

not welcoming high-skilled workers here and then promptly leaving them in a limbo that may last a lifetime.

It is time that we fix the system to create a merit-based, first-come-first-served system that is fair for all employment-based immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the excellent work he has done on this bill; the collaboration that we have had on bringing it forward so it could be considered today; and the tremendous bipartisanship that has been exhibited throughout dealing with this question, going back for nearly 10 years of work on this.

I would note that the vast majority, way over 90 percent, of employment-based immigrants who have been sponsored for green cards are already working in the United States on some form of temporary visa. This doesn't bring in additional people. These are people who are already here.

The question is, are they going to be able to get the stability that legal permanent residence provides? If they do, it will be good for our country in several ways.

One, they are contributing to our economy, whether they are physicians serving in medically underserved areas, whether they are scientists breaking new ground, or whether they are H-1B nurses who are serving in underserved areas.

Further, we know from studies that people who are legal permanent residents are not vulnerable to those who might be abusive employers trying to suppress their wages. So, this is good for American workers as well as those who would gain bargaining power by gaining legal permanent residence.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can have a great vote of support for this bill today. I thank all the cosponsors and those who worked so hard to get us here today.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1044, the "Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act of 2019."

H.R. 1044 will help alleviate the massive immigrant visa backlog by eliminating the 7 percent "per-country" limit on employment-based visas and increasing the family-based per-country limit from 7 percent to 15 percent.

The bill will also ease backlogs for certain family-sponsored immigrants by modifying the per-country limits in the family-sponsored green card system.

Specifically, H.R. 1044 provides for the phased elimination over three years of the "per country" cap for employment-based immigrant visas so that all workers are treated fairly.

The legislation raises the "per country" cap from 7 percent to 15 percent for family-sponsored immigrant visas and restores 1,000 employment-based visas per fiscal year to the People's Republic of China, that have histori-

cally been set aside for green card applicants under the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992.

Mr. Speaker, the United States makes 140,000 green cards available every year to employment-based immigrants, including many who first come here on temporary H-1B or L visas.

Current law, however, provides that no more than 79 percent of these green cards can go to nationals of any one country—even though some countries are more populous than others.

This bipartisan bill alters the per-country limits for employment-based immigrants so that all are treated equally regardless of their country of birth.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong supporter of the H-1B program.

Without it, American employers would not be able to hire enough highly educated professionals for the "specialty occupations."

A "specialty occupation" is employment requiring the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge.

This includes doctors, engineers, professors and researchers in a wide variety of fields, accountants, medical personnel, and computer scientists.

An American employer who wants to bring an H-1B employee to the United States must, among other requirements, attest that it will pay the H-1B employee the greater of the actual compensation paid to other employees in the same job, or the prevailing compensation for that occupation.

Additionally, the employer must attest that it will provide working conditions for the H-1B visa holder that will not cause the working conditions of the other employees to adversely be affected; and that there is no applicable strike or lockout.

The employer also must provide a copy of the attestation to the representative of the employee bargaining unit or, if there is no bargaining representative, must post the attestation in conspicuous locations at the work site.

Mr. Speaker, as important as it is that the H-1B program enables our country to benefit from the services of foreign professionals who have skills and knowledge that are in short supply in this country, is the fact that American businesses use the program to alleviate temporary shortages of U.S. professionals in specific occupations and to acquire special expertise in overseas economic trends and issues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1044 to help alleviate the immigrant visa backlogs and enhance the nation's economic competitiveness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1044, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ADDING FLAGSTAFF AND YUMA TO LIST OF LOCATIONS IN WHICH COURT SHALL BE HELD IN JUDICIAL DISTRICT FOR STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1569) to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1569

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

SECTION 1. DISTRICT COURTS IN THE JUDICIAL DISTRICT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA.

Section 82 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "Globe, Phoenix, Prescott, and Tucson" and inserting "Flagstaff, Globe, Phoenix, Prescott, Tucson, and Yuma".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1569, a bill unanimously supported by our entire Arizona delegation that will amend title 28 of the U.S. Code to add the cities of Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which Federal district court can be held in my home State of Arizona.

The U.S. Code is outdated. It has not been amended since it was enacted in 1948. It is preposterous that right now, district court matters can only be held in Globe, Phoenix, Prescott, and Tucson.

That means Yuma and Flagstaff residents must travel at least 100 miles to attend a hearing or report for jury duty. That is totally unacceptable and unnecessary.

A pillar of the United States structure of democracy is for all Americans to have access to the courts, whether that is by literal location or by reducing cost barriers. We are weakening that pillar when residents must drive over 100 miles for their day in court.

Access to justice should not be dictated by where you live. I am proud to support this legislation because it will have a tremendous impact on the residents in these parts of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I hope the Senate acts

swiftly and delivers H.R. 1569 to the President for his signature.

It is time for Arizona to have a more efficient and effective court system.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything the gentleman just said. This is a good bill. It needs to happen.

These locations are different, and since 1948, the State of Arizona has changed.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to vote “yes” on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O’HALLERAN), the sponsor of H.R. 1569.

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER and Ranking Member COLLINS for moving this bill through the Judiciary Committee. Similarly, I thank all the committee members for supporting the bill on a unanimous voice vote.

This legislation has the bipartisan and bicameral support of the Arizona delegation.

This simple, commonsense legislation allows current Federal judges to sit in existing courthouses or magistrates’ chambers in Yuma and Flagstaff, two rapidly growing communities where constituents do not have full access to the Federal judicial system.

By allowing existing judges to sit in Yuma and Flagstaff, residents of rural Arizona will not have to travel the significant distances they currently do to Phoenix or Tucson to be heard by a judge.

This will mean that police officers can spend more time on patrol and that individuals won’t have to travel to serve on juries or participate in matters that require a judge.

□ 1530

Easier access to courthouses will help Tribal nations that are under significant Federal jurisdiction. This will only further support Tribal sovereignty.

This legislation is a simple way to improve life for residents of rural America, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1569.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman O’HALLERAN for his leadership on this important legislation. I also thank Chairman NADLER for working with me and advancing this bill through the House Judiciary Committee. It is going to make a positive difference to Arizonans. And I thank Representative COLLINS, as well, for his support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1569.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING AND TREATING OFFICERS IN CRISIS ACT OF 2019

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 998) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 998

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Supporting and Treating Officers In Crisis Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. EXPANDING SUPPORT FOR POLICE OFFICER FAMILY SERVICES, STRESS REDUCTION, AND SUICIDE PREVENTION.

Part W of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10491 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the part heading, by striking “**FAMILY SUPPORT**” and inserting “**SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND FAMILIES**”;

(2) in section 2301 (34 U.S.C. 10491)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, including any research and reports developed under the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-113; 131 Stat. 2276)” after “interested parties”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, psychological services, suicide prevention,” after “stress reduction”;

(3) in section 2302 (34 U.S.C. 10492), by inserting “and mental health services” after “family support services”; and

(4) in section 2303 (34 U.S.C. 10493)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “officers and” after “law enforcement”; and

(ii) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) Evidence-based programs to reduce stress, prevent suicide, and promote mental health; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by inserting “, mental health crisis, and suicide prevention” after “family crisis”;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking “the human immunodeficiency virus” and inserting “infectious disease”;

(iii) in paragraph (8), by inserting “, injured, or permanently disabled” after “killed”; and

(iv) by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

“(10) Specialized training for identifying, reporting, and responding to officer mental health crises and suicide.

“(11) Technical assistance and training to support any or all of the services described in paragraphs (1) through (10).”

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZING GRANT PROGRAMS FOR SUPPORTING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND FAMILIES.

Section 1001(a)(21) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(21)) is amended to read as follows:

“(21) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part W, \$7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. BASS) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 998, the Supporting and Treating Officers in Crisis Act of 2019, also known as the STOIC Act. This bill would provide important mental health and suicide prevention services to law enforcement officers and their families.

Specifically, it would modify an existing, but expired, authorization providing support to law enforcement officers’ families to add mental health and suicide prevention programs directed at officers themselves. Additionally, S. 998 would also reauthorize the family support provisions and would appropriate up to \$7.5 million for each fiscal year from 2020 to 2024 to carry out both the family and law enforcement officer mental health programs.

The law enforcement officers this grant program would assist all too often face dangerous and horrific challenges, which takes a hard toll on them and, often, their families. Too frequently, local resources are not readily available or accessible for these purposes. S. 998 would bridge this critical gap.

Seeking help is often the hardest step to take to address one’s mental health issues. It can be especially difficult for law enforcement officers because of the stigma against it within the law enforcement community and, too often still, in society as a whole. The aim of this legislation is to help overcome this reluctance by destigmatizing mental health treatment in the law enforcement community.

Provisions in this legislation encourage recipients of grant funding to set up suicide prevention hotlines. These lifelines are a critical step for getting those officers who need it the assistance they require and thereby help address the nationwide tragedy of officer suicide.

The impact of on-the-job stress is not limited to law enforcement officers, however. The underlying expired grant program, which this bill reauthorizes, permits recipients of grant programs for marital and adolescent support groups. This “whole family” approach to mental health services is essential for retaining officers. It is often said that departments recruit officers and retain families. Family support programs, such as those authorized in S. 998, provide critical support that keeps officers on patrol.