third time I have asked my friends on the other side to please tell me why all of the women's organizations, law enforcement organizations—some 200-plus—are against this bill, and all of them were supporting the previous bill.

I yield to the distinguished manager of the bill, a dear friend of mine, for a response.

Mrs. ADAMS. Thank you, Mr. CONYERS.

I will tell you, shame on them. Shame on them. This bill reauthorizes VAWA for 5 years at the same levels as the Senate. It protects victims.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Since we're shaming on every organization that protects women, would you tell me who supports the Republican version of the bill? Name somebody.

Mrs. ADAMS. If the gentleman would yield, I can say that I do, and I know that we have a list of them.

I will tell you, Mr. CONYERS, that I have sat quietly and tried to behave here, but I am offended when I hear that this does not protect victims. I am offended when I hear that we are politicizing something that was politicized

on the other side in the other Chamber and by the other side of the aisle.

So I have very much concern about that because, as someone who has been in the situation, who has been on the scenes of these crimes, we are trying to reauthorize something that is very important to victims across our Nation—victims, not politics. And that's where I stand on this issue.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I have asked why hundreds of organizations are supporting it, and you say: Shame on them. I ask who's supporting the Republican measure and you say: I am. Well, I'm glad to know that. And I think that just about tells everybody where the logic and the support for this bill is. There is none. It's a Republican—not a prank, but a serious blow to women. And that's what the organizations know, and that's why, Madam Floor Manager, they're opposed to this bill.

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 2 minutes to ZOE LOFGREN, a member of the committee.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I think sometimes it's helpful to get into the nitty-gritty of legislation. This bill changes the law that exists today and reduces protection for immigrant women in key ways. Let me just talk about one of the ways.

If you are an immigrant temporarily here, or even without your documents, and you are a victim of domestic violence and the police want to keep you here because you're a witness or they need your help in a prosecution, the police can obtain what is called a U visa so you get to stay here. That's in the current law. It was bipartisan. It was done in the year 2000.

This bill changes that in important ways. Under current law, if you are a U visa holder, you have the possibility of applying for a permanent visa. Why is that important? Because otherwise, if you come forward to cooperate with the police, you could be voluntarily deporting yourself and be separated from your children, and that is a deterrent to people coming forward to work with the police. That's why it was crafted the way it was. Even under the manager's amendment, there is a diminution of that possibility, and it would lead to absurd results.

I'll give you an example.

Under the manager's amendment, you can only apply for the residence if your abuser had been deported to the country where you are from. So a U visa is for 4 years. If your abuser is serving a 5-year sentence, you have to be deported, and then your abuser will come after you the next year. It's a stupid provision, unfortunately. I can't believe that that's the intended result. I know Mrs. ADAMS is sincere, but that's what is in the bill. And that's

why people object to the bill—that, among many other provisions that will endanger women and take us back from where we were.

I think that when you take a look at not just the groups that support the Senate bill instead of this, but the groups that support this bill, who embrace abusers, you know where you need to stand—and that's not with this bill, despite the sincerity of the author.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first clarify. The bill requires that U visa holders actually assist law enforcement. Current law does not. Let's make that very clear. The other thing is we do want them to cooperate because we do want those perpetrators off the streets. We want to make sure they're off the streets so that no other victim is victimized.

In the earlier version of the bill, I was very concerned about: What about the next victim? If we do this and we don't address this, what about the next victim? Which victim doesn't make it out of that house? And I've heard my colleagues on the other side talk about how we're trying to do something because of immigration. No. We're trying to do something to protect the victims and the next victims if we don't get the circle of violence stopped. It always repeats itself.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to our leader, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership on this important issue, not only as this legislation comes to the floor, but for the past couple of decades on the subject. I commend the maker of our motion to accept the Senate bill, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, for her sincere leadership on this issue as well.

Madam Speaker, 18 years ago, Members of Congress came together—some of us gathered in this Chamber right now—came together to make history with the original passage of the Violence Against Women Act. We helped ensure that no victim of domestic violence has to suffer in silence.

I want to especially salute our Vice President, JOE BIDEN, who was chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate at the time, who worked with our chairman and many Members on both sides of the aisle to pass that legislation, again, making history.

□ 1620

The original Violence Against Women Act took domestic violence out of the shadows and shone bright sunshine on it.

In the years since, domestic violence has decreased by more than 50 percent—more than 50 percent. What a remarkable outcome. Twice in the intervening years we have come together in a bipartisan way to reauthorize and strengthen the law. This year our colleagues in the Senate acted similarly, passing a strong bill with a strong bi-

partisan vote of 68–1, including the support of every single woman in the Senate, Democratic and Republican alike. In doing so, they not only built on the history of the past, but they made progress for the safety of American women.

In sharp contrast, sadly, while it was a strong bipartisan bill in the Senate, and our substitute that we requested from the Rules Committee was to be able to put forth the Senate bill, so that would be the Senate Democrats and Republicans and House Democrats all in agreement, unfortunately in sharp contrast, House Republicans have brought to the floor today a bill that is controversial in that it will weaken the protections we have given to those who suffer domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

This legislation on the floor fails vulnerable people—members of the LGBT community, Native American women, and immigrant victims. All people deserve to be protected from domestic violence. There should be no exceptions to this law. We can't say women of America, we're passing a bill to protect you—not so fast in your applause if you happen to be a member of the LGBT community, an immigrant or otherwise, or a Native American woman.

Because the Republican bill is a step backward from the current law of the land, more than 300 organizations have spoken out in opposition, from the American Bar Association to the YWCA.

Local law enforcement officials have said that this Republican House bill “will impede criminal investigations, undermine prosecutions, and interfere with victim safety.” I repeat the quotation. The local law enforcement officials have said this bill “will impede criminal investigations, undermine prosecutions and interfere with victim safety.”

Religious organizations such as the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service and the National Association of Evangelicals have also expressed strong opposition to certain provisions of this legislation.

The many advocates and experts who work day in and day out on this issue, on the issue of domestic violence, have also opposed the House Republican version of the Violence Against Women Act. Republicans have chosen not to listen to the professionals in the field and are failing to give the many organizations serving battered women the tools that they need.

The Obama administration has said in their Statement of Administration Policy that the legislation “rolls back existing law and removes long-standing protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault—crimes that predominantly affect women.” That is why the President's senior advisers have said that they would recommend that the President veto this bill.

Today, this House of Representatives has heard powerful statements from women Members of Congress about the

need to pass a strong Violence Against Women bill. I hope that the safety of women will be high on the list of our colleagues as they determine their vote.

For nearly 20 years, the Violence Against Women Act has strengthened communities and provided critical life-saving support to victims of violence. Because of this law, more victims get the help they need and domestic violence rates have decreased. Not only has VAWA saved lives; it has saved money. All Americans are entitled to feel safe, including in their own homes—every one of us. Yet too many women continue to live in fear. That is why we must strengthen, never weaken, the Violence Against Women Act.

And I want to commend the members of the Judiciary Committee, my colleagues on the House side, the Democratic side, who have brought such tremendous intellectual resource to this legislation, listening to those who minister to the needs of women who have been victims of domestic violence and to those who are trying to protect it.

I know that everyone in this body, Democratic and Republican alike, have the same goal, which is the safety of women. We not only want us to have the same goal, we want us to have the same goal for all women in America. And that's why we must strengthen, never weaken, the Violence Against Women Act.

Because this bill on the floor rolls back current law and fails to protect all victims of violence, I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

MAY 16, 2012.

UPDATED: MORE THAN 300 ORGANIZATIONS
OPPOSE HOUSE GOP VAWA BILL

Today, the House will consider H.R. 4970, the House GOP Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Reauthorization bill. The bill is being considered under a closed rule.

More than 300 organizations oppose the House GOP bill, including such groups as the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Network to End Domestic Violence, National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, Break the Cycle, Legal Momentum, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, National Organization for Women, Feminist Majority, YWCA USA, AAUW, Business and Professional Women's Foundation, National Women's Law Center, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, American Bar Association, NAACP, National Council of La Raza, Human Rights Campaign, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, and National Congress of American Indians.

The National Association of Evangelicals and the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service are opposed to the immigrant provisions in the bill.

The Administration has also issued a veto threat on the bill.

MAY 16, 2012.

A VOTE FOR H.R. 4970 IS A VOTE AGAINST VAWA

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Please see below for the more than 320 groups and individuals who have written in opposition to key provisions of H.R. 4970:

1. Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.

2. Advocates for Human Rights
3. African Services Committee
4. Alachua County Victim Services and Rape Crisis Center
5. Alaska Federation of Natives
6. Alianza Latina en Contra la Agresión Sexual
7. Alliance for Immigrants Rights & Reform—Michigan
8. American Bar Association
9. American Civil Liberties Union
10. American Federation of Labor
11. American Gateways
12. American Immigration Lawyers Association
13. American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA), Washington Chapter
14. American Jewish Committee
15. American Public Health Association
16. Americans for Immigrant Justice, Inc.
17. America's Voice Education Fund
18. Anindita Dasgupta, MA, Doctoral Candidate at the University of California, San Diego
19. Anita Raj, PhD, Professor of Medicine and Global Public Health at the University of California, San Diego
20. Artemis Justice Center
21. ASHA for Women
22. Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund
23. Asian Pacific American Legal Center, a Member of the Asian American Center
24. Advancing Justice
25. Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence
26. Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach
27. ASISTA
28. Ayuda
29. Bangladeshi American Democratic Caucus of Michigan
30. Bangladeshi American Democratic Caucus
31. Boesche Legal Clinic, University of Tulsa College of Law
32. Boston University Civil Litigation Program
33. Break the Cycle
34. California Coalition Against Sexual Assault
35. California Partnership to End Domestic Violence
36. Caminar Latino
37. Campaign for Community Change
38. Canal Alliance
39. Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition
40. Captain Maria Alvarenga Watkins, (Retired) Metropolitan Police
41. Department, Washington, D.C.
42. Casa Cornelia Law Center
43. Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities
44. CASA de Maryland, Inc.
45. Casa de Proyecto Libertad
46. Casa Esperanza
47. Center for Family Policy & Practice
48. Center for Gender & Refugee Studies
49. Center for Pan Asian Community Services, Inc.
50. Center for Victim and Human Rights
51. CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers
52. Central American Resource Center
53. Chief Brian Kyes, Chelsea Police Department, Massachusetts
54. Chief Pete Helein, Appleton Wisconsin Police Department
55. Christian Community Development Association
56. Church World Service
57. Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice
58. Coalition Against Religious Discrimination
59. Coalition for Humane Immigrant

60. Coalition to Abolish Slavery & Trafficking
61. Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault
62. Community Action and Human Services Department
63. Community Action Network
64. Community Immigration Law Center
65. Connecticut Legal Services Inc.
66. Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
67. Community Refugee and Immigration Services
68. Community Solutions
69. Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.
70. Cris M. Sullivan, Ph.D., Professor, Ecological/Community Psychology, Associate Chair, Psychology Department
71. Detective Sergeant Robert Mahoney, Peabody Police Department, Massachusetts
72. Detective Shelli Sonnenberg, Boise Police Department, Idaho
73. Detective Stacey Ivie, Alexandria Police Department, Virginia
74. Domestic Violence in the African American Community
75. Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project
76. DREAM Activist Virginia
77. Education Not Deportation Project of the United We Dream Network
78. El Rescate Legal Services, Inc.
79. Empire Justice Center
80. Enlace Comunitario
81. Equal Justice Center
82. Esperanza
83. Esperanza Peace and Justice Center
84. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
85. Evan Stark, Ph.D., MA, MSW, Professor and Director of Public Health, School of Public Affairs and Administration, Rutgers University—Newark & Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration, UMDNJ—School of Public Health
86. FaithAction International House
87. Families and the Law Clinic, Columbus School of Law, Catholic University of America
88. Families Against Mandatory Minimums
89. Families for Freedom
90. Family Counseling Services of Greater Miami, Inc.
91. Farmworker Justice
92. Feminist Majority
93. First Focus
94. Florida Coastal Immigrant Rights
95. Florida Coastal Immigrant Rights Clinic
96. Franciscan Action Network
97. Freedom Network (USA)
98. Fuerza Latina
99. Futures Without Violence
100. Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network
101. Georgia Asylum and Immigration Network (GAIN)
102. Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights
103. Gibbs Houston Pauw
104. Giselle Hass, PsyD, Adjunct Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, Center for Applied Legal Studies
105. Gulfcoast Legal Services
106. Haven Women's Center of Stanislaus
107. HAVEN, Oakland County Michigan
108. Hawai'i Coalition for Immigration Reform
109. Hawaii State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
110. Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society
111. Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society—Pennsylvania
112. Helene Berman, RN, Ph.D., President of the Nursing Network on Violence Against Women International
113. Holy Cross Ministries of Utah
114. Human Rights Campaign

115. Human Rights Initiative of North Texas
116. Human Rights Watch
117. Immigrant Defense Project
118. Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota
119. Immigrant Legal Center of Boulder County
120. Immigrant Rights Clinic, Rutgers School of Law—Newark
121. Immigration Equality
122. inMotion, Inc.
123. InterCultural Advocacy Institute
124. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona
125. International Institute of the Bay Area
126. Intimate Partner Violence Assistance Clinic University of Florida
127. Iowa Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church
128. Levin College of Law
129. Jacquelyn Campbell, Ph.D., RN, FAAN, Anna D. Wolf Chair, The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing and National Director, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Nurse Faculty Scholars
131. Jane Doe Inc.
132. Jay G. Silverman, Ph.D. Professor of Medicine and Global Health Division of Global Public Health Senior Fellow, Center on Global Justice University of California at San Diego, School of Medicine Adjunct Associate Professor of Society, Human Development and Health Harvard School of Public Health
133. Jewish Women International
134. Just Neighbors
135. Justice For Our Neighbors
136. Justice For Our Neighbors—South-eastern Michigan
137. Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights
138. Kentucky Domestic Violence Association
139. Korean American Resource & Cultural Center
140. Korean Resource Center
141. La Fe Multi-Ethnic Ministries, Intersvarsity Christian Fellowship/USA
142. La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians
143. Latin American Association
144. Latin American Coalition
145. Latina/o Bar Association of Washington
146. LatinoJustice PRLDEF
147. Leadership Conference of Women Religious
148. Legal Aid Service of Collier County
149. Legal Aid Society of Minneapolis
150. Legal Aid Society of Rochester, New York
151. Legal Aid Society of the Orange County Bar Association, Inc.
152. Legal Aid Society—Employment Law Center
153. Legal Momentum
154. Legal Services for Children
155. Leslye E. Orloff, J.D. Director, National Immigrant Women's Advocacy Project, American University Washington College of Law
156. Lieutenant Carole Germano, Danvers Police Department, Massachusetts
157. Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service
158. Lutheran Social Services of New England
159. Mary Ann Dutton, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Georgetown University Medical Center
160. Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence
161. Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition
162. Maui International Language School
163. Mennonite Central Committee U.S.
164. Michigan Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights
165. Michigan Indo-American Democratic Caucus
166. Michigan Muslim Democratic Caucus
167. Midwest Association of Farmworker Organizations
168. Midwest Association of Farmworker Organizations
169. Mil Mujeres
170. Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women
171. Mountain Crisis Services
172. Mujeres Latinas En Accion
173. Muslim Public Affairs Council
174. My Sister's Place (New York)
175. My Sister's Place, Inc. (D.C.)
176. Nassau County Coalition Against Domestic Violence
177. NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.
178. National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd
179. National African Immigrant and Refugee Women's Network
180. National Alliance to End Sexual Violence
181. National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum
182. National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers
183. National Association of Evangelicals
184. National Association of Federal Defenders
185. National Center for Transgender Equality
186. National Center for Victims of Crime
187. National Coalition for LGBT Health
188. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
189. National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs
190. National Coalition on Black Civic Participation
191. National Congress of American Indians
192. National Congress of American Indians Task Force on Violence Against Women
193. National Council of Jewish Women
194. National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
195. National Council of La Raza
196. National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
197. National Domestic Violence Hotline
198. National Employment Law Project
199. National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference
200. National Hispanic Council on Aging
201. National Immigrant Justice Center
202. National Immigration Forum
203. National Immigration Law Center
204. National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild
205. National Korean American Service & Education Consortium
206. National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health
207. National Latino Evangelical Coalition
208. National Legal Aid & Defender Association
209. National Network to End Domestic Violence
210. National Organization for Women Foundation
211. National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault
212. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence
213. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and the Women of Color Network
214. National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women
215. Nawal Ammar, Ph.D. Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology
216. Neighbors in Support of Immigrants
217. NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
218. Network for Victim Recovery of DC
219. Nevada Hispanic Services Inc.
220. New Bridges Immigrant Resource Center
221. New Mexico Asian Family Center
222. New Sanctuary Coalition of NYC
223. New York Anti-Trafficking Network
224. New York State Coalition Against Sexual Assault
225. North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence
226. North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault
227. North Carolina Stop Human Trafficking
228. Northwest Immigrant Rights Project
229. Officer Michael LaRiviere, Salem Police Department, Massachusetts
230. Ohio Alliance to End Sexual Violence
231. Paso del Norte Civil Rights Project
232. Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center
233. Physicians for Human Rights
234. Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
235. Political Asylum Immigration Representation Project
236. Public Justice Center
237. Rachael Rodriguez, Ph.D., Associate Professor in the School of Nursing at Edgewood College
238. RAICES
239. Rainbow Services, Ltd.
240. Refugee House, Inc.
241. Refugio del Rio Grande, Inc.
242. Rhonda Giger, Prosecutor—City of Bothell, WA
243. Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network
244. Ross Silverman LLP
245. Rural Women's Health Project
246. Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law
247. SEPA Mujer Inc., Servicios para el Avance de la Mujer
248. Sergeant Inspector Antonio Flores, San Francisco Police Department, California
249. Service Employees International Union
250. Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network
251. Sex Workers Project at the Urban Justice Center
252. Sexual Assault Response Services of Southern Maine
253. Sexual Violence Center
254. Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S.
255. Sierra County Victim Assistance Unit
256. Sisters of Mercy Institute Justice Team
257. Sisters of Mercy of the Americas
258. Sisters of Mercy South Central Community
259. Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia
260. Social Justice Action Network
261. Sojourners
262. South Asian Americans Leading Together
263. Southern Poverty Law Center
264. Stephanie J. Nawyn, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, Michigan State University
265. Student Action with Farmworkers
266. Supervising Deputy Sheriff Marcus Bruning, St. Louis County
267. Sheriff's Office, Missouri
268. Tahirih Justice Center
269. Tapestry, Inc
270. The Advocates for Human Rights
271. The Bridge to Hope
272. The Episcopal Church
273. The Immigrant Legal Resource Center
274. The Kansas/Missouri Dream Alliance
275. The Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights
276. The Legal Aid Society
277. The Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County
278. The P.E.A.C.E.* Initiative
279. The Sentencing Project
280. The United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries

281. The Violence Intervention Program
 282. The William Kellibrew Foundation
 283. TN Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
 284. Transgender Law Center
 285. UC Davis Immigration Law Clinic
 286. UFW Foundation
 287. Unidas, The National Latina LGBT Human Rights Organization
 288. Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations
 289. United Methodist Church
 290. United Migrant Opportunity Services
 291. United Migrant Opportunity Services/UMOS Inc.
 292. United Women.org
 293. University of Miami, School of Nursing & Health Studies
 294. U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops
 295. VIDA Legal Assistance, Inc.
 296. Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates
 297. Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
 298. Violence Intervention Program
 299. Virginia Coalition of Latino Organizations
 300. Virginia Organizing
 301. Virginia Sexual & Domestic Violence Action Alliance
 302. Voces de la Frontera
 303. Voces Unidas for Justice
 304. Voices of Immigrants in Action/Rural Women's Health Project
 305. Voices of Men
 306. Volunteer Attorneys for Rural Nevadans
 307. Walnut Avenue Women's Center
 308. Washington Defender Association's Immigration Project
 309. Washington Immigration Defense Group
 310. Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
 311. WeCount!
 312. Who Is My Neighbor? Inc.
 313. Willow Creek Community Church
 314. Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence
 315. Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault
 316. Women Against Abuse
 317. Women of Color Network
 318. Women's Crisis Support—Defensa de Mujeres
 319. Women's Law Project
 320. Women's Refugee Commission
 321. Worker Justice Center of New York
 322. Workers Rights Clinic
 323. World Evangelical Alliance
 324. World Relief
 325. Wyoming Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
 326. YWCA USA

For further information on the overwhelming opposition to H.R. 4970, please visit the Minority Judiciary Committee web site: <http://democrats.judiciary.house.gov/issue/materials-opposing-republican-violence-against-women-act-hr-4970>

Or contact House Judiciary Democratic Staff, Ron LeGrand and Jenny Perrino.

We strongly encourage all colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 4970 today.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), who is also a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, for nearly 20 years the Violence Against Women Act has supported programs that assist victims of domestic abuse, stalking, and sexual assault. I'm proud to support the legislation that's on the House floor today because it reauthorizes those programs, strengthens them

by targeting more funding to programs that need it, and processing that needs it, and also gives some new provisions which I helped work on with the Judiciary Committee to better serve our Native Americans.

This piece of legislation which provides services to all victims without discrimination has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support. Unfortunately, because some in Congress saw an opportunity to use abuse victims as a prop in a political game, today we're having a different discussion, and I feel it's shameful. House Republicans are not going to allow the Violence Against Women Act to get sidelined because of politics. It's simply too important.

One area of particular concern to people back home in South Dakota is provisions for Native Americans and Native American women. Native American women suffer from higher levels of abuse than non-Indian women, but all too often they don't get to see their perpetrators brought to justice. It's simply unacceptable.

This Violence Against Women Act improves upon many of the programs that are designed specifically to aid Native American women, and it also includes new provisions to improve Congress's response to potential problems they may run into. Furthermore, to better ensure that Native American women have improved recourse against abusive individuals, I worked with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the staff to include language in this bill to empower Native American women to either petition individually the Federal courts or through their tribal courts for a Federal restraining order. Ensuring that these women have the ability to obtain a protection order is a vital step towards stopping the cycle of abuse that many of them suffer through. It impacts disproportionately those in Indian Country over other areas of the Nation.

Those who have suffered from violence and abuse have gone through enough. Let's not cause more harm by putting politics before victims, and let's support and reauthorize the improved Violence Against Women Act today.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, in fact, the new tribal protection orders added by the manager's amendment would reverse the Violence Against Women Act's victim-centered approach and would require Native women to sometimes travel hours to obtain protection orders from a Federal district court.

Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished whip of the House of Representatives, STENY HOYER of Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished ranking member from Michigan who has been such an extraordinary fighter for the rights of all people in our country, and I rise in opposition to this bill.

□ 1630

I would say, as an aside, the last speaker talked about Native Americans. The National Congress of American Indians of course says this matter does nothing to address the crux of the issue—the lack of local authority to handle misdemeanor-level domestic and dating violence when the perpetrator is non-Indian. It goes on to oppose this legislation.

I rise in sadness, Madam Speaker. I was the cosponsor of the original Violence Against Women Act in 1994. We passed a bipartisan bill that has helped law enforcement significantly reduce domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

While great progress has been made, unfortunately one in three American women still experience violence by a partner, stalking, or sexual assault. That's why this bill is a perfect example of why we need to work together in a bipartisan fashion to reauthorize and strengthen the Violence Against Women Act. I will tell my friends the Senate did this. Why is it that we have to choose disunity and confrontation over consensus? I don't know why that is, particularly on an issue of this great importance to the American people.

The Senate came together, 68 of them—two-thirds of the United States Senate, Republicans and Democrats, overwhelmingly supported this. Every woman in the United States Senate supported the Senate bill—everyone, Republican women and Democratic women, who know firsthand the crisis that confronts our communities.

However, this version was reported by the Judiciary Committee with no bipartisan support—and indeed bipartisan opposition. Why do we have to do that? We could have come together. We should have come together. The Senate came together. There is no reason we can't, other than to make our points on a partisan basis.

This bill is weaker than existing law, it is regressive, and it sends the wrong message about our values. The Senate's version extends new protections to Native Americans and to all who are targeted, regardless of sexual orientation. Isn't that our value, to protect every individual? "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all individuals are endowed by their Creator." Shouldn't we protect all individuals, not exclude some?

Not only does the House version fail to include those protections, it also makes it harder for law enforcement to encourage immigrant victims to come forward to seek help and justice. I met with over 30 members of the law enforcement community on Monday. We sat around and we talked about, generally, gang violence, but we talked about VAWA. We talked about the ability of people to come forward and make complaints, feel comfortable in doing that, and enhance the ability to get domestic defenders out of the cycle of violence against domestic partners or

others. They all agreed that we ought to make it easier, not harder. We make it harder in this bill. This is not the right way to go.

This version is opposed by hundreds of groups. I've got a list here. I'm not going to read it. Leader PELOSI submitted it for the RECORD. Hundreds of groups are opposed to this legislation, including the American Bar Association, and are urging a "no" vote.

I'm going to vote "no" on this, and I hope all my colleagues do as well so that we can adopt a bill that has overwhelming bipartisan support and the support of these groups. Why do we confront these groups and say: Nope, you're wrong, we know better; we know better; you've worked on this for years and decades, but we're going to go our own way?

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

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased to yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

This version is opposed, as I said, by hundreds of groups representing victims, advocates, faith-based organizations, as well as law enforcement.

Now, almost every one of us, every one of us—or most, I imagine—has had some personal experience with this. In our own families, ourselves, as lawyers, as doctors, as neighbors, as friends, as fellow church members, we all know the cost of this violence. Let us come together and act together.

This should not be a vehicle for partisan confrontation. Instead, we should adopt the Senate's bipartisan version and ensure that law enforcement agencies have the tools they need to prevent domestic violence and provide victims with the assistance they need.

Let us vote "no" on this legislation, and then let us move forward in a bipartisan, constructive, overwhelmingly supported fashion like our colleagues in the United States Senate did in a bipartisan way.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say that I agree that all victims need to be covered, and that is what this piece of legislation does. We do not segment out. We do not pit victim against victim. It is all victims.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield now 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, 2 out of every 10 women in America will be a victim of rape in her lifetime. More than that will experience severe physical violence by an intimate partner. Madam Speaker, which one of those women is not worthy of protection or support as a result of this legislation?

H.R. 4970 is opposed by tribal governments because Native American women will have less protection under this

bill. H.R. 4970 is opposed by groups that support immigrants because immigrant women will find themselves victims of these crimes without the support that they need. And the community of LGBT Americans will find themselves without the support they would get under the Senate version of this legislation.

Once again, the House majority demonstrates the dysfunction in Washington, D.C. Instead of applauding the overwhelming vote in the Senate with a bipartisan vote that passed just recently by 68 votes in the Senate for a Violence Against Women Act to be reauthorized and putting that bipartisan bill on this floor, our Republican colleagues in the House went the other way.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to put the Senate bill on the floor, get this work done, follow the lead of the American public that says: Get to work, make it happen, and protect women who are the victims of violence in this country.

Mrs. ADAMS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 5¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, it's with great disappointment that I rise today in opposition to this bill, not because the issue of violence against women is not real, but because this House bill does not do enough to address domestic violence and protect women.

Sadly, instead of taking action on a bipartisan bill that has passed the Senate that meets the need to protect America's women, the Republican majority has chosen confrontation over compromise with a bill that is seriously limited, particularly in the protections it offers to Native American women.

It was my great hope that the House Republicans would rise to do the right thing. Don't hide behind excuses—do the right thing. Let's close the loophole that allows abusers to get away with violence, especially against Native American women. It's not right that abusers game these loopholes to beat their victims. Reject this bill and take up the Senate version.

Mrs. ADAMS. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this bill has been revealed to be reauthorizing certain grant programs, but it really doesn't. It undermines the safety of the most vulnerable victims of violence. It rolls back important protections for immigrant victims, putting them in a

worse position than under current law, and excludes other vulnerable populations, such as tribal women, LGBTQ. In short, any alleged improvements made by this bill cannot conceal the overwhelming harm that it will cause.

When I asked who supports this bill, the floor manager could name only one person. She said, I do. And when I asked her why do all of the women's organizations and law enforcement organizations oppose the bill, she made some other comment about why that was so.

□ 1640

Ladies and gentlemen, we must turn back this unacceptable piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ADAMS. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), my dear friend, a former Federal prosecutor and an original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. GOWDY. Nell Lindsey was a nurse at a local hospital. Her shift had ended, and it was time to go home. She couldn't take her own car because her husband had disabled the car so it wouldn't work. This is the same husband who had broken her jaw on a family vacation, the same husband who had knocked out her teeth in an Applebee's parking lot while her children watched, the same husband who had called their oldest son a sexual-orientation epithet, and put beer in the baby bottle of their youngest child.

So Nell Lindsey got a ride home from the hospital from work with a friend of hers. And as they were headed home, they saw an ominous sight, Madam Speaker. They saw the car of her estranged husband. Now, he had been ordered to stay away from her, Madam Speaker, but he didn't care. And there was a conditional bond to stay away from her, but he didn't care. And there was a court order, an order of protection to stay away from her, but he didn't care.

And when Nell Lindsey and her friend saw that ominous sight of Marion Lindsey in a car, they did a very smart thing, Madam Speaker. They headed straight for the Inman Police Department. And they're jumping over railroad tracks, and they're running stop signs, and they're running red lights. And Nell gets out her cell phone and she calls 911. And she says, Please help, please help.

So they pull into the back parking lot of the Inman Police Department, and she still has the cell phone to her ear, and through the audiotape that we played at trial, Madam Speaker, you could hear Nell Lindsey saying, Please help, please help. And then you heard four gunshots. And when they took her body out of the back seat of that car, she still had the cell phone in her hand.

The system failed Nell Lindsey, Madam Speaker. She did everything we tell battered and abused women to do. The courts couldn't save her, the prosecutors couldn't save her. Her husband's on death row, but that doesn't

save her. But even in her death, Madam Speaker, she did something good because she spawned changes in South Carolina in the way that we treat violence against women.

And with the help of Violence Against Women grants, like the ones that are at jeopardy today, with the help of those grants, and a woman named Lynn Hawkins, who I must concede, Madam Speaker, does not share my political ideology in any way, shape, or form, but she put the political sloganeering and the bumper stickers behind and she said, let's change the system in South Carolina, and we did it. It wasn't in time to save Nell Lindsey, but it was in time to save a graveyard full of other women in our State.

So I'm going to ask simply this, Madam Speaker: Can we stop the election-year gimmicks? Can we stop these manufactured wars that pit one group of Americans against another group of Americans?

I spent 16 years prosecuting men who raped, stabbed, strangled, shot, and killed women. I have a mother, a wife, a daughter, three sisters, and the images of countless women indelibly imprinted on my mind because they were killed by men who claimed to care about them.

This is not about politics to me. If you want to make women safer, then change the way we draw juries, change the discovery rules, improve the rape shield statute. But stop focusing on November's election for just one afternoon and wonder with me what good we can accomplish if we will stop the political games, and if we could pick up some humanity and embrace the fact that, even in a political environment as dysfunctional as this one, we can find common ground when it comes to fighting for those who have no voice, who have nobody to stand up for them.

Madam Speaker, the political games have to stop, at least for a day. They have to stop. If this bill fails, it will be because those on the other side were so bent on making a point that they stopped caring about making a difference.

Madam Speaker, the Senate bill is fundamentally and constitutionally flawed. Further, to say, Madam Chair, it continues to pit one group of Americans against another group of Americans solely for political reasons. Lady Justice doesn't do that, and politicians shouldn't do it either. I urge support for this bill.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, the House Majority's version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, which eliminates important protections for women that have been supported on a bipartisan basis for many years.

The tragedy of domestic violence is a reality for many families in our country and around the world. Unfortunately, it likely touches someone we know. Domestic violence affects people at all income levels, ethnicities, and ages.

Since its enactment in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) has been improved with each renewal in 2000 and 2005.

It has been done on a bipartisan basis. The Senate's 2012 VAWA reauthorization bill passed by a 68–31 margin.

The same cannot be said for this bill, which barely passed the House Judiciary Committee by a 17–15 vote along mostly partisan lines. Rather than addressing serious gaps in protection and services, H.R. 4970 rolls back critical safeguards that have long been part of this law and repeals current law requiring abuser-submitted evidence to be corroborated before it can be used against a victim. These safeguards were included as part of previous reauthorizations and are included in S. 1925, the Senate's 2012 bipartisan reauthorization bill. With these provisions stripped, H.R. 4970 leaves countless women, including LGBT, immigrant, and American Indian victims at risk.

The bill puts abused immigrant women at increased risk by imposing new, burdensome procedural hurdles that would delay or deny protections and put victims in a more vulnerable position than they would be under current law. Law enforcement groups, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National District Attorneys Association, and National Association of Attorneys General support provisions in current law and in the Senate bill that protect immigrant women and help police and prosecutors pursue cases against dangerous perpetrators.

The House Majority's VAWA reauthorization would abolish significant enhancements contained in the bipartisan Senate bill. For LGBT victims of domestic violence, H.R. 4970 fails to prohibit discrimination and ensure equal access to services. This bill would do away with provisions designed to provide justice to American Indian women by eliminating provisions empowering tribes with jurisdiction to prosecute non-Indian perpetrators on their lands.

Our Nation's most vulnerable victims of violence stand to lose from this reauthorization should it become law. I am dismayed to see that some could actually support legislation that provides protections for abusers rather than the abused. I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 4970.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. This controversial bill would weaken long-standing protections and fails to protect the most vulnerable victims of violence.

Last month, the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Instead of supporting the bipartisan Senate bill, House Republicans introduced a dangerous partisan bill that rolls back many vital protections for battered women and shifts the power into the hands of abusers. This bill fails to protect battered immigrant spouses legally here, diminishes protections for the LGBT community, and neglects challenges facing Native American victims. It is a slap in the face to victims and those who have worked tirelessly to protect them.

One out of every four women in the United States is physically assaulted by an intimate partner and more than 740,000 children and youth are treated in hospital emergency departments as a result of violence each year—more than 84 every hour. In Texas, last year the number of family violence fatalities in-

creased 28 percent from 2010. In El Paso, Texas according to the El Paso Police Department, police responded to 200 reports of sexual assault and 4,500 domestic violence cases just last year.

These numbers indicate the severity of a widespread problem that can have devastating social and health-related consequences and this bill will only weaken the confidentiality provisions for victims seeking protection from further violence. This bill reverses the "U" visa program that encourages immigrant victims of crime to report and help prosecute serious criminal activity and now will create obstacles for those seeking to report crimes. Now immigrant victims will be far less likely to share potentially valuable information with police that could help solve crimes and prosecute offenders.

Republicans in the House should drop their misguided attempt to undermine the Violence Against Women Act that puts the safety and security of women at risk and instead should reauthorize and strengthen the existing program, as the Senate has already done. House Republicans should be ashamed of politicizing such an important issue and for attempting to roll back longstanding bipartisan protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual violence.

As the National Organization for Women has stated, this bill "disregards the biases and disrespect that certain victims face when seeking help from the criminal justice system and access to lifesaving services, effectively giving second-class treatment to Native American, immigrant women, and LGBT victims. The bill smacks of willful ignorance of the problem and hostility to people deemed not to be 'true' victims." I fully support this statement because the fact of the matter is, violence is violence, regardless of who the victim is.

As a husband, father, and grandfather to four wonderful women, this issue is very important to me. If there is any issue where we should all agree, it is to help stop domestic and sexual violence, and to protect all victims. This should not be a political issue, but a matter of protecting those whom are most vulnerable. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this partisan measure.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, and I encourage the majority to instead take up the bipartisan version of the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization that passed the Senate. I would like to thank my colleague, GWEN MOORE for her steadfast and unyielding work on this issue, and I was proud to join her as a cosponsor of the version of the VAWA reauthorization that she introduced in the House.

Since 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has been reauthorized without controversy, almost entirely devoid of any partisan rancor or division. It is an essential piece of legislation that seeks to protect the victims of abuse and offer them much-needed support. Since its original passage, and during each of the previous reauthorizations, Congress has continued to improve the VAWA by increasing protections for women every time it has come to the floor.

This year, both the bipartisan Senate bill and Congresswoman MOORE's bill offer reforms that make certain that when we pass a law that protects all women, we mean all

women—with no exceptions. The reauthorization should include the new language proposed in those bills which would guarantee that the law will not discriminate against any woman based on her race, color, religion, national origin or sexual orientation.

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that my Republican colleagues will end this partisan gamesmanship on an issue that has always been, and should always be a bipartisan one. I join my colleagues, as well as hundreds of organizations and groups, and women across the country in opposing this bill.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us to pass the bipartisan Senate bill which ensures equal protection to all women in the United States of America.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I believe every Member of the House supports the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. However, I oppose the bill we are considering today because it contains serious gaps in its protections for Native American victims of domestic violence and it does not include language to ban discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered victims in grant programs under the bill.

The bill fails to grant the tribal police and courts, generally the closest legal authorities for an alleged incident of domestic violence occurring on a reservation, the authority to address an incident occurring on tribal lands. Instead, tribal residents in my district would be forced to rely on Federal courts, located several hours away in Tacoma and Seattle, for help and protection. This puts a terrible and potentially dangerous burden on Indian victims in need of a protection order, many of whom do not have the means to travel this distance. Furthermore, the requirement forcing a victim to disclose her residential address called for in Section 1006 of the bill may well put her in further jeopardy.

I am also deeply concerned about the bill's refusal to prohibit discrimination against LGBT individuals in all VAWA programs. No victim of violence of any kind should be denied assistance simply because his or her sexual orientation. It is wrong that the bill further perpetuates this inequity, and I fear the reasons are purely political.

The answer to this problem is simple. A bipartisan compromise reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act passed the other body with 68 votes in favor, including 15 Republicans. It resolved these issues in a way that was acceptable to both sides, and I encourage the leadership in the House to allow this bill to come to the floor for a vote immediately.

I urge my colleagues to reject this flawed bill and to push for the consideration of a truly bipartisan reauthorization bill before the week is out.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant but strong opposition to H.R. 4970, a needlessly partisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) that unwisely undermines important protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Initially enacted in 1994, VAWA acknowledges the harmful and persistent impact that domestic violence, sexual assault, and dating violence has on our society. Nearly one in four women are the victims of rape or abuse by a partner during adulthood, with young women between the ages of 16 and 24 experiencing

the highest rate of partner violence. One in four girls and one in six boys are sexually abused before the age of 18, half of whom are victims of incest. Nationwide, approximately three women are killed each day by a current or former intimate partner.

In addition to the physical and emotional trauma experienced by victims, domestic violence and sexual assaults impose a tremendous economic cost on our nation. Rape is the most costly crime to its victims, totaling \$127 billion a year in medical costs, lost earnings, and diminished quality of life. The cost of intimate partner violence exceeds \$5.8 billion, including \$4.1 billion in direct health care expenses. Over 25 percent of domestic violence victims report that they lost a job, at least in part, because of this violence. In total, domestic violence is estimated to cost employers in the U.S. up to \$13 billion every year.

To address this staggering problem, VAWA established streamlined programs to provide law enforcement, judges and prosecutors, and social service providers with the resources they need to hold offenders accountable and support the needs of victims. It allowed for coordinated, community-based services for victims and strengthened housing protections. VAWA also created important prevention programs for young people and improved the response to violence against Native American women and those in underserved communities. The tangible results of VAWA are impressive and should make all Americans proud.

Since 1994, reporting of domestic violence has increased by as much as 51 percent, while the number of individuals killed by an intimate partner has decreased 34 percent for women and 57 percent for men. States have enacted important protections for victims of stalking and strengthened rape laws in response to VAWA. Many more victims of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault are able to access critical services. An entire generation of justice system professionals now understands that our society cannot tolerate these crimes. In just the first six years after enactment, VAWA saved an estimated \$12.6 billion in net averted costs.

Yet, the bill before us today betrays the bipartisan history of VAWA. It fails to contain important reforms included in a Senate-passed version of the bill that ensure LGBT, Native American, and immigrant women receive the protections they deserve. The bill lacks protections for LGBT survivors despite the fact that studies have clearly shown that these individuals are underserved explicitly because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. It fails to provide American Indian women effective recourse to bring justice against non-Indian abusers, even though these women face rates of victimization more than double that of non-Indian women. And the bill, for the first time ever, weakens protections in current law for migrant victims of violence. The bill would leave immigrant victims without meaningful access to protection, create processing delays that will keep women in life-threatening situations for longer periods of time, and undermine law enforcement efforts to investigate and prosecute violent crimes with the assistance of immigrant victims.

Compounding the serious flaws in the legislation, Republicans forced the bill to the floor under a closed rule, allowing no opportunity for Democratic Members to offer amendments

to improve the bill. Instead of following a truly democratic process to debate these important policy provisions, the majority finds it more important to shield their side from uncomfortable votes. This procedure is inappropriate for legislation as important as VAWA and is clearly inconsistent with the majority's pledge for a more open Congress.

VAWA always has been, and should have remained, a bipartisan bill. I am deeply troubled that my Republican colleagues decided to roll back protections for victims of abuse and failed to include the responsible reforms contained in the Senate bill that passed by a bipartisan vote of 68–31. We must pass a strong VAWA reauthorization, but this bill falls well short of that critical necessity.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I encourage the Republican leadership to allow a vote on the bipartisan Senate bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I cannot support the H.R. 4970, the Republican bill that rolls back critical protections for domestic violence victims. Until now, reauthorization of the Violence against Women Act has involved a strong, bipartisan effort. In sharp contrast to this bipartisan history, the Republican Leadership aggressively is pushing a bill that weakens current law, shifts power into the hands of abusers, delays or denies protection to battered spouses and victims of heinous crimes such as rape and sexual assault, prevents law enforcement from gaining the cooperation of many immigrant victims of serious crimes, and leaves more dangerous criminals on the streets to strike again. This is unacceptable and undermines the intent of the bill to protect all victims of domestic and sexual violence.

In April 2012, the Senate passed by a vote of 68 to 31 a bipartisan bill that advanced the Federal government's commitment to protecting all victims—a bill that strengthens current law. In sharp contrast to the bipartisan Senate bill, the Republican bill fails to include key protections for Native American, immigrant, and LGBT victims of domestic violence. Even with the Manager's Amendment, the Republican bill undermines key protections for many domestic violence victims, making them less safe and tarnishing our American value of protecting the vulnerable. It is no wonder that over 100 organizations oppose the House Republican bill.

So, I stand with the diverse group of organizations—including the NAACP, the National Women's Law Center, the Human Rights Campaign, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors to strongly oppose the House Republican bill and to support the bipartisan Senate bill. As policymakers, we should be protecting our citizens, not decreasing their safety.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which is an affront to women, their rights and their safety.

It is worth noting that the Violence Against Women Act was originally passed under a Republican Congress. Its provisions that protect immigrant women passed in 2000 and 2005—again during Republican majorities.

Yet, today, we are voting on legislation that would gut these protections, delivering women seeking help into the hands of their abusers—endangering their safety and their lives.

Immigrant women are disproportionately impacted by domestic violence. One study from New York City found that 51 percent of domestic partner homicide victims were foreign-

born. Other research has suggested that, among undocumented Latina women, the rate of battering is as high as 34%.

For immigrant women, there can be language barriers preventing them from seeking help. In many cases, abusers may try to use the threat of deportation to prevent their victims from leaving.

The Violence Against Women Act is designed to help those who are most vulnerable and who need assistance. Instead, the provisions being offered by the Majority, today, would make it harder for those who have been battered to escape abuse and find safety. This legislation weakens confidentiality protections that prevent abusers from knowing their victims are seeking help. Needless, duplicative interviews with DHS would make it harder for those who are abused to secure assistance through the immigration system. The legislation would also make it more difficult for those cooperating with law enforcement to avoid deportation. Collectively, these provisions effectively cut women off from help, making it harder for them to avail themselves of the legal process.

Make no mistake: despite what our Republican colleagues say, these provisions will not reduce immigration fraud. That argument is a red herring. Indeed, there is not one shred of evidence suggesting female immigrants are misusing the Violence Against Women Act.

How can we turn our back on women who need assistance? What kind of a message does it send to pass this legislation? Are we saying to those who suffer abuse they do not "count" because they are undocumented?

I say to my colleagues—let us send another message. Reject this legislation. Pass a real Violence Against Women Act that does not divide us by playing politics, but extends help to women who need it.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, it is with great disappointment that I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2012. I was proud to support the original Violence Against Women Act when Congress passed it with bipartisan support in 1994 because it created landmark programs to help victims of domestic violence, provided grants for law enforcement agencies, and established new categories of crimes such as stalking. VAWA is one of the true bipartisan success stories in Congress and it has achieved a real, significant and lasting impact on our nation. Since VAWA first passed, the annual incidence of domestic violence has decreased by 53 percent. However, there is still much work to be done, as approximately one in five women have been raped in their lifetime, and 45 percent of the women killed in the United States die after being attacked by an intimate partner.

Given the fact that violence against women continues to be a serious problem in this country, it is disappointing to see the Republican majority pursue such a partisan and reckless path forward with this legislation. Instead of following the Senate's lead, which passed an effective and bipartisan bill to reauthorize VAWA, the GOP has decided to play politics with this important issue and has significantly weakened protections for battered women and instituted discriminatory policies. Specifically, H.R. 4970 does not include key provisions of the Senate bill which ensure that LGBT victims are not discriminated against in VAWA programs. We can all agree that no

victim of domestic abuse should be denied care because of their sexual orientation. As a lifetime supporter of civil rights I cannot in good conscience support legislation which would permit this to happen.

Further, three out of five Native American women are victims of domestic violence in their lifetime, which is a pressing national problem. The Senate bill addresses this concern by including provisions which would give Native American tribal governments jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute incidents of violence, in addition to providing grants to assist tribes in prosecuting such crimes. Yet H.R. 4970 does not adequately address these concerns by not including any of these provisions in the legislation. Such crass indifference makes this legislation impossible to support.

The path forward to reauthorize VAWA is clear. The Senate sent a clear message by passing a strong, bipartisan bill, and the House should do the same. Let us stop fighting these needless partisan battles and instead come together to reauthorize a program which has worked so well over the years. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 4970 and support the Senate bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, has historically provided a vast network of support for victims of dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking since its initial passage in 1994. Declining instances of domestic violence and increased awareness surrounding these forms of abuse are a testament to the success of VAWA's programs, and to the importance of its preservation. Unless VAWA is reauthorized, these programs will no longer be available to protect the countless victims of domestic violence and abuse throughout the United States.

Today, as Congress seeks to reauthorize this landmark piece of legislation for the third time, VAWA is at serious risk of being stripped of its most important provisions. The Senate version of VAWA was adopted on April 26 with bipartisan support, and not only preserves important protections for women but also expands those protections to LGBT individuals and Native American women. Conversely, H.R. 4970 represents a partisan bill that rolls back existing protections and excludes entire groups of victims.

As long as H.R. 4970 excludes critical improvements and disregards the recommendations of key stakeholders, I cannot support this bill. In the previous reauthorization, VAWA was drafted in a bipartisan fashion and included meaningful provisions for protecting battered and abused individuals, and as such I supported its passage. Unfortunately, H.R. 4970 completely fails to achieve the original objectives behind VAWA, and actually does more to harm women than it does to help them overcome their aggressors.

To show my support for VAWA, I have joined my colleagues as a cosponsor of H.R. 4271, an alternative to H.R. 4970 that contains language more consistent with the original intent of the bill. H.R. 4271 is simply a better bill that goes further to recognize the same prevalence of abuse among Native American women and LGBT individuals, and ensures that all victims are protected regardless of sexual orientation or national origin.

Madam Speaker, this attack on women needs to stop immediately. I can find no jus-

tification for why this Congress should exclude certain groups of women from the protections afforded by VAWA. The bill that is being considered before the House today does a disservice to victims of domestic abuse in the U.S., and falls drastically short of the original intent of the law.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012. The Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, has been instrumental in protecting women from domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Domestic violence often has devastating consequences for women, their families, and society as a whole.

VAWA provides essential grants including educational programs for the prevention of domestic violence in schools, battered women's shelters, a national domestic violence hotline, grants to improve law enforcement and prosecution of violent crimes against women, among others. It also provides much needed services for the protection of children from maltreatment, sexual assault, and domestic violence.

A manager's amendment was offered to address some immigrant protection issues with H.R. 4970, but did very little to change the original bill. H.R. 4970 would change the requirements for abused immigrant spouses of U.S. citizens and permanent residents by imposing a higher standard of proof than required for asylum applications, and by allowing government adjudicators to break confidentiality and interview an accused abuser. The revised bill would only prohibit basing decisions exclusively on the information provided by the abusive spouse. The bill would also decrease protections for immigrant victims by undermining the U visa program, which allows an immigrant victim of a serious crime to stay in the U.S. to assist law enforcement in investigating and prosecuting the crime. The manager's amendment only provides a small portion of victims the opportunity to adjust their legal status after their U visa expires. Battered immigrant spouses would be less likely to report abuse if they could still be deported and their abusive spouses would be made aware they are trying to seek help.

H.R. 4970 ignores improving the safety of co-ed students on college campuses. Provisions to strengthen requirements for universities to report on how they address sexual violence on campus, were removed from the bill. If college campuses are not protected from sexual harassment, assault, or violence; students will not be able to learn and could potentially miss out on true educational opportunities.

The bill would not restore Native American tribal courts' jurisdiction over crimes of domestic violence or dating violence committed on reservations and tribal lands in cases where the victim is a tribal member but the defendant is not. Those cases currently fall outside the jurisdiction of both tribal and state courts and are rarely prosecuted on the federal level.

I believe it is important to provide preventative domestic violence programs as well as help those who have been affected by domestic violence with programs that can help them recover and protect them in the future. Many of the domestic violence programs that we have today would not be able to continue without the reauthorization of VAWA. H.R. 4970

mitigates VAWA's 18-year history and abandons many victims of domestic and sexual violence.

As a supporter of VAWA from the beginning, I urge all my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4970 and to vote on a bill that would allow these much needed programs and services to continue so that we may work to stop domestic violence.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, this week, the House of Representatives is expected to take up a bill reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), a traditionally noncontroversial bill that improves the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes against women. The bill works: We've seen a 60 percent decrease in domestic violence since the bill first passed in 1994.

The Senate recently passed its version of this bill in an overwhelming, bipartisan vote. Unfortunately, the partisan House version rolls back some of its most critical components, limiting protections for certain classes of women. In fact, women's advocacy groups like the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence say this bill would discourage victims of these heinous crimes from going to the police for help and actually increase abusers' power.

I can't support this bill for a number of reasons, but chief among them are its failure to include provisions to help reduce violence against young women on college campuses. This issue, in particular, resonates as we mark the second anniversary of the tragic death of Yeardeley Love, a Baltimore native and student athlete at the University of Virginia who was beaten by her abusive ex-boyfriend.

Yeardeley's mother, Sharon Love, recently visited Washington to encourage lawmakers to swiftly pass the VAWA reauthorization approved by the Senate. That bill requires colleges to provide clear protocols and disciplinary policies for reports of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking. It also requires colleges to help victims report the incident to law enforcement and seek a protective order if they choose to do so, as well as provide victims with options to change academic, living and transportation arrangements. Finally, it provides prevention programs for students who could be abusers, victims and bystanders.

It is shameful that the architects of the House bill have opted to remove these critical components. I am urging House leadership to bring the Senate version to a vote so we can provide real protection to women of all ages and races.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, House Republicans say they want to prevent violence against women, yet because of their ideological agenda, the bill on the floor this week actually eliminates current protections for battered women, placing them in danger.

Domestic violence does not respect any boundary; it does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or political affiliation.

Turning Points, the only domestic violence intervention program in Prince William County, served 6,000 clients last year. In Fairfax County, there were more than 8,000 cases of domestic violence reported, and we have seen a 40 percent increase in homelessness due to domestic violence.

Yet House Republicans would make it harder for women to come forward to report abuse.

In a letter to the Judiciary Committee, law enforcement officials from across the Nation said the Republican bill, quote, "will turn back the clock on over 17 years' of progress made by law enforcement in reducing violence against women and children in our communities."

Madam Speaker, protecting women and children from abusive situations should not be a partisan issue. We should take up the Senate's bipartisan bill and not further abuse these poor victims.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, It is with great pleasure to rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Act. In doing so, I am reminded of an old Samoan belief that the female siblings are the "tama sa" or sacred child in the family. They are to be treated with respect, care and love—offenders of this ancient taboo often faced extreme consequences. Madam Speaker, I am in full support of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

While I fully support reauthorization of an Act of Congress that since 1994 has been an essential tool to protect victims of domestic and sexual violence, I do however have some major concerns with H.R. 4970, legislation before us today. Unlike the Senate reauthorization bill, S. 1925, introduced by Senators PATRICK LEAHY and MIKE CRAPO and was passed by the Senate last month with strong bipartisan support, H.R. 4970 introduced by my colleague Ms. SANDY ADAMS, will effectively bring more harm than protect victims of domestic violence.

Madam Speaker, unlike S. 1925, H.R. 4970 offers no protection for Indian spouses abused on tribal land. Under a 1978 Supreme Court decision, non-Indians cannot be prosecuted by tribal courts for crimes committed on tribal land. Last July, the Justice Department recommended that Congress give tribes local authority to prosecute non-Indians in misdemeanor domestic and dating violence cases.

Madam Speaker, the Senate reauthorization bill, S. 1925, will do just that. It will recognize certain tribes' concurrent jurisdiction to investigate, prosecute, convict, and sentence persons who assault Indian spouses, intimate partners, or dating partners, or who violate protection orders, in Indian country. It recognizes that tribal nations may be best able to address in their own communities—neither the United States nor any State would lose any criminal jurisdiction as a result.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4970 on the other hand, completely ignores this ongoing injustice against Indian spouses, wives or partners, on tribal lands.

I am also disappointed that certain provisions in H.R. 4970 would strip away some of the existing protection for immigrant victims of abusive relationships. As it stands now, VAWA allows battered immigrants to petition for their own immigrant status, independent of their abusive spouses and thus freeing them from their spouse's abuse and control. If enacted however, H.R. 4970 will allow immigration officers to interview an alleged offender and consider the information obtained in making a determination about the adjudication of a battered immigrant's petition for status. This allows abusers to manipulate the immigration process to cause further harm on the victim. Moreover, it will reveal confidential information necessary to protect the victim and her children from the unwanted advances of an abusive spouse or partner.

Madam Speaker, in the ancient Samoan culture, it is a great shame to the male sibling if any harm or injury happens to the "sacred child". It is within this cultural context, and also with a deep sense of fairness and justice that I urge my colleagues to pass the Senate reauthorization bill. The house bill H.R. 4970, while it was written with good intention, does not do justice for the women of this country.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, the House Republican version of this bill rolls back existing protections for immigrants who are victims of domestic violence and strips provisions in the Senate version that protect Native Americans and LGBT abuse victims.

Republicans have decided to use this non-partisan issue to push their war on women further than many of us thought possible. This new bill says that if a Native American or immigrant—documented or not—is the victim of abuse, the government should turn a blind eye. This is a cold, heartless vision of what law enforcement means to the American people, and it's hard to find words strong enough to reject it.

The House bill eliminates an existing confidentiality clause known as the self-petitioning process that allows abused women to apply confidentially, if appropriate, for protected immigration status. If the clause is removed from current law, women legally in the country because of a pending marriage who suffer abuse would not be able to keep their applications for permanent status private from their abusers. Boyfriends or husbands would be able to revoke the citizenship application, making the abused woman revert to undocumented status and limiting her legal options.

Men shouldn't be able to abuse women and control their access to law enforcement at the same time. This is a scary scenario that we shouldn't even have to contemplate.

Currently, Federal and State law enforcement officers have exclusive authority to prosecute misdemeanor domestic violence crimes committed by non-Indians on Tribal lands, many of which are known to go unprosecuted for logistical and other reasons. The Senate VAWA reauthorization bill lets Tribal law enforcement exercise jurisdiction over such cases, while the House version maintains the status quo. The unfortunate situation of abused Native women has been ignored for far too long. The law should protect all women from abuse, wherever they live. Republicans found an awful lot of nerve to deny equal protection to millions of Native American women for no reason I can tell.

The Senate version includes a provision that helps colleges and universities increase violence-prevention education and reduce dating abuse and sexual assault. The House version does not include that language. The Senate version prevents any entity that receives Federal anti-abuse grants from turning away LGBT victims when they have suffered from domestic violence or abuse. The House version is silent on the issue.

According to a National Network to End Domestic Violence report, "Domestic violence impacts one in four American women over their lifetimes, and 15.5 million children are exposed to domestic violence each year. Victims rely on services to escape violence and rebuild their lives. When victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence or stalking take the difficult step to reach out for help, many are in life-threatening situations and must be able to find immediate refuge."

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012, offered by Representative ADAMS of Florida. I wish to extend my deep appreciation to Representative ADAMS for her leadership in introducing this legislation and my heart goes out to her and all of the women across the country who have been victims of domestic violence.

Each year, there are more than 200,000 victims of sexual assault nationwide. Sixty-two domestic violence deaths occurred in my home State of Indiana within a recent twelve-month period. As a husband to a wonderful wife and a father of two precious daughters, I strongly support efforts to end sexual violence and domestic abuse.

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was originally passed by Congress in 1994 to address rising violent crime rates against women, and in subsequent years we have witnessed a dramatic reduction in the incidence of domestic violence in this country. In 2006, I supported legislation to reauthorize VAWA, which added improvements to enhance sentencing for repeat sex offenders and require pretrial detention of child pornographers.

While we have made progress in our fight against domestic and sexual violence, there is still work to be done, and that is why this reauthorization legislation is so important. Today's legislation continues our fight to prevent victims of these tragic crimes. It includes enhanced tools for law enforcement to arrest abusers and those who violate protection orders. It increases penalties for sexual assault and abuse. It funds programs to aid domestic violence victims seeking refuge from their abusers, and it promotes awareness in an effort to prevent these crimes from occurring in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to support this reauthorization of VAWA and to support our continued efforts to combat sexual violence and domestic abuse.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, House Republicans say they want to prevent violence against women, yet because of their ideological agenda, the bill on the floor this week actually eliminates current protections for battered women, placing them in danger.

Domestic violence does not respect any boundary; it does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or political affiliation.

Turning Points, the only domestic violence intervention program in Prince William County, served 6,000 clients last year. In Fairfax County, there were more than 8,000 cases of domestic violence reported, and we have seen a 40 percent increase in homelessness due to domestic violence.

Yet House Republicans would make it harder for women to come forward to report abuse. In a letter to the Judiciary Committee, law enforcement officials from across the Nation said the Republican bill, quote, "will turn back the clock on over 17 years' of progress made by law enforcement in reducing violence against women and children in our communities."

Madam Speaker, protecting women and children from abusive situations should not be a partisan issue. We should take up the Senate's bipartisan bill and not further abuse these poor victims.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)

should present Congress with an opportunity to set aside our many differences and work together so that women and families across the country can lead safer, healthier, and happier lives. VAWA has transformed our Nation's response to violence against women and brought critically needed resources to states and local communities so they can prosecute these crimes. Reauthorizing VAWA is essential. For these reasons, I am both saddened and angered that the Republican House majority has squandered this opportunity.

All women, no matter what their background or lifestyle, deserve to live free of violence and danger. Our Senate colleagues recognize this. They passed a thoughtful reauthorization bill that helps women in need.

The Senate bill prohibits discrimination against gay or transgender individuals in VAWA programs. It ensures that immigrant women can file domestic violence complaints without fear for their safety. It extends vital protections to Native American women by permitting non-Indian men who commit violent crimes against them on tribal land to be prosecuted through the tribal system. It also includes important improvements to better address the high rates of dating violence and sexual assault experienced by people in college and other educational settings.

In contrast, the House Republican VAWA bill leaves out all of these protections. It delivers the reprehensible message that women in the United States are not worthy of protection if they are gay, Indian, or non-citizens and it flat out fails to make other needed updates to the law.

Congress should not be in the business of choosing who is and is not deserving of safety. Every woman should have access to protective services if and when she needs it. The regressive policy in H.R. 4970 falls far short of this goal. I stand with President Obama and women's advocates across our country in opposing this bill and I urge all my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Yes, ma'am, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Moore moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4970 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 30, after line 3, insert the following:
SEC. 6. PROTECTING CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVACY OF VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to eliminate, reduce, or otherwise limit any protection in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act that provides confidentiality to victims of domestic vio-

lence to protect such victims from future violence. This protection includes preventing notification of a victim's efforts to seek assistance from law enforcement from being exposed or transmitted to the victim's suspected batterer.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, if the final amendment that I'm offering here today were to be adopted, is it not the case that the bill will be amended and that the House will then proceed to final passage right away?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair stated on February 27, 2002, and May 10, 2012, if a motion to recommit with forthwith instructions is adopted, the amendment is reported by the chair of the committee and is immediately before the House.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit simply clarifies that the preservation of confidentiality to protect the victims' identity to avoid retaliation and even loss of life shall not be weakened as compared to current law.

□ 1650

We have debated the need to expand this bill beyond what the author has put in. We have lost that debate because the Rules Committee has put forth a closed rule, and we do not have the opportunity to present the Senate version of the bill, which passed overwhelmingly in the Senate 68-31. So we have lost that battle for the Violence Against Women Act to include all women.

In this motion, we are simply trying to reestablish one little sliver—one little piece—in this bill that we are hoping the majority will recognize will greatly enhance the safety of all women. This motion simply protects the victim's identity to avoid retaliation and even the loss of life, and it makes sure it is not weakened as compared to current law. Now, we are going to be told that the manager's amendment does that, but it does not.

Under current law, abused women are able to seek help and come forward to authorities under the condition of confidentiality; but H.R. 4970, as amended, does a couple of things. For example, it delays the protection of battered victims by staying adjudications before pending investigations or prosecutions are completed. It creates a negative inference against the victim if law enforcement does not open a formal investigation or if prosecutors fail to prosecute the perpetrator. I can tell you that, notwithstanding the due process rights of abusers, current law provides a very delicate balance between the due process rights of abusers and the confidentiality of those accusers.

The fact that the bill was amended in this way restimulates me to remember

an incident in my own life when the balance of rights was tipped in favor of the abuser. I am reminded of a time when I got into an automobile, with a man whom I thought to be a personal friend, to go get some fried chicken. He pulled in behind some vacant buildings, and he raped me and choked me almost to death. When I went to the hospital, I was encouraged by an advocate—this was in the 1970s, long before there was a Violence Against Women Act, long before there was a Rape Shield Act—to take him to court.

Indeed, I was on trial because, like this bill—and just like what I experienced—I had to prove as a victim that I was not being fraudulent in my accusations. Oh, they brought up how I was an unwed mother with a baby. Maybe I seduced him. They talked about how I was dressed, and they carried me through all kinds of bureaucratic hoops. Ultimately, he was found to be not guilty; although, I had done everything that I was told to do in terms of prosecuting this. I cannot stress the solemn nature of this issue.

It doesn't surprise me that she had the cell phone in her hand but that she lost her life because she couldn't escape this man. It doesn't surprise me that she was shot four times behind the police station. The most dangerous time for a woman is when she is trying to escape her perpetrator, when she is trying to do something about it, when she is trying to turn her life around, hers and her children's.

When the perpetrator is given the tools that this bill gives him to have an abuser's rights prevail over the rights of the victim's, she will have the cell phone in her hand, but she will lose her life anyway because she cannot escape this man. The manager's amendment does not fix this. We have heard from 325 groups and organizations that oppose this bill and say that the manager's amendment does not fix it, so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. ADAMS. I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, Democrats in Congress and others have been accusing Republicans for months for waging a war on women. We've been called antivictim, elitist, homophobic, and racist. These ridiculous attacks stop now—right here, right now. It's a shame, really. We've always had a bipartisan vote on this issue. It has always been a bipartisan issue, but this year, it has turned into an election year politic.

The Violence Against Women Act was bipartisan legislation when it was enacted in 1994 and when it was reauthorized by a Republican-controlled House in 2000 and in 2006. Instead of coming together to reauthorize grant programs to help victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, my colleagues on

the other side of the aisle have created a phony war on women to score political points. These attacks are unfortunate and divisive. Domestic violence knows no political or socioeconomic boundaries. Neither should legislation to fund these important programs.

Critics of this bill outright dismiss the dozens of good, broadly bipartisan things that this bill does in its nearly 200 pages of text, and they have chosen to focus their attention on a handful of things it doesn't do. So let's be real about what the bill does:

It reauthorizes the VAWA grant programs for 5 years at the same levels as the Senate-passed bill. That's over \$680 million a year in Federal funds to support these programs, and this is on top of the increase in funding for these programs that were adopted just last week by this House in the CJS appropriations bill.

It sets aside specific funding for sexual assault investigations, prosecutions, and victim services as well as reauthorizes State rape prevention education programs, programs to promote educational awareness to prevent violence and to improve services for young victims. The bill also improves emergency and transitional housing services for victims.

This bill provides greater protections to Indian women by designating domestic violence tribal liaisons within the U.S. Attorney's Offices, and it creates a new provision to allow victims of domestic violence or Indian tribes on behalf of victims to seek protection orders from U.S. district courts against Indian or non-Indian abusers.

When I made the decision to pack what few belongings I could carry and leave with my daughter to escape an abusive relationship, all I cared about was protecting my daughter and providing her a safe and healthy life. In my years of service in law enforcement, not once did a domestic assault or rape victim question where the help was coming from or which political party or organizations endorsed the law that made that funding possible.

The reason for that is this: This bill isn't about Washington politics. It's about people's lives.

If you vote against this bill today, you will vote to deny help to millions of victims. Opponents are willing to sacrifice helping millions of American women escape their abusers in the name of political gamesmanship, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and "yes" on the final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4970, if ordered, and suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 2621, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 236, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—187

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

NAYS—236

Adams	Bilirakis	Canseco
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Cantor
Akin	Black	Capito
Alexander	Blackburn	Carter
Amash	Bonner	Chabot
Amodei	Bono Mack	Chaffetz
Austria	Boustany	Coble
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Coffman (CO)
Bachus	Brooks	Cole
Barletta	Broun (GA)	Conaway
Bartlett	Buchanan	Cravaack
Barton (TX)	Bucshon	Crawford
Bass (NH)	Buerkle	Crenshaw
Benishek	Burgess	Culberson
Berg	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Biggert	Camp	Denham
Bilbray	Campbell	Dent

DesJarlais King (IA)
 Diaz-Balart King (NY)
 Dold Kingston
 Dreier Kinzinger (IL)
 Duffy Kline
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn
 Duncan (TN) Lance
 Ellmers Lankford
 Emerson Latham
 Farenthold LaTourette
 Fincher Latta
 Fitzpatrick Lewis (CA)
 Flake LoBiondo
 Fleischmann Long
 Fleming Lucas
 Flores Luetkemeyer
 Forbes Lummis
 Fortenberry Lungren, Daniel
 Foxx E.
 Franks (AZ) Mack
 Frelinghuysen Manzullo
 Gallegly Marchant
 Gardner Marino
 Garrett McCarthy (CA)
 Gerlach McCaul
 Gibbs McClintock
 Gibson McCotter
 Gingrey (GA) McHenry
 Gohmert McKeon
 Goodlatte McKinley
 Gosar McMorris
 Gowdy Rodgers
 Granger Meehan
 Graves (GA) Mica
 Graves (MO) Miller (FL)
 Griffin (AR) Miller (MI)
 Griffith (VA) Miller, Gary
 Grimm Mulvaney
 Guinta Murphy (PA)
 Guthrie Myrick
 Hall Neugebauer
 Hanna Noem
 Harper Nugent
 Harris Nunes
 Hartzler Nunnelee
 Hastings (WA) Olson
 Hayworth Palazzo
 Heck Paul
 Hensarling Paulsen
 Herger Pearce
 Herrera Beutler Pence
 Huelskamp Petri
 Huizenga (MI) Pitts
 Hultgren Platts
 Hunter Poe (TX)
 Hurt Pompeo
 Issa Posey
 Jenkins Price (GA)
 Johnson (IL) Quayle
 Johnson (OH) Yoder
 Johnson, Sam Rehberg
 Jordan Reichert
 Kelly Renacci

NOT VOTING—8

Cassidy Johnson (GA) Sánchez, Linda
 Filner Labrador T.
 Hinojosa Landry Slaughter

□ 1720

Messrs. RUNYAN and FINCHER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri, MARCHANT, BROOKS and MEEHAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPEIER and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 257, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 257, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 205, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—222

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

NOES—205

Ackerman Andrews Bartlett
 Altmire Baca Bass (CA)
 Amash Baldwin Bass (NH)

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

NOT VOTING—4

Cassidy Labrador
 Filner Slaughter

□ 1729

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 258, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

CHIMNEY ROCK NATIONAL MONUMENT ESTABLISHMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2621) to establish the Chimney Rock National Monument in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, as amended.